OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIFTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

58-59 VICTORIA, 1895

VOL. XL.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE ELEVENTH DAY OF JUNE TO THE TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF JULY INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1895

House of Commons Debates

FIFTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 11th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ROADS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. DALY moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 114) to amend the Act respecting roads and allowances in the province of Manitoba. He said: This is a Bill to amend chapter 49 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, by which certain road allowances are vested in the province under certain conditions, and it is to modify the manner in which these roads can be taken over by the province of Manitoba, particularly in organized municipalities. Under the previous Act the roads were surveyed simply, and are vested in the province of Manitoba; but by this Act we provided that all road allowances in townships surveyed up to the present time are declared to be the property of the province in all organized municipalities; and this provision is based upon that line. The other clauses of the Act lead up to that, and deal with the old roads in the city of Winnipeg. The Bill is asked for by the Government of Manitoba in order to do away with certain doubts that have existed there as to the old trails and roads in the city of Winnipeg, under the surveys that were made a few years ago.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 66) further to amend the Penitentiary Act.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

THE CRIMINAL CODE, 1892.

Bill (No. 51) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, was read the second time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved:

That a Message be sent to the Senate, requesting their Honours to unite with this House in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses to examine and report upon the Bill of the Commons, No. 51, intituled: "An Act further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892," and informing them that the Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, and Hon. Messrs. Daly, Dickey, Curran, and Messrs. Adams, Amyot, Baker, Brodeur, Carroll, Choquette, Coatsworth, Corbould, Delisle, Edgar, Forbes, Fraser, Girouard (Jacques Cartier), Langelier, McLeod, Masson, Monet, Mulock, Tisdale and Weldon, will act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of said Joint Committee, should the Senate agree to its creation.

Motion agreed to.

THE MARKLAND MORTGAGE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Minister of Finance to execute, on behalf of Her Majesty, a release and discharge of a certain mortgage given to Her Majesty in 1858 by the Hon. George H. Markland upon certain properties in the city of Kingston, which were sold in 1862 under the said mortgage, and to convey the properties so sold, freed and discharged from the

said mortgage, to the persons entitled thereto, on payment of such part of the purchase money as now remains unpaid, either with or without interest and on such other terms and conditions as the Minister deems expedient in the public interest.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am certainly opposed to the proposition which the hon. gentleman now submits to the House. I do not know whether he has traced the history of this transaction, but this I know full well, that the papers of the year 1856, of the old Parliament of Canada, will show that this amount represents funds belonging to the University of Toronto; that the University of Toronto claimed the money that was so invested; that the Government itself is liable to the university for those moneys; and if the hon. gentleman undertakes to deal with this matter, he ought first to make the necessary provision that the university itself shall be secured an amount of money which is comprised in that mortgage and the interest thereon. I think in the appendices of 1856 a statement will be found which shows the origin of those moneys and for what purpose they were loaned. If I remember rightly, they were in some way connected with a canal; at all events, the moneys belonged to the University of Toronto, and the hon. gentleman ought, if he undertakes to deal with this mortgage, and he does propose to deal with it as the property of the Dominion of Canada, and as one which the Dominion has a right to remit, he ought to be prepared to secure to the university the funds which originally belonged to it.

Mr. FOSTER. The resolution as it stands on the paper, no doubt, deals with a debt due to the Crown, and as it involves a loss to the treasury, it should be introduced by a resolution, although I have already introduced a Bill on the subject. I had heard nothing until the hon. gentleman's speech to-day, with respect to any special claim which the University of Toronto has on the property. I found that this matter had been hanging up in the departments for several years. It was dealt with by the Public Accounts Committee some years ago; the Committee had all the papers before it, investigated the case, and made a report to the effect that the whole trust should be written off. The House adopted that report, although it never went any further. The proposal I submit to the House is not to wipe off the whole indebtedness, but to accept 50 per cent of the indebtedness which the parties interested are willing to give. However, I will look into the matter of which the hon. gentleman has spoken and when we come to the first reading of the Bill we can take the matter under consideration.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. I understood the other day when this matter was brought up for the first time that the hon. gentleman would bring down to the House the correspondence relating to this subject. I understand from the hon. gentleman to-day that there has been a report made by the Committee on Public Accounts. In what year was that made?

Mr. FOSTER. In 1888.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is perfectly clear that if that is the case, that the Committee were not properly informed with respect to the nature of the money.

Mr. FOSTER. That must be clear, because I find no mention of it whatever in the report.

Resolution reported.

THE MARKLAND MORTGAGE.

Mr. FOSTER moved the discharge of Order for second reading of Bill (No. 93) respecting the discharge of a mortgage to Her Majesty known as the Markland Mortgage.

Motion agreed to, Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

SUPPLY—THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

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

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I propose inviting the attention of the House and of the Government to the petition presented and

read at the Table on behalf of the Auditor General. This petition shows that the Auditor General feels that in his present position and with the resources at his command he will not be able to properly discharge those duties which Parliament has imposed upon him. There is a strong sense of duty and a keen sense of unfair treatment pervading this petition. It is of special consequence to the House of Commons that this petition should receive very full consideration. From it, it is clear that he holds he is denied the necessary strength to enable him to efficiently discharge the duties that pertain to his office as Auditor General, that he is denied the ability to reward honest service, in the same way that persons at the head of other branches of the public service are permitted to do, and that he is denied the necessary means to secure the highest efficiency in the public interest in the department over which he presides. From that petition we gather that he has made representations to the Minister, with whom, by the law which created his department, he is authorized to officially communicate, and that those representations have not been heeded, that the communications which he has addressed to the Minister earnestly setting forth the duties of the office, the amount of labour involved, the interests which it is intended to protect, have not been answered. This office, beyond any other office in the public service, is one in which this House has special interest, and the officer is rather the officer of this House, than an officer of the Government. He states in the communication which he has addressed to the House, that so long as Sir John Macdonald lived, he had his cordial support in the discharge of his duties, but that during the past two years his relations to the Government in the discharge of the duties as Auditor General have been less satisfactory than before. The importance of the case is brought before us by the statement of the fact that there is $40,000,000 of expenditure made annually, which requires to be properly audited, and it is his duty to see that every dollar is used for the purpose for which it is voted, if used at all, and for no other purpose. The importance of the office has been recognized long since in England, and those who have studied the public accounts of the expenditure of Canada during its earlier history, and since the creation of the office here, can have no doubt whatever that the office of Auditor General, and the discharge of the duties of that office in an efficient and satisfactory manner, are of the highest consequence to the good government of the country. It is true, the Auditor General has certain duties to discharge in connection with the administrative work of the Government; but, as an auditor of appropriations, he is not an officer of the executive at all, but an officer of this House. He was intended by the law to be placed under the protection of this House; and, if he is dealt with vexatiously, if he is subjected to embarrassments and difficulties by being denied either the aid or the pecuniary resources necessary to the carrying on of the work of his office, it is proper for him to bring that matter under the attention of this House; and it is proper for this House to afford to him the necessary protection and relief. It would be a most improper thing were he at the end of the next year unable to make a proper report, unable to give to the House the information which it requires, and were he to assign as an excuse for the failure to conform to the law, that the necessary means were not placed at his disposal for that purpose. This House is entitled to know what are the relations between its Auditor and the Government; and if the Government withholds from him that pecuniary support necessary to the proper discharge of his duties, it is his business to report that fact to this House. There was a time in the history of the English Government when the chief function of the House of Commons was to vote subsidies, when the redress of grievances and the work of legislation were solely under the control of the Crown and when the House of Commons sought to secure the redress of its grievances by petition to the Crown, asking that the Crown should legislate in a particular way. These petitions generally related to encroachments on the part of the Crown on the customary law of the country, and nearly all the legislation carried on by Parliament for centuries was nothing more than the restraint of the Crown from such encroachments and the restoration of the ancient usage. The great function of the House of

Commons was the voting of the necessary supplies. It was not until the time of Charles II. that the practice was introduced by Charles Downing of dividing the subsidies granted to the Crown, and assigning a certain portion of each subsidy to a particular object. And so the Crown was restrained, so far as its conduct could be known to the House, by the detailed estimates of the Appropriation Act. But at that time there was no audit of the accounts, and flagrant abuses and misappropriations were from time to time brought to light. It was not until the time of William III. and Anne that Parliament took steps at all to secure an audit of the public accounts. When the House of Hanover came to the English throne, those provisions of the law was disregarded; and on more than one occasion under the rule of both George I. and George II. subsidies were made after the old fashion. Lump sums were voted, and it was left to the Crown, on the advice of the Ministers, to decide how that money should be appropriated. In 1780, Mr. Burke, in his proposal for economical reform, also proposed a scheme for the proper audit of the public accounts; and so we find, at least as early as 1785, that an Audit Act was adopted, and a committee was provided, appointed in the first instance by Parliament, but afterwards by the Crown, to exercise a superintending control over the expenditures that the Government from time to time made. Those proceedings on the part of Parliament were not intended as checks upon the treasury at all. They were intended to enable the treasury to ascertain how far the subordinates of the Government were properly discharging the duties assigned to them, and how far the money was being applied to the purposes, not merely to which Parliament had voted it, but to which the Government intended that it should be applied by their subordinate officers. That was an audit altogether different from our modern conception of a proper audit. It was purely an administrative audit. It was an audit which exercised a certain superintending influence over the accountants of the various departments rather than over the treasury itself. This system continued, with more or less completeness, down to 1857, when further changes were made, and the present system was mainly adopted in the year 1865. Mr. Macaulay, who was Secretary of the Board of Audit at that time, says that the auditors ought to be made in fact as well as in theory the servants of the House of Commons; they ought to be dependent, for the means of discharging their duties efficiently, wholly on the House of Commons. He points out that if you make the audit in that regard dependent upon the Crown, he never can discharge those modern duties which it is intended he should discharge in exercising an efficient control over the expenditures by the executive Government itself. But when that subject was under discussion in the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone pointed out that the Board of Audit is intended as a board of verification—that its business is to ascertain whether the moneys are being precisely used for the purpose of which they are voted. Its business is to secure truth and accuracy in the administration of the finances of the country, but it is not intended that the Auditor General and the Controller, shall undertake in any way to govern the public policy in reference to public expenditure. Their duties are wholly of a legal, and not in any sense, of a political character. The coercive and political side which appertains to public expenditure, Mr. Gladstone observes, is wholly under the control of the House of Commons, and of the Committee of Public Accounts, and not under the Auditor General. He observes that the auditor does two things: He sees that the money is used for the purpose for which it is voted, and that it is paid out from the exchequer in accordance with the law. Mr. Macaulay, in the report to which I refer, makes the following observation:—

> The whole of our experience as appropriation auditors tend to satisfy us that we ought to have no further communication with the executive departments than may be necessary for obtaining information. Whatever tends to associate us, either directly or indirectly, with the pecuniary transactions of the Government, cannot but tend to damage the credit of the Reports in which we require to submit those transactions to the judgment of Parliament.

Now, in England as here, there are two kinds of auditors, and this fact has in some degree served to confuse in the minds of members of the House, here as there, the duties and functions of the auditor, and his relation to the House of Commons and to the Government. There is an administrative

audit, and there is an appropriation audit. So far as the Auditor General is engaged in the work of administrative audit, he is acting on behalf of the Government; he is assisting the Government in superintending the expenditures of public money. But in so far as he is acting as an appropriation auditor, he is superintending the action of the Government itself, and as an appropriation auditor he is an officer of this House, and of this House alone. Now, the auditor when he is engaged in the work of administrative audit, considers whether the departmental expenditure is in accordance with the treasury instructions. The treasury decides what they will do in respect to any irregularity pointed out, and in England, as here, the auditors make their report through the Treasury Department; not because they are subordinate to the Treasury Department as appropriation auditors, not to give the Treasury Department a superintending control over the auditors, but to enable them to rectify any irregularity or mistake which the auditors have pointed out, and to enable them to accompany the report to the House, with any explanation they may choose to make in reference to that matter. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the position of the auditor here. The Auditor General is required to make his report, not to the Finance Minister, but to Parliament, and he makes it through the Minister of Finance, and why? In order that he may enable the Minister of Finance, first, to make any correction that he or the Treasury Board may desire to make in respect to these irregularities, and to accompany the report with any explanation they may choose to make in respect to the matters which the Auditor General has to criticise. In England there was no provision made for questioning any expenditure in excess of the Parliamentary vote, or for the service for which any appropriation is made, and this expenditure was made without fear of detection, and very serious abuses grew up at one time, especially in connection with the army and navy vote. This in fact, led in a large degree to the modern system of audit in England, and led to the conferring upon the Auditor General and Controller there, supervision over the public appropriations. The appropriation audit now extends to every branch of the public expenditure. It is conducted by the Exchequer and Audit Department, in concert with the accountant of the branch whose accounts are under consideration. They act on behalf of the House of Commons and under the rules set out in the Acts of 1866 and 1884. They see, first, that the expenditure is attested by regular vouchers; second, that the expenditure is sanctioned by the proper departmental authorities, and third, that it is distinctly authorized by some Act of Parliament. Under the first two heads the audit is an administrative audit; under the whole three the audit is an appropriation audit. The first, as I pointed out, is sent to the treasury to rectify irregularities and then it is the duty of the auditor to report to the House of Commons every departure made from the Appropriation Act. Now, that was the condition of things that existed in England with respect to the audit of the public accounts at the time that our Act of 1878 was carried. Here our statute provides for the appointment of the auditor by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada. The auditor is entitled to hold his office, not during pleasure, but during good behaviour, and he can be only removed from that office upon an address supported by both Houses of Parliament. The appointments that are made in his department under the law, are made by the Governor General in Council, who have the power to regulate the numbers, the salaries, the grades, and the classes of officers. The Auditor General may make rules which are reported to the Treasury Department, and which are there approved of before they can come into operation. He may ask for information, or report for information any facts that he deems proper to the Governor General in Council, but he does this through the Minister of Finance as the organ of communication. It is the duty of the auditor to see that no payment is made for which there is no parliamentary appropriation; that there is no money paid beyond the amount voted, that he report to the Governor in Council, through the Minister of Finance, in cases where any accountant or sub-accountant has expended without authority or in excess of an appropriation. The Audit Act provides that no cheque shall issue from the Finance Department without the Auditor General's certificate, except: 1. Where the Law officers of the Crown, differ in opinion from the Auditor General. 2. Where there has been an accident during the recess and an unforeseen expense arises in consequence. 3. Where, upon the report of the Auditor General on the one side and the Deputy Minister of Finance on the other, the Treasury Board decides against the Auditor General. When accounts are prepared by the Department of Finance for the Auditor General, he is required to certify and to report upon them, and it is under this authority that payments are directed. The Auditor General's Report is required to be made to Parliament through the Minister of Finance for the reason I have already mentioned. The law assumes that there is a difference in the nature of the office of Auditor General from that of any other departmental offices connected with the public service. It places every other officer under the entire control of the Government, but it does not so place the Auditor General, because the Auditor General is required to exercise a

check over the expenditures of the Government and to see that every dollar paid out of the public treasury is paid out under the authority of some law. And it is only by permitting to him a large measure of discretion and by meeting his wishes in every case, except where it can be shown that they are most unreasonable, that the relations which the Act creates between the Department of Finance and the Auditor General can be allowed to continue. Otherwise the function of the Auditor General would be very greatly impaired. He must be at liberty to set his opinion against that of the Ministers, and to override the opinions of the Ministers, except in the cases pointed out in the statute. Without this independence which the law intended to secure to him, his office would be of very little value. From the very nature of the work which he is called upon to perform, the officials which he requires must be, on the whole, of a higher order than those in the average departments of the public service. The departments which are most nearly like that of the Auditor General, are the Departments of Justice, Inland Revenue, Finance, in consequence of the Insurance Department associated with it, and the Geological Branch. Now, I wish to call attention to some of those matters of which the Auditor General complains, and to point out to the House how obvious it is, from these facts, that the Auditor General has been unfairly dealt with by the Minister of Finance. Let me take the Department of Justice. There are fifteen clerks in that department. Three of them are chief clerks; five are first-class clerks. So that eight out of fifteen are chief or first-class clerks, making 53⅓ per cent belonging to these two classes. Then take the Inland Revenue Department. In it there are twenty-two clerks, of which three are chief clerks, and six first-class clerks, that is nine out of twenty-two, or 40 8-10 per cent are of these higher grades. In the Finance Department there are twenty-eight clerks, of whom four are chief clerks and six first-class, making ten out of twenty-eight, or 35¾ per cent. Then in the Geological Branch, there are twenty-nine clerks, of whom six are chief clerks, nine first-class, so that fifteen out of twenty-nine, or 51¾ per cent, belong to these two divisions. Now, look at the Auditor General's Department which ranks along with these, and is certainly a special department. There are twenty-four clerks in it, of whom three are chief clerks, and one first-class, that is four out of the twenty-four, or 16⅔ per cent of the clerks in that department, belong to these two classes. Compare that with the departments I have mentioned:

Department of Justice...	53⅓	per cent,	first rank
Inland Revenue.....	48 $\frac{8}{10}$	do	do
Finance Department.....	35¾	do	do
Geological Branch.....	51¾	do	do
Auditor General's Branch	16⅔	do	do

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Look at the average salaries paid in these different departments:

Department of Justice.....	$1,579 17
Inland Revenue.....	1,510 46
Finance Department.....	1,551 79
Geological Branch.....	1,564 22
Auditor General's Branch.....	1,073 94

Thus the Auditor General's branch is nearly $500 below the average of any one of these other departments. Now, the Auditor General required for the payment of extra clerks, $1,800. I believe he communicated with the Minister of Finance and informed him that every dollar of that would be required for the proper discharge of the work of his department. Yet the Minister of Finance cut that down to $1,300, and the Auditor General was not consulted. No communication was had with him. The amount asked for, in the first instance, was necessarily small, but the Minister of Finance reduced that from $1,800 to $1,300. Now, look at the condition of the other departments. The Governor General's office is allowed for extra clerks, $1,400 this year, and $1,400 for next year. The Secretary of State's Department is allowed $1,600 for each year. I have no hesitation in saying that I am fairly convinced that the whole work of that department can be done by five clerks. I am perfectly sure of that, and yet you give to that department, which has scarcely anything to do, $1,600 for the payment of extra clerks and you withhold a considerable portion of the amount asked by the Auditor for the work of his department. Printing and Stationery, the average for the current year is $2,000, and they ask $2,000 for next year. In the Interior Department and Indian Affairs, the Government give $1,800 to each for extra clerks. In the Finance Department it was $1,000 for the current year, and the estimate is $1,000 for next year. In the Customs Department, the amount is $1,700 this year, and $1,700 for the coming year. In the Inland Revenue, it is $1,500 for the current year, and the same amount for the next year. In the Public Works, it is $1,500, and the estimate for next year is the same. In the Post Office Department, the estimate for extra clerks was $18,800 for the current year, and the Government is asking the same under their estimate for next year. In the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the estimate is the same for each year—$2,000. In the Department of Railways and Canals the figure is the same—$2,000 for each year. And the Auditor General asks $1,800 for extra clerks, and you propose to place at his disposal $1,300 for this purpose. This shows that you have given the Auditor General wholly different treatment from that you have meted out to the other departments of the public service. Then, you have a very large increase in the work of that department, as I shall presently show. It is said that the cost of the Auditor General's Department is

large. Including salaries, printing and contingencies, the amount asked for is about $40,000. This is for auditing $40,000,000, or at the rate of $100 of cost for every $100,000 of pecuniary transactions. I am perfectly sure that in the management of any private business that would not be considered a large rate. Then, it is said that the report is swollen far beyond what is necessary. I do not think that that is so. There are in the report 1,600 pages. That means four pages of letter press for every $100,000 of public expenditure. We are told that there is more detail than is necessary; that in England the detail is not given so minutely as it is with us. In England they have upward of $400,000,000 of expenditure every year, and it would require twelve volumes of 1,600 pages each to give the expenditure with the same detail as it is given in the Auditor General's Report. Now, in England, as here, the information is given, not to inform the Government of something they did not know before, but for the information of the members of the House of Commons, and to enable the House of Commons to exercise that control over the public finances which it deems to be in the public interest. And so long as the report is not so voluminous or so minute as to prevent the House from becoming acquainted with its contents, it is not more minute than the public interests require. There is an impression abroad in the House that one of the grounds of the attempts to cripple the department of the Auditor General is that it is held by some that he gives details of matters that ought not to have found their way into his report. That would be a good objection if the statement made by the Auditor General in his report were inaccurate. But there is no charge of inaccuracy; there is merely the charge that it is not a comfortable thing for some parties who have received money from the public treasury to have pointed out the various purposes for which that money was obtained. Well, this may be a fault in the expenditure, or it may be a fault in the public taste. As to the latter, I do not think that any persons have done more to pervert the public taste—if it is regarded as a defect—than the gentlemen on the other side of the House and the press which supports them. We all remember the attacks made years ago upon the local government in Ontario. We remember the attacks made upon the Lieutenant-Governor Macdonald, the stories put in circulation about the sumptuous manner in which his friends who accompanied him to Port Arthur on one occasion were provided for. That was used for all it was worth against the Lieutenant-Governor and the member of the Government most intimately associated with him on that occasion—the Commissioner of Crown Lands, if I remember rightly. And so this species of publication is not very agreeable. Now, in regard to the publication of such details, a great deal depends upon the person and the manner in which he was engaged in the service of the Government. If the Government secures a person to perform a service gratuitously, they naturally do not expect to provide for him in exactly the same way as they would provide for the secretary of a Minister. What would be quite proper in one case, might not be proper in another. In either case, we do not suppose that the Government would insist upon the parties living on treacle and brimstone.

Mr. FOSTER. They thought Cockburn should have done it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a rule laid down by the hon. gentleman's friends long ago. I suppose he has heard of "Little Miss ——," a picture which hung in the room of one of the Ministers in Toronto. I suppose he has heard of the glasses and decanters furnished for the Speaker's room there. I suppose he has heard a great many things just of the kind that appear in the Auditor General's Report, which, it is complained do not properly appear in that report. I do not know what the hon. gentleman would put there. How would he account for the expenditure? Would he group a hundred of these expenditures and call them "sundries"? If that is the course he wishes to see pursued, the hon. gentleman ought to ask Parliament to adopt that course, when the Auditor General would be required to conform his conduct to the rule of Parliament in that as in every other particular. I believe a great many frauds have been detected, a great many mistakes have been corrected, by the full details published by the Auditor General. If I remember rightly, not long ago frauds were detected in connection with the management of the Carillon and Grenville Canal, the discovery being due to the full reports of the Auditor General. It was discovered that persons who had been dead for years were still upon the pay rolls, that supplies were purchased for those who had been in the church-yard for many years, and that $25,000 at least had been taken from the public treasury by manipulations of this sort. Now, it is said that this report has grown very large. That is because the Government have thrown the administrative audit upon the Auditor General. Let me call the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Indian accounts were given to the Auditor General to audit for the first time in 1882: that the Franchise Act accounts were given to him to audit after the passing of that measure, in 1886; that these $60,000 were struck off the charges on that measure by the Auditor General, and $200,000 on the charges connected with preparation of the voters' lists on the subsequent occasion. So that in connection with that matter, the work of the Auditor General's department has been increased, and at least $260,000 were saved to the public treasury in consequence of the audit. Then, there is the

examination of the revenue returns, which was first given him in 1887, and which required, I am told, the services of four additional clerks. Now this reference to the Auditor General grew out of Mr. Tilton's case, in 1887. I believe that it was a proper thing; the audit is a necessary audit. It is an administrative audit, it is true, it is a matter which concerns the Government; but in the prevention of frauds upon the Government in the administration of the departments, there is also a prevention of fraud upon the public treasury. Then the bank accounts and the currency accounts were given in charge to the Auditor General in 1887, and the store accounts were given him in 1894. Now, these are all administrative audits, but they have all added very largely to the work of the department, and they have all served to swell the volume which the Auditor General annually is required to lay upon our Table under the provisions of the Act. Now, the Auditor General requires examinations for promotion in his department precisely the same as in the other departments. Of course, they are of a somewhat different character, and of a higher order than the majority of the examinations required. What the Auditor General has complained of in his petition is that he has not enough money to pay the extra clerks required; that enough money is not voted to enable him to fill up the classes, and to promote men who are eligible for promotion in the public service in his department. The theoretical organization of that department stands as follows:—Chief clerks, three; first-class clerks, four; second-class clerks, five; or twelve of the three classes. The present organization is: Three chief clerks, one first-class clerk; and six second-class clerks. So it will be seen that the Auditor General's Department is kept below its theoretical organization, in the standing of those in the public service, as well as in numbers, and that the Auditor General is denied the right which is exercised by the head of every other department of the Government. It is complained that the Auditor General's Report is a work for the benefit of the Opposition. Now, whether it be so or not, depends largely upon the manner in which the Government discharge their duties, and the strictness with which they conform to the law. The Auditor General, in so far as his work comes in contact with the administrative work of the Government, is necessarily a criticism on the action of Government. It is intended to be so. It does not matter who may be the Auditor General, or who may be the Government; that is the necessary relation between them, that is the necessary consequence of a proper audit; and unless it can be shown that the audit is dishonest; that the facts are perverted; that they are intended to convey an erroneous impression; then it seems to me there is nothing of which a Government have to complain in the audit of the public accounts. The public accounts in England show how closely the auditors and controller criticise the work of Government in the payment of public moneys. This department began in our Government in 1878, there was none in this country before. There can hardly be any complaints of want of economy in the audit office. There is no superannuation, I believe, at the present time in that office. There is not a single party charged against the superannuation fund who has served in the Auditor General's Department. I do not know why the Minister of Finance has dealt with the Auditor General's Department in the way he has done; whether he thinks he is doing too much, or whether he thinks he is doing too little: whether he thinks that the persons in the public service in that department are less severely taxed with work than they are elsewhere, or whether they are more severely taxed. I think it is impossible to look at the Auditor General's report and observe the number of items there reported, to bear in mind the fact that everything there reported is taken from the original documents—nothing is copied from any book or report made by any Minister's department—I say it is impossible to look at these facts without seeing that a great amount of work is performed in that department. Now, it seems to me that it is the business of this House to pay some regard to the petition which the Auditor General has addressed to this House. I am perfectly sure it never would have been submitted here if there was any hope or expectation that that department would be dealt with by the Government in the same way as others, that it would have meted out to it the same consideration that is extended to other departments of Government. Sir, this House has only to look at the facts I have mentioned, at the number of chief clerks, at the number of first-class clerks, at the percentage which they constitute of the number of clerks in the service, as compared with every other department of the public service, to see that this is a marked department, that it has been marked out for the expression of the displeasure of the Administration. It is impossible to look at the average salary of the clerks in that department, and compare them with the average salary in the Department of Justice, in the Department of Inland Revenue, in the Geological Branch, in the Department of Finance, without seeing that it has been a marked department, and that it is stamped with the expression of the displeasure of the Government. If the Government had anything to complain of, they should have come down and frankly stated what it was. But nothing of that sort has been done. I will not trouble the House with making a comparison as between all the departments of the Government, but if hon. members will take the

whole departments and compare the various salaries paid in the whole of them, taken together, they will find that the average salary is considerable more than the average salary paid to the officers in the Audit Branch. That ought not to be so, for the reasons I have mentioned, for those who are qualified to enter that branch of the public service require, on the whole, a higher degree of attainment than the average clerk in the public service. There are special departments in which the average rank of attainment is higher than in others. I have already mentioned them—the Department of Justice, the Department of Inland Revenue, the Insurance Branch of the Department of Finance, the Geological Branch, and the Department of the Auditor General, and I have shown this House that the Auditor General's Department, as compared with the other departments, gives an average to each clerk of $1,070, while the average in the other departments is $1,570, being a difference of $500 between the average of the one and the other. Can any man in his senses say that is a mere accident, that a department so marked out has been fairly dealt with, or fairly treated, by the Administration? I say, Sir, there can be no two opinions on this subject. I will not trespass further on the indulgence of the House. I call the attention of the House to the work of the Auditor General's Department, to the number of persons employed, and to the fact that they, on the whole, work longer hours than do the clerks in almost every other department, taking the year together, and they are entitled to consideration which they have not received at the hands of the Minister who was intended by law to be the guardian of this department under the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Sir, I will try and not take up as much time as my hon. friend has consumed on this question, and will abridge a little at least by refusing to enter into the long historical disquisition to which he has treated the House as a sort of prelude to his discussion of the subject. With that history I have neither quarrel to make nor anything to say in its commendation: I dare say it is perfectly accurate, and will be found to be a very valuable contribution to the records of the House. However, I think this question is comparatively a simple one. We are dealing with the petition and the allegations made in the petition, and I found, as the hon. gentleman proceeded, that we are to deal with certain allegations not made in the petition. Upon certain private information, which he possesses, he has based his conclusions, and based his charges. My hon. friend was so imbued with information that he forgot its source. He began by saying the petition disclosed certain things. He said that the petition, for instance, disclosed that communications had passed between the Auditor General and the Finance Minister, and those communications were discourteously treated, and an answer was not deigned to them. I have read over the petition rather carefully, and I cannot find anything of that kind stated in the petition. So I fancy the hon. gentleman has been pumped so full of information that he has mistaken the brief, and he bases charges on information which is not before the House: it is, perhaps, within the cognizance of the hon. gentleman, but is not known to other hon. members. I want to say, in the first place, that the hon. gentleman attempted to give a party bias to this question, as I would have expected him to do, and, so far as the facts of the case are concerned, and so far as I myself am concerned, his charges in connection with the Auditor General's Department are based upon his own imagination, and upon nothing that can be found in fact. The hon. gentleman ended his long disquisition by stating that any man in his senses could not come to any other conclusion than that there was a settled determination to treat the Auditor General's office unfairly and wrongly, as compared with other departments, as could be seen by the history of this case. I tell the hon. gentleman, and I tell him with all frankness, that so far as the Finance Minister is concerned, I do not think there is a Minister in the departments, and I do not know any hon. member on the floor of this House, who is to-day more in sympathy with the work and aim of the Auditor General than I myself am. Now, Sir, I set that explanation, made in all frankness, to the House, and, of course, made truthfully, against the suggestion of my hon. friend. If there has been any unfairness in the treatment of the Auditor General's Department, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, it must be had by inference, but it is not within his power to make the charge against the Finance Minister that he has imported party politics into his treatment of the Auditor General's Department, and that he has done one act against the honest and fair administration of that department, and that he has failed, in any respect, to do his duty to his own department, and to those which come under him. I let that statement go to the House and to the country against the assertion of the hon. gentleman. Surely we can discuss the merits of this case without drifting into party politics.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I said nothing about party politics.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not occupy the time of the House in discussing this question. I leave hon. members to judge from a perusal of "Hansard" as to whether that did not show throughout all the hon. gentleman's remarks, and was explicitly stated in the latter part of his observations. What is the whole trouble? Has the Auditor Gen-

eral stated any grievances against the Government other than two—in fact, only one, but one with two branches? First, that he asked for the promotion of two men to be first-class clerks, and he did not get them promoted; second, that his contingencies were cut down by $500. Go through that petition from first to last, and point out any allegation in that petition of unfair treatment on the part of the Government, or grievances in regard to the Government, except on those two points. It cannot be done. Now, whence comes the evidence of that unfair treatment? My hon. friend knows, and those who sit behind him know, as the House knows, that this year has been a year when the Estimates have been very severely pruned—they have been very carefully looked into. My hon. friend leaps to the conclusion that the Auditor General's two men were not promoted because he was the Auditor General, and I was the Finance Minister, and that the other departments, forsooth, had been treated differently.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And so they have.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us see. I suppose I have a grudge against the Department of the Governor General. It had one first-class clerk last year; it has only one first-class clerk this year. I must have a grudge against the Department of Justice. The department had four first-class clerks last year; it has four this year. For the benefit of my hon. friend I will give him a little information which he does not possess. My hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, pressed before Council the appointment of two chief clerks in addition to those he already had, and pressed his claim with very great force, and with very great fairness. He did not get them. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) did not know that fact; but he does happen to know that the Auditor General pressed for some promotions, and did not get them. It is asserted that I am sympathetic in dealing with other departments, but not with the Department of the Auditor General, and that I am importing animus and party feeling in dealing with it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Other departments have fifty-five.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman cannot run round the bush. I will deal with those other matters later. He must take this dose of medicine at the present moment. Then I must have had spite against the Penitentiaries Branch. It had one first-class clerk last year; it has only one this year. I must have had spite against the Department of Militia and Defence. It had seven first-class clerks last year; it has seven this year. It is the same way with regard to the first-class clerks in the Secretary of State's Department; and also in the Department of Public Printing. I must have special spite against the Minister of the Interior, because the number of first-class clerks in that department has been diminished by one. The Auditor General did not get his two promotions. The Minister of the Interior lost one first-class clerk; yet we are all right so far as the party feeling is concerned, but the Auditor General's treatment is an index of where the animus lies. The office of the Controller of the North-west Mounted Police had one first-class clerk last year; it has one now. The Department of Indian Affairs had ten first-class clerks last year, it has nine first-class clerks this year. The Auditor General has the same in both years. The Department of Finance and Treasury Board has one first-class clerk proposed more this year than last year, and has one second-class clerk less proposed than last year. That we will debate on its merits when the time comes. In the Customs Department, there is an increase of one first-class clerk. In the Inland Revenue Department, the first-class clerks remain the same. In the Post Office Department the first-class clerks remain the same, and the second-class clerks are actually reduced by five, and the third-class clerks by four. In the Department of Agriculture the first-class clerks remain the same in both years, and in the Marine and Fisheries there is one more. In the Department of Public Works they are the same. In the Department of Railways and Canals they are the same. In the Geological staff, the first-class clerks, or technical officers as they are called, are the same; and in the High Commissioner's office they are the same. Now, what does that show? It shows that when we go through the departments, the increase in first-class clerks is almost nil, and that the decrease more than offsets the increase, and that other departments have equal claim, as far as the first-class clerks are concerned, increase or decrease, than has the Auditor General's Department. So much with reference to that. I will take up another point. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) gives it as his mature judgment, that if we want to make a comparison of the departments as to efficiency, ability, training, and high-class work, you must take the Justice Department, the Geological Department, the Finance Department, and the Auditor General's Department. Let us examine that position. Take the Geological Department. Every man of the technical officers in the Geological Department must be a specialist, and a specialist in what requires more than a mere glib facility of going over the multiplication table backwards, of counting up a row of figures which may come to be done automatically, and with very great accuracy; of seeing whether a certain appropriation amounted to a certain sum, and seeing whether the cheques drawn against the credit given for that appropriation amounted to exactly the

same sum. I say that no man who understands what training and education means, would, for a moment, put the clerks, as an average, in a counting department like that of the Auditor General, against the technical officers, geologists, astronomers, and the like of that in the Interior Department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear. You have got the salaries the same as in your own department.

Mr. FOSTER. I say more. I take the Department of the Minister of Justice and I say that his is a technical department. He has to have men who have been trained in law, men who have studied, and men who understand the intricacies of that great science which my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) pursues with such avidity and such success. I make the assertion here : That, as between the average ability, and the average training and capacity, necessary in the Auditor General's Department, as constituted ; and, between the Justice Department, there is not a parallel to the disadvantage of the Justice Department, but quite the opposite. Take the Finance Department. I will say very little about that, except this, that I think the variety of work, and the kind of work that is done there, requires a set of officers, as a rule, of higher training and of greater ability, than is required in the Auditor General's Department. There is a grievance because the amount which was asked for contingencies in the Auditor General's Department, that is for temporary clerical work, was diminished. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) sees what is upon the face of the Estimates, but he does not see what was asked when the Estimates were being considered in Council. The Estimates had been gone through before, and sums that were asked for clerical help were cut down to the figures as they are. Just before we came to finish the Estimates, I went through them in Council, and, wishing to bring the contingencies for clerical work down to a certain sum, I docked off two or three departments, my own amongst the others, and the Auditor General's Department suffered to the extent of $500. I did not have very much compunction in doing that, for this reason : That I knew that during the current year, two or three, or four permanent places in the Auditor General's Department had remained unfilled for a considerable length of time, and that the contingencies for clerical temporary help this year were large. These positions are in process of being filled, and, before the end of this year, will be filled, so that the Auditor General's Department starts out next year with its full complement of permanent men, and, consequently, comparing it with the current year, would require less temporary help than it did last year, and so I considered that the vote might be fairly well diminished. it was diminished by that amount. The Auditor General still gets $1,300 contingencies, and the Finance Department has only $1,000 contingencies. If you take it as treatment on behalf of the Finance Minister, unfair, with regard to the Auditor General, as my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) says, what do you say to the Minister of Finance's treatment of his own department, where the contingencies are cut down to $1,000, or $300 less than the Auditor General has ? Now, Sir, the Auditor General's office has fairly well increased. The Auditor General commenced, in 1879, with fourteen clerks. I suppose we may take 1880 as the first full year when he got into operation. He had fourteen clerks then, who were paid the sum of $14,929.17, and his contingencies were $2,547.42 ; the total being $17,476.59. In 1890 it had increased to twenty-one clerks, $23,076.78 for their pay, $2,990.40 for contingencies, or a total of $26,067.18. In 1894 it had increased to twenty-four clerks, with pay for the same amounting to $25,962.52, with contingencies of $3,499.95, or a total of $29,462.47. That is, from 1880 up to 1894 the increase was from fourteen to twenty-four clerks, and the total cost, not taking in his own salary, was an increase of 68 per cent. Now, Sir, that is a very good increase, indeed. Sixty-eight per cent in a period of fourteen years. Let me take the Department of the Minister of Finance, and let me make a comparison as between the two. In 1879, the Department of the Minister of Finance had thirty-eight clerks, and in 1895 it has twenty-eight clerks. It spent, in 1879, $48,500, but it spent, in 1895, only $43,100 ; and I make the assertion here that the work of the Finance Department has increased just as largely in its importance, in the care that is given to it, and in the amount of actual work necessary in the department ; it has increased just as much as has the Department of the Auditor General in the last ten years. In that respect I do not think there is very much to be found fault with. Just these few facts which I have given, disprove entirely that there was a certain course of action pursued towards the Auditor General's Department, which was not pursued towards the others, and that it was pursued through partisan motives. Now, Sir, the Auditor General is, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) says, an officer of this House. I do not think the Auditor General can really be called an officer of this House. There is a law upon the statute-books, and that law gives it into the power of the Governor General in Council to appoint the Auditor General, and he is the appointee of the Government for the time being, in this Dominion. His tenure of office is made conditional, and in that respect he differs from most of the other civil servants. But in every other re-

spect he is an officer appointed by the Government for the time being, under power conferred upon the Government by an Act of Parliament—the only way by which the Government can appoint an officer whatever. He is subject to the Civil Service Act, but he has certain powers which no other deputy head possesses. My hon. friend says there is evidence of unfair dealing towards that department. In 1886, in the revision of the statutes, the power which he was formerly supposed to possess, of promoting the clerks in his department, was taken from him; and when the Auditor General made that fact clear, first to myself and afterwards to Sir John Thompson, as Minister of Justice, I said to him at once, and Sir John Thompson said to him afterwards: "We will give to you the power which Parliament gave to you at first, and supposes you to have, and which has been taken from you." And, by a special Act, we re-conferred upon him that power, and made him supreme with regard to promotions in his own office. The only thing to which he is amenable in his department is this: that the money required for his clerks has to be voted by Parliament on the recommendation of the Government. My hon. friend says there is some other way of providing the money. Who is to vote it? Can he do it? If he made the attempt the Speaker would rule him out of order, though from the tenor of the argument the hon. gentleman advanced the other day when the Speaker ruled a Bill out of order, I should judge that the hon. gentleman feels himself competent to do almost anything he likes to do in this House. He will find, however, when he comes to canvass the ways and means, that there is no way by which the salaries of the officers of the Auditor General's Department can be voted except by the Government bringing them down in the Estimates, and asking the House to pass upon them. Apart from that, the Auditor General has full powers in his department; he makes rules and regulations for its management; he promotes according to what rules he sees fit himself to lay down. My hon. friend went into a historical disquisition as to audits, which was no doubt correct. He detailed very carefully, and I dare say very accurately, the kind of audit that exists in Great Britain. Our system of audit is modelled almost entirely on that of Great Britain; but I take exception to the statement, which my hon. friend made two or three times, that the Auditor General, in pursuance of his duties, must necessarily criticise the Government. I say that the Auditor General, in the proper discharge of his duties, may never have occasion to criticise the Government. What has he to do? His duties are laid down by the law; my hon. friend can read it, has read it. He has to see, in the first place, that there is a parliamentary authority for every expenditure. Is there any occasion for a quarrel between him and the Government in that? Must he necessarily criticise the Government when he goes to the Estimates as they were passed in the Supply Bill, and compares the credit he is asked to give with the wording of the vote? Not at all. He has to do more than that: he has to see, where the Government or the Treasury Board makes an appropriation of a certain amount, and in a certain way and under a certain heading, that the limit prescribed is not exceeded. Is there any chance of a quarrel between him and the Government with reference to his oversight of that? He has to see, when a credit is given, and cheques are issued on it, that the cheques and vouchers are placed before him—that sufficient proofs of the expenditure are there. There is no necessity of criticising the Government in that. Sir, if the Auditor General does not busy himself, as he has no business to busy himself, with the policy of the Government and party politics, there is no necessity for him, in the fulfilment of his duties, to criticise the Government. He is to critically examine departmental payments in respect to authority. The only possible chance of the Auditor General and the Government coming into collision—and it is a legal, not a party collision—is where he says he thinks there is no parliamentary authority for an expenditure, while the Minister of Justice, when the question is referred to him, says he thinks there is parliamentary authority. That settles it, and should not that settle it? Are we to have an Auditor General who in a case of that kind is to be superior to the law department of the Government? Not at all. If there arises a question of the legal construction of an appropriation by Parliament, and the Auditor General, a layman, thinks that it is not within the power of a department, according to that appropriation, to make a certain expenditure, the only thing for a Government to do, or the Government would come to standstill, is to have the matter submitted to its law officers, to accept the opinion of those law officers, and to stand on its responsibility. Such cases as that are provided for in the regular course—the report of the Minister of Justice coming back to the Treasury Board, and the Treasury Board passing upon it. These things give no occasion for collision between the Government and the Auditor General. The machinery is easily put into execution; it is plain and clear; it works automatically. In my experience with the Auditor General, I do not know a single instance in which the least friction has arisen with reference to the working of that clause. So I say it is unfair for any one to argue that it is necessary for the Auditor General to criticise the Government; and I take exception to the clauses in this petition in which the Auditor General expresses the opinion that he must necessarily be considered to be antagonistic

to any Government in power, if he fairly discharges his duties. I do not think that is a right statement of the case; I do not think it is necessary, neither ought it, in fact to be the rule. Sir, there is one important point that is left out, and, as my hon. friend alluded to it, I will take that up for a moment. He states the number of clerks and their salaries—that is done also in the Auditor General's statement—in the Finance Department, and draws an average; and then he says that as the clerks in the Auditor's office are paid on the average so much less, therefore there is unfairness. My hon. friend did not take into account that the Finance Department, with its quota of clerks, has been in operation since 1867, that it commenced in that year with a staff of officers from the old united provinces, and that from 1867 forwards, by that gradual accretion and accumulation that will take place, the officers, under the statutory increases and promotions, have gradually gone up to the higher grades and to the larger salaries in those grades. The Auditor General's office started in 1879 with a very small proportion of old officials, almost the entire number who are there now being officials who have entered the service since 1879. And yet you want this fourteen year old department, under our system of increases or accretions, to average equal with a department which is so much older; and he draws a conclusion that if it does not average equal, there is unfairness to the one that averages less. I want to say that the Auditor General has not been unfairly treated in another way. The Civil Service is a unity. In all the different departments, we look very carefully at what is going on in every other department. We are anxious to have fair-play as between department and department. You cannot make a hard and fast iron rule which will hold always. There will be some instances, some right and laudable instances, where exceptions are made on account of merit and service. But we try to administer the Civil Service on a basis of uniformity in the several departments as nearly as possible, and there is no exception among the departments at Ottawa which is so marked as the Auditor General's in that respect. The Civil Service law provides that its members shall come in at the minimum salary of $400, with an addition in the case of optional subjects, and that the salary shall go on increasing at the rate of $50 per year until it reaches the maximum of the class; and so on through all the grades. Now, the Auditor General has put more men, at their first appointment, on higher salaries than minimum than probably any other department in proportion to its numbers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is not that a necessity from the work of his department?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all, in my opinion. More than that. In the other departments the rule is that a clerk, in the third class for instance, may have his salary increased until it reaches the maximum of that class by the annual accretion allowed by law, after which he has a claim for promotion into a higher class. That is the rule, and we abide by that rule.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. FOSTER. I tell my hon. friend that we do. My hon. friend would perhaps found an argument to the contrary on some exception, but every rule has exceptions, and I am speaking of the rule. Of course when a vacancy takes place by death or otherwise, that rule may be broken; and the man who stands the highest in his class and is the best fitted to fill the vacancy is the one who is selected by the Minister for promotion. Such an event will operate to bring a man into a higher class before he has reached the maximum of the class from which he was promoted. But in these matters—not of promotions but of increases within the class and promotions without going to the top of the class—you will find that the Auditor General's Department shows exceptional instances. Here, for instance, in 1879, Mr. Thomas Porter went in, at a salary of $800, $400 above the minimum. Mr. Lynch went in at $400, had his salary increased from $500 to $700, was raised from $750 to $1,100, and then went as high as $1,350 by annual increase of $50. Take the case of F. Hayter, who went in at first at a salary of $700, $300 above the minimum, then went up by increases to $850, and jumped from $850 to $1,100, then went to $1,150, and from that jumped to $1,400, after which he had his salary increased from $1,700 to $1,800, and is now getting $2,000. I doubt if you can find in any other department so rapid a rise against the general settled rule. Take the case of J. Gorman, who went in at $700, was raised to $850 by increases and then jumped to $1,100, after which he went to $1,150 by one year's increase, and then was promoted to $1,400, and to-day he has a salary of $2,000. I have nothing to say against these officers. They are all good officers, and the Auditor General lays great store by them; but I am pointing out that these do not show at all that the tendency of the Government and the Minister of Finance has been to put the repressive cap on the Auditor General's Department to any burdensome extent. Mr. Bolton went in at $700; Balderson went in at $800, was raised to $850, promoted to $1,100 and then transferred. Mr. J. C. Macdonald went in at $700; Mr. Bissonnette at $700. These two, I think, however, were transfers from the Post Office Department, and that should be taken into account. Miss Baldwin went in at $500; Reid at $800, and Kearns, who was transferred from the Post-office Department, at $700, went up to $800, was then increased to $1,100, and now gets $1,350. Mr. Martin who went in at $800,

went up to $850 by increase, and was promoted directly to $1,100. Mr. Stevenson went in at $600, was raised from $900 to $1,100. Mr. Hayes went in at $650 from the Post-office Department, went up from $850 to $1,100. Mr. Moore came in at $700, went to $800 by accretion, and was then advanced to $1,100. The others seem to have gone in at $400 to $500. This shows that in the Auditor General's Department, not only have the clerks been in a great many cases taken in at larger salaries than the minimum but they have been rapidly advanced. If you will take the history of the department, it will show that there has been no disposition to prevent the Auditor General having full scope for his plea, which he made time and again, that he was anxious to get university graduates and that to get those he would have to offer them special inducements to accept office. I allowed that plea, and in case after case they went in at a larger salary than the minimum. There were other points mentioned by my hon. friend, but I think I have touched on the main points. With reference to the petition, as my hon. friend has introduced the matter of correspondence having passed between us, he knows as well as the Auditor General that these are busy times. They are busy times for me and for the Council. I received a notification from the Auditor General asking that this provision should be made and desiring me to get the determination of the Council upon it. I took it to the Council, but you cannot always get before Council, on a day's and sometimes a week's notice matters which are not very important or urgent. After I took it to the Council and waited an answer it had been there a few days, I received another communication—short but to the point—saying that if an answer were not given by the Council in a day or two, he would appeal to Parliament. I laid that letter under the cover of my blotter, and it has remained there until the present. Seeing that the House has this petition before it, I may say frankly that I think the fairest way for the Auditor General to have proceeded, as he is an officer in the Civil Service, would have been to discuss the matter with the Government, to lay his grievance before the Government, and taken the reasons why the Government were not prepared to give him the increases he required this year and all the clerks he asked. Are we to be told that the efficiency of the department and its working is to be impaired because, forsooth, two second class clerks are not to have the promotion or the increase which the Auditor General desires? Are we to be told that the work of the department cannot go on satisfactorily and that the whole department is to be crippled because we do not convert two second-class clerks into first-class clerks? Cannot the work be done as well by second-class clerks as by first-class clerks? I do not mean to say that an opening should not exist for a laudable ambition to rise, but I say this, that of the two clerks whose promotion the Auditor General asks, one has long got to the maximum of the class and the other has very lately come to the maximum. If these men had been year after year at the head of their class waiting for promotion and not getting it, I could see that their ambition would be somewhat nipped and they might more listlessly do their work. But that is not the case. I do not think it is the strongest of reasons for the Auditor General to say: The whole efficiency of my department is crippled, and I have to bring my case before Parliament and ask for a solemn investigation because two second-class clerks, at or near the maximum of their class, desired promotion and must be promoted this year. I do not think that is a reason for bringing this matter up here. I think we might have settled it if the Auditor General had simply preferred his request to the Government, consulted with them through me, and allowed a little time for consideration. My hon. friend drew an argument by inference from an unfortunate expression in this petition. It is not directly stated that the First Ministers, since the late Sir John Macdonald, have oppressed the Auditor General; but it is certainly an inference which my hon. friend was quick to take, that while Sir John Macdonald stood at the back of the Auditor General, the Premiers since then have rather oppressed him. There is an assertion made in this petition which I think I must notice. The Auditor General leaves it to be inferred that probably objections have been made because the promotions are not in the hands of the Government. He says:

> It is possible that one of the objections to promotions here is that, when the money provision is made for a promotion, your petitioner makes the promotion, excluding from consideration everything but the claims which the candidates have made good by effective service in the Audit Office.

I am bound to say, in all fairness and frankness, that the Auditor General might better have left that out. I cited the case in which Sir John Thompson, as Minister of Justice and leader of the Government, and I took steps speedily to replace the power of promotion in the hands of the Auditor General when, by inadvertence, it had been taken away by the consent—the passive consent, at least—of the House. If we had wished to treat him unfairly, we would have allowed the Revised Statutes to remain as they were. The inference to be drawn from the Auditor General's statement is a wrong inference, and I would rather that statement had been left out. Another statement is made in this petition. The Auditor General pledges himself that, whatever party is in power, he will see that the finances are administered rightly, and, if he cannot have them administered rightly, he will let the tax-payer

know it. My own impression is that the Auditor General and the tax-payer are just as far apart as the Clerk of this House and the tax-payer. The Auditor General does his work and the Government does its work; the Government is responsible to the members of this House, and the members of this House will fight the battle of the tax-payers. And so I think that statement might also have been left out of the Auditor General's petition. Now, as to the audit. My hon. friend wants to know whether there is not a good deal of dissatisfaction on the part of the Government as to the kind of display made in the Auditor General's book—whether that is not a reason for all this alleged oppression. There is no oppression, but suppose we take that argument and see what it is worth. The Auditor General goes upon a certain system now. The Audit Department was founded, and the Act gave the Auditor General power, based on the English system. When the Auditor General started out he started on the English system, and his first reports were in that form. Let any hon. gentleman take the report for 1879, and a number of succeeding years, and read them, and he will see the English system copied exactly. In those days, when he came to any department, he simply stated the nature of the expenditure, how much less than granted, or how much more than granted, and, if everything was in proper form, gave his certificate. If there was anything wrong with the account, he made a note of it. I have here the audit for the British Parliament for 1891 and 1892. Take, for instance, the expenditures on royal parks and gardens. You have a statement of the salaries, the grant that was made, what was spent less than was granted, or what was spent more than was granted, under the different items, and the certificate of the Auditor General to that effect. But when we take the report of the Auditor General of the Dominion for 1894, or any other of his reports of late years, we find that it is much more than an audit: it is a display of every item of expenditure and revenue down to its minutest detail, so far as his staff have the time to gather it up, and so far as printer's ink can spread it out to be reported to this Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there anything wrong in that?

Mr. FOSTER. Is there anything wrong in that? My hon. friend might say there was nothing wrong with a great many things which would yet be out of place under certain circumstances. There is nothing wrong with my hon. friend dancing a jig; but if he were to step out on this floor and dance a jig while the Speaker was in the Chair, his act would attract attention as being somewhat out of place. There would be nothing wrong in the Auditor General, if he took it into his head, making his volume five times as large as it is by putting in the names of every male inhabitant of Canada to whom no sum of money was paid. At least, he would have both the positive and negative—the names of those who received money and the names of those who did not. Take, for instance, the first thing in the Auditor General's Report. There is a list giving the names of persons who received pay from more than one source, exactly the amount received in each case and the source from which it was received. Is there anything wrong in that? my hon. friend would say. No, nothing wrong in that, and the Auditor General does not say there is anything wrong in it. The law permits the payment; the House of Commons passed the law; the administration is acting according to the law. There is no audit in this. The English audit, and what was formerly the Auditor General's audit, would simply give a statement of the salaries or disbursements, state what amount over or what amount under the grant, and if at any time he found that there was a theft of money or any wrong in any way, he would simply make a note of it and call the attention of the House to it. But this report goes very much further. It is a display of items which have nothing to do with an audit. Sir, you may look through the Audit Act without finding anything that forbids the Auditor General to display all these items, but you will find also that the general tenor of the Act is to provide for an audit such as the Auditor General first made. He is to take the expenditure and the grants made by Parliament and to see that the expenditure is made in accordance with the grant, and if there is any over-expenditure or under-expenditure, he is to make a statement of that fact—not to put down the details of every transaction with every Tom, Dick and Harry who happened to be paid for a pound of nails or a hundred feet of boards. Now, do you see how unfair this is in some respects, and how misleading to members of the House. If the Auditor General's Report is to give the details of everything that is bought and sold, there ought to be alongside the specification in each case. Otherwise we are led into difficulty in discussing the matter in this House. And if we, with our knowledge of the technique of these matters, are apt to be misled, how much more are the public into whose hands this volume may happen to fall, likely to be misled. You have the generic name given in any case, but you may have a dozen species of that thing, varying in value by hundreds of dollars. Simply to give the name and the price, without any specification as to quality or anything of that kind, is really wrong information. I will not pursue this subject any further at the present time. I want to say this, that I do not think we can grant, on this petition, the committee that is asked for. To grant a state committee, a committee of the House, on the statement that two men have been refused promotion, and that $500, in a year of stringency, has been

taken from the contingency account, is, I think, a request which the House can hardly accede to. What the Auditor really asks the House to do is to censure the Government, and this from an appointee of Government and a member of the civil service is too absurd to consider seriously.

Mr. COCHRANE. How much salary are these two men getting now ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think they are getting $1,400 each, one has lately come to the maximum and the other has been there for a year or two. The Government cannot see its way clear to grant a commission upon these grounds. It may, however, become necessary some time or other for the Government to have a special commission appointed who will take up this whole question of audit, and report upon the matter for the information of the Government and the House ; but the committee that is asked for by the petition, and, on the grounds that petition sets forth, cannot be granted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Like a lady's letter, I think the pith of the hon. gentleman's speech was in his postscript. He made it very apparent, indeed, that he regretted the good old days when the audit was compressed into a space that was not likely to give any trouble to the Department of Finance, or to the supporters of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. And your days, when there was none.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was the party who created the audit, and I created it with knowledge. I knew that when our expenditure was a matter of $14,000,000 less than the present Government had to provide for, there was not likely to be much necessity for an audit ; and if the hon. gentleman had imitated my example, and if, in the space of five years and after, he had had to encounter an expenditure of $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 incurred by his predecessors, and yet was able to point to a total increased expenditure of barely $200,000, there would be much less need for an audit than we have now. However, it is clear that the real offence the Auditor General has committed, as the Minister made abundantly clear before he concluded his remarks, was this, that the Auditor General—who, I beg to inform him, is in a very special sense an officer of Parliament, as contradistinguished from an officer of the Government—has given, for many years back a huge amount of information to the people of Canada which has been, no doubt, very inconvenient to the hon. gentleman and his friends. The Auditor General has brought to light a vast number of expenditures which reflect no credit on the Government of which the hon. gentleman is a member, and I have not the slightest doubt myself that the Minister of Finance did not feel at all disposed, as he intimates, to be in any way concerned in enlarging the volume of the Auditor General's Report. I am bound to say that in the report as it stands, there is quite enough to give food for reflection, not merely to the hon. gentleman and his supporters, but to all persons throughout this country who care to know how it comes to pass that to-day we are spending very close on $40,000,000 for services which ought never to have cost this country $25,000,000, and, with proper and wise administration, never would have cost this country $25,000,000. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was good enough to point out the marvellous increases, the startling and sudden jumps, which have taken place in the Department of the Auditor General. Did he ever hear of a very remarkable sudden jump which took place in the case of a Mr. McLeod, who, I think, was pitchforked into the Civil Service with very little experience at all, and who, if I am not mistaken, is now receiving about $2,400 a year as Assistant Receiver General, somewhere down in St. John, a gentleman with whom the Minister of Finance is very familiarly acquainted.

Mr. FOSTER. I know him well, and he is a fine fellow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think he was promoted to about $2,400 a year, with very little merit, except that he happens to be a rather close connection of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FOSTER. His merits are undoubted, but you are wrong in your figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount he receives ?

An hon. MEMBER. Two thousand two hundred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We will give him the benefit of $200. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman went at considerable length into the question of the amount which the Auditor General's Department now receives. I have taken the trouble to look at the details of that department in the year 1892, and I find there were then twenty-five officers, whereas there are now twenty-six. Those twenty-five officers, in 1892, received $25,095 ; the twenty-six are now receiving $26,740. Well, deducting the $500 which, I suppose, would be about the amount paid the extra clerk employed since that time, it does look as if there was no very great increase in these four years, but a vastly less increase than the ordinary statutory allowances would provide. Now, were these twenty-six officials receiving the average statutory allowance of $50 a year, which is rarely refused in the other departments, the expenditure for this office would be $30,000, in place of $26,740. Applying that test, which, I admit, is a somewhat

rough one, but still a reasonably fair one, it would appear that there had been, since 1892, a period of four years, making allowance for that officer I spoke of, a total increase of $1,200, all told, in the Auditor General's Department; while the ordinary statutory increases of $50 for twenty-six men would have amounted to about $1,300 for one year; so that the increase in that way has been about one-fourth, apparently, of the ordinary increase which could have been expected to take place. Now, there may be a sufficient explanation for that; I do not know whether there is or not; but I do say that prima facie the fact that the Auditor General's Department merely received an increase of $250 or $300 a year for four years, does look a little like no very rapid promotion, no very particular recognition of the services which his officers may have rendered. I see, too, that in 1892 --and in 1891, for that matter—there was just the same staff, apparently, of chief clerks, and first and second-class clerks, that there is now. In 1892 there were three chief clerks, one first-class clerk, and five second-class clerks. The number of third-class clerks appears to have been the same. As I have said, there may be a sufficient reason, but it is perfectly apparent that the annual increment in that office has been very considerably below that which has taken place in several of the other offices. I did not hear the Finance Minister state that there had been any great number of removals, or that there had been any great number of officials placed on the superannuation list from the Auditor General's Department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). None at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; there were several officers placed on the superannuation list, but, unfortunately for the comparison, they have all died, while the Finance men have lived.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They have been worked to death, in fact. But I will let that go. Now, I am rather inclined to think that it would be in the interest of the Minister of Finance to deal a little more liberally with the Auditor General. The Minister of Finance himself stands, to a certain extent, in the same relation that the Auditor General does to the public expenditure; and although his good intentions have been vastly in excess of his performances, and although he has tried, at times, with very poor success, indeed, to curb the extravagances of his colleagues, I think for the purpose of keeping his colleagues in order, there is no better or valuable official than the Auditor General. The Auditor General, and here I take issue with some statements made by the Finance Minister, by displaying in the fashion he has done all the details of expenditures which have taken place in the public departments, places a most wholesome check on the natural extravagance in which all the departments will indulge unless very strictly curbed.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like the hon. gentleman's opinion as to that being a good audit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say it is a very valuable service to the country, and is highly appreciated. There is no blue-book issued by this House for which I have received such an immense number of applications as for that of the Auditor General.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say there is no blue-book issued by this House, which, if hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to read the newspapers carefully, furnishes so many good and useful texts and so many illustrations of the extravagance which has led us to our present pass, because I have no hesitation whatever in saying to the hon. gentleman that however much or little he may hold himself personally responsible for it, the position of Canada to-day, with its estimated expenditure of $39,225,000 is in itself a proof, especially in view of the fact that we have a population of barely 5,000,000, that it has been most extravagantly governed; and I have not the slightest doubt if it had not been for the Auditor General and the display made from time to time of the way in which the people's money goes, that expenditure would have far exceeded even that enormous figure. It is perfectly clear that when Parliament created the office of Auditor General and gave to the occupant of the office a tenure similar to that of the judges, it intended him to be in a particular sense an officer of Parliament and independent of the Government of the day. That was the evident intention with which that Act was passed, and to a very considerable extent, and to the credit of the late Prime Minister, be it said, that was always recognized by Sir John Macdonald at least. But it is equally clear to every hon. member on both sides of the House that it is utterly and entirely impossible for the Auditor General to discharge his functions properly unless he is allowed reasonable latitude in the matter of having a proper staff. It would be utterly and entirely absurd for us in one breath to say that this shall be an independent officer, the Government shall not have power to dismiss him at their pleasure and shall not have power to compel him to do this or that, although in certain ways, provided by statute, they may override him, leaving him however the right of appealing to Parliament and stating the grounds of the difference between himself and the Government, and in another breath to refuse to such official a reasonable staff to enable him to discharge his duties. In his petition before us the Auditor General makes a statement which should not be disregarded.

He informs us that he is obliged as it is to work his staff to an extent that he cannot hope to continue for a long time; he tells us that he wants a small addition to his clerical staff and that he believes such is necessary to the proper administration of the work, and that he is compelled, however regretfully, to appeal from the decision of the Minister, which for his own convenience he would avoid. I would not uphold any other member of the Civil Service, holding office under ordinary tenure, in appealing to Parliament; but I contend that the Auditor General is our servant, is in a special sense a servant of the House, in contradistinction to a servant of the Government of the day. The Auditor General was appointed for that purpose, the Act shows clearly and distinctly this intention, and the fact, to which the hon. gentleman alluded, shows this, for he alone of all the officials is allowed to promote, although not to appoint, showing distinctly the great difference existing between him and any other head of a department. How is it possible that he should discharge the duties properly unless allowed a reasonable staff? And I am bound to say that looking at the amount of work done, looking at the character of the work, it appears to me that there are very few departments indeed in which it is more necessary to have more capable officers or men who will work more freely in the public service than in such a department as this, and if you take away from those officers all hope of promotion and let it be understood that when a man goes into the Audit Department his salary will be smaller and his chance of promotion less than in any other department, or at all events that he will advance much more slowly, most surely you hamper the Auditor General and by degrees will impair the efficiency of his work. I showed from the records of 1891-92 that the rate of increased expenditure in his department is very much less than could have been expected; that whereas in those four years, had the officers received the ordinary $50 increase, there would have been an addition of $5,000 to the total instead of only about $1,200, allowing for the salary of the extra officers. Let us come to consider another matter of which the Auditor General complains, and that is the fact that his allowances have been cut down. It appears to me that this is an extraordinary step for the Minister to take to leave almost every other department in full possession of such clerical assistance as it needs and cut down the Auditor General of all men in the world. As my hon. friend from Bothwell pointed out, the Governor General's Secretary's office receives the same clerical assistance; the Department of Justice is reduced to some small extent, and I must say, with all due defference to the Minister of Justice, that if he requires clerical assistance to the amount of $2,500, which is put down in the Estimates, $1,800 is not an excessive sum for the Auditor General to ask. I note that in the Department of Secretary of State, where there does not appear to be an overwhelming amount of work, $1,600 is allowed for clerical assistance. In the Department of Printing and Stationery, $2,000 is allowed under this head; in the Department of the Interior there are two distinct allowances made, $1,800 in one branch and $1,800 in the Department of Indian Affairs, $3,600 in all; against $1,800 asked, but not granted, to the office of the Auditor General. The same remark applies to all the departments, Agriculture alone excepted, I suppose in consequence of all census returns being completed, and all these departments are allowed precisely the same sum for clerical assistance as before. I think it is perfectly proper to ask, why single out the Auditor General's Department out of a dozen departments for a special reduction? Surely it is quite as important that we should know how the public money is spent as we should be informed as to what happens in the Department of Interior or Indian Affairs, or Printing, or even Public Works. It does appear, looking at the two facts to which I have called attention, as if the Auditor General had a strong prima facie case for coming to this House and saying that he was rather unfairly treated in this matter. I have no doubt that the amount of work thrown on the department has increased in a very unusual degree. The very fulness of details, to which the Minister objects as much as to the size of the volume, and the very great particularity with which the various expenditures are given, afford proof enough that the officers of the department do not eat the bread of idleness whatever else they may do. And there is this other point which the Minister would do well to consider. As I have said, there is no single blue-book issued to which the country pays more attention or studies more carefully than the Auditor General's Report. It may not be pleasant always to hon. gentlemen opposite that the people should do so. But the fact is, and if he regards his own popularity and the interests of his own party, I would say to him: Just now on the verge of a general election the worst thing that he could do would be to allow it to appear, that he was anxious to diminish the strictness of the investigation which the Auditor General is making. I add, that in the general public interest, which in this matter undoubtedly ought to govern the House, I think he would be well advised to lay down the rule, that the Auditor General should be interfered with as little as possible. I do not think there is the slightest risk that the Auditor General would ask for any extraordinary or any excessive appropriation. In point of fact the Auditor General is asking for less, or the Minister is giving him less, both in his main Estimates and his Supplementary Estimates. The reduction

on the two together, I see, amounts close on to $1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Some older men have died out, and younger men are going in at less salaries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, if you are able to cut him down on the main Estimates, it is all the better reason for giving him the little paltry assistance he asked for on the minor ones. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had a special grudge against the Auditor General. I am inclined to think that if he understands his business, he would know that the Auditor General is a very valuable buffer between himself and his colleagues, particularly those in the spending departments. But, I strongly suspect that the Finance Minister—and the whole of these Estimates look like it—that the hon. gentleman wherever he could, and wherever he dared, made reductions without much consideration of what the consequences would be. Where he stumbled against some refractory colleagues, he was not able to cut much, but as the Auditor General was not a colleague, he was able to make a cut there, and he did it accordingly. We know exactly what these contingencies amount to and how they are managed. We know perfectly well that at a future time it is the easiest thing in the world to "supplementarise" in favour of these other departments, if they happen to require to expend a little more than is given them. Therefore, it would be a perfectly safe thing, if he wanted to make a show, to do as his predecessors and himself have done before, and cut down in some cases, knowing that it did not amount to anything, for if there were no Supplementary Estimates this year, there would be Supplementary Estimates next year, and they could all be replaced without inconvenience to anybody. This, however, does not apply to the case of the Auditor General. I dare say, as the Finance Minister made very clear, it is not altogether pleasant to have all these details paraded. There is no doubt whatever that they do supply a good deal of food for thought and meditation to persons who cannot for the life of them understand, no more than I can, how it comes to pass that we require nearly forty million dollars a year to run the Government of this country. I have no doubt that the various details that we find in the report of the Auditor General, do give occasion to a great many persons to reflect rather gravely on the way in which Canada is governed to-day, and, therefore, I can quite understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) does not find it pleasant to have all these things extended. But the Finance Minister says, that if the Auditor General goes into these details he should go into them a great deal more fully. Sir, I cannot agree with him there. I think the Auditor General does his duty very fully as it is, and I am not disposed to advise him, even at the suggestion of the Finance Minister, to go into very much more minutiae than he now does. I would rather recommend that this House, and particularly the members of the House who support the Government, should take the report as it stands, and read it, and digest it thoroughly, and come to a clear understanding as to how the money goes. If they do that, I am perfectly certain they will become, for once in their lives—that is to say, the great majority of them I hope—will become for once in their lives real earnest supporters of the Minister (Mr. Foster) in that policy of economy which he has so often proclaimed, and which up to this time, even with the assistance of the Auditor General—and it has been very valuable aid to him—he has found it so utterly impossible for him to put in practice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The point that has been raised has at any rate not produced the issue which the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has suggested, and that was: whether the Government was in favour of an audit or against an audit, or whether the Government was in favour of a thorough and complete audit or a partial and incomplete one. That is not the question at all. The Government and the Conservative party have been loyal to the intentions of Parliament in their regard for the Audit Act of 1878, and the amendments made to that Act since. They have proven that by never having suggested any departure in the slightest particular, from the legislation to secure that mose desirable object. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have greater respect for the office of the Auditor General than has the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), because the great benefit that the Auditor General seems to be in his eye to any Government (and perhaps that was the reason for his creation) is that he is a buffer—whether an old buffer or otherwise he did not say—but at any rate the great purpose of this officer, as the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) suggested, was to act as a buffer. Now, political history has shown us that there is much in that observation dropped by the way, because it fell to the lot of the late Alex. Mackenzie, Premier of the Liberal Government, to publish, after the defeat of his Government a very good and substantial reason for some sort of buffer. That hon. gentleman told us in unmistakable terms that it was almost an impossible task for him to guard the public treasury, and that he had to rest on his arms day and night to protect that treasury. It then apparently devolved upon the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to introduce into this legislature, a Bill for the creation of this grand buffer, and to assist

his Premier in keeping off these hungry and dangerous supporters. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has contended that it was always the intention that this officer should be a parliamentary officer, and under parliamentary control. I refer the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) to his own Bill, and he will find that that was not his intention, and that when he introduced the Bill he did not propose that the Auditor General should be half so independent in the conduct of his office, as he is to-day. He did not propose that the Auditor General should have power, either to promote, suspend, or dismiss the officers of the Audit Department. That suggestion came from an outside member and was incorporated in the Bill. The hon. gentleman did advocate that we should keep, as nearly as possible to the English system of audit, and efforts were made in that direction, and all that the Finance Minister has contended to-day is in the direction of the English system of audit. No one at any time, whether at the inception of this legislation or since, has suggested that the English system, which was the system we attempted to copy, is violated in any respect. And, while the same great powers are given to the Auditor General in England as are confided in our Auditor, the Minister of Finance to-day made reference to the manner in which the Auditor General in England performs his duties, to show, as I take it, how far the Auditor General in Canada goes beyond the proper spirit of the discharge of his duty, beyond the scope of his duty, beyond the scope that was intended, and beyond the scope that serves any useful public purpose. No one will deny that it is to the benefit of the Opposition that there should be the greatest possible light thrown upon all affairs of Government, small as well as big. Often, public opinion forms around the smaller items of expenditure of Government, rather than around the larger items which more particularly concerns the public weal. But, I would submit for the consideration of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House: whether it is not a most creditable thing for the Government of the day, that since 1878, with a system of audit practised as you cannot find it in a British Parliament—a system of audit that lays bare every two-penny-halfpenny expenditure, and sets out the accounts in this enormous and bulky form—the Government has been able to stand criticism of every character, carping, generous or small, and has been able to live where strong and properly administered Governments might fall, in consequence of the slightest misconduct, simply because of an impression, a false impression, that might be created in the minds of many electors not thoroughly informed of the difficulty of controlling expenditure on the part of the best of governments. With all these facts and figures put before the public, the position of the Government to-day is as strong as ever. It reflects, of course, a great deal of credit upon the intelligence of the electorate; but I press that point to show to what an unfair extent any Auditor General may exercise what the House considers his powers, but what practice shows not to be his duty and not to be encouraged. I will make some references to very valuable information obtained on this point by the Public Accounts Committee in England. The Public Accounts Committee there, as we know, discharges duties of great importance and benefit to the state. They go, with the Auditor General, not on a venture to fasten on the Government and on the departments great wrongs; but they go with the Auditor General, as a business body, to assist him in a proper presentation of the parliamentary or national accounts; and, as I will show later on, their opinion and the opinion of the Auditor General in England, is totally at variance with the opinion of the Auditor General in Canada as to his duty and his position. I am surprised that in this House no comment should have been made upon an extraordinary and unparalleled procedure on the part of the Auditor General in petitioning the House of Commons in regard to the matter contained in that petition. It is perhaps as well that no point of order was raised, and that a full discussion was invited by the leader of the Government; but that the petition is irregular can hardly be gainsaid by any one. When Parliament created that officer and that office—whether he was to be wholly a parliamentary officer or not does not matter in this consideration—three modes only were specifically mentioned as to how and where he should be heard, and in what manner his views were to be laid before Parliament. In one part of his duties he was to communicate with the Treasury Board; in another respect, and for the information of Parliament, he was to communicate through the Minister of Finance as Receiver General; and he was at all times—as in England the Auditor confines himself, in ventilating his opinion in regard to the proper audit and the proper means of audit—to be in communication with the Public Accounts Committee. These are the ways in which it is pointed out that the Auditor General may be heard by the Parliament of his country; but in taking the extraordinary and irregular course of presenting a petition to this House, which the hon. gentleman deems a censure on the Government of the day, he has ridden roughshod over the rules of this House. A personal grievance may be presented here by petition and may be discussed; but I challenge hon. gentlemen to find that departmental grievances, or grievances from the judiciary or from parliamentary officers, are fit subjects of petition or of consideration by way of petition by this Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman seems to doubt that. If he looks at the rules of this House he will find that Rule 86 states :

> Every petition, not containing matter in breach of the privileges of this House, and which according to the rules of practice of this House can be received, is brought to the Table by direction of the Speaker, who cannot allow any debate, or any member to speak upon, or in relation to, such petition ; but it may be read by the Clerk at the Table, if required ; or, if it complains of some present personal grievance, requiring an immediate remedy, the matter contained therein may be brought into immediate discussion.

Let the hon. gentleman find a precedent for an officer holding this position, or any other position in the service of the Government, ventilating here, by way of petition, questions of this character, or questions concerning chiefly public officers who are members of the Civil Service. The petition involves, if it involves anything, an expenditure of public money ; and the demand for a committee is also most irregular—so irregular that the hon. member for Bothwell did not press that upon the attention of the House for a moment. I pointed out, however, to show the rash, not to say the indelicate manner——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman challenge the Auditor General's right to petition the House and to set forth his reasons for doing so ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I say that the objection to that procedure has been waived, and that perhaps under the circumstances, it is as well that it should be ; but I press the point upon the House, to show the indelicate haste with which the Auditor General has brought forward this one-sided statement, which the Government are convinced, as my colleagues inform me, and as I myself know in regard to many things within my own knowledge, is erroneous in many vital particulars. The demand for a committee in a matter for which this Government is certainly responsible—that is, the proper administration of that office and the seeing that adequate money is obtained from this Parliament in order to carry on the important duties of that office—could not for a moment be granted by this House without the House coming to the conclusion that the Government had lost the confidence of the House as a Government in every respect. Such a committee could not be granted by a Government that is strong enough to stand, as this Government is. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford dilated with pleasure upon the fact that there was much food for reflection in the Auditor General's Report ; and I have no doubt that that report is so framed as to make it acceptable to the Opposition. But how does that meet the point mentioned by the Minister of Finance, that an enormous part of that thick and bulky volume serves no purpose whatever, and that an enormous part of it contains misleading and inaccurate staements ? But the Government of the day do not propose to say, "You shall not print the items, if you have the time and Parliament desires that to be done ; but the Government of the day and Parliament ought to insist that if you attempt to put the details of those items before the public, you shall not vary or alter them in the Department of the Auditor General" ; and, in that case, I take it, the sum the Auditor would require in order to have full transcripts made of all the accounts in detail, would be a sum that this Parliament would not for many a long day feel itself justified in granting. The work would be enormous. Take, again, the correspondence. What is it ? I have had some experience of this in a department which has to do with many small items of expenditure. You find many pages in the report to which the Public Accounts Committee never thinks of referring—why ? Because they relate to matters that have arisen between the accountant of some department and the Auditor's office, which have been adjusted, and as to which there is no dispute. The report shows that the two offices came into collision. A mistake is made ; the Auditor General calls attention to it; rectification is at once made, and four or five letters are immediately sent to the printer to be included in the report. If my memory serves me right, the only reason which the Auditor General gave is the absurd reason that these letters showed the value of the office. Who asked him to prove the wisdom of this Parliament in any particular ? What is the use of printing pages of correspondence when their publication cannot in any way benefit the public interest ? Why, for instance, publish correspondence concerning how much every member of this House drew for sessional indemnity, and items of that character, which take up page after page.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why not ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think any member of this House has ever suggested the good purpose of the correspondence to which I have referred or of the publication of details of expenditure in that way. Take, for instance, the misrepresentations in that report, perhaps owing to want of time—but ought not justice to be considered as well as time ? Take, for instance, an item in connection with my department, in which police gloves are put down at so much a pair. The price seems extraordinary, and then further down you see gloves charged at one-third the price, a suspicion enters the mind of the reader as to how these prices come to vary. The explanation in the account will satisfy everyone. Regimental regulation gloves, for certain purposes, cost a certain amount, on account of material and style, whereas other

gloves, for other purposes, cost much cheaper; but in the Auditor General's Report, ordinary gloves apparently go in at the same price as the special article. And so all the way through. To my mind, if the public and Parliament want that information, they want it in full, and it ought to be put in the report as received by the Auditor General from the department. It ought not to be put in as his clerks are pleased to consider will suffice. Time and again, page after page, there are the most unfair representations that could possibly be made. The hon. gentleman referred to the question of superannuation. I think the Minister of Finance explained how much there is in the theory of the Auditor General on that subject. Those who are on that list connected with his office have died; those connected with the Finance Department on the list have not. The promotion of men has been more rapid in the Auditor General's Department, as I am informed, than in any other in the service of the Government, taking the clerks all round. What complaint can be founded on that? As regards the cutting down of the expenditure, nearly every department has had its expenditure cut down this year, as has been said more than once. But the only point on which the hon. member for South Oxford seemed to dwell was this question of the $500 or so in connection with clerical assistance. It is well known that the Auditor General and the clerks of his department, instead of doing this work which he thinks will be in arrears, attend needlessly the Committee of Public Accounts which sits twice a week, even when that committee is not engaged in any system of audit but in an inquiry into the policy and the manner of carrying on our public works. You will find at every meeting present the Auditor General himself and one of his clerks. A different course pursued by him would, I am satisfied, enable him to do much of the work he complains will not be done if he does not receive this $500 additional and have one or two promotions made. Let me quote one or two extracts from the petition to show that the Auditor General has most unduly misconceived his responsibilities and his duties as such. He says:

> That it is quite useless to make the Auditor General a parliamentary officer with the object of securing an independent examination of the expenditure of $40,000,000 and of the collection of the same amount of revenue, as well as of giving an intelligible statement in detail of all, while there is left entirely in the hands of those whose financial transactions he is to criticise, the power to give or withhold assistance, and the power to promote the clerks or keep them for ever in the same position.

That statement shows that he does not properly appreciate his duties in that connection. What are they? It is not for him to tell us how we are to establish an audit office, how we are to amend the Act, or how we are to get the most perfect system of audit, unless we ask him. He is simply what the founder of the system in England has called a "passive officer." He is an officer who simply puts facts before Parliament, and it is his duty to confine himself to the facts. If the staff at his disposal was only able to put so much work before Parliament, he would place that work before Parliament. Then if he were asked by the Public Accounts Committee why he did not investigate further, he could make his reply: I did all I could with the staff at my command. He would then be examined as to the work his staff were employed upon, and it would be for the committee to report to the House that the audit office was not sufficiently manned, or some other action would be taken. That is the manner in which the audit office ought to speak, and not by criticising. It is not, according to English precedent, for the audit office to take a position which makes it an ally of the members of the Opposition and causes it to speak from the Opposition benches. The object of the audit office is simply to ascertain the naked facts and leave them for Parliament to consider or discuss. In that way alone would the Auditor General properly fill the position he holds—that is, if he is to be of service to any government and not to be, as he thinks necessary, hostile to or unpopular with any government. If he does his duty properly, it is to the disgrace and discredit of the Government that he should be unpopular. If he performs his duty as laid down by Parliament, under directions given him by the Public Accounts Committee, he does what any government should be grateful to him for doing; but if he steps outside of that, in the way he is attempting to do now, and goes beyond his duty, he creates the suspicion, in the minds of many in the country, that he has some object in making these criticisms and attacks on the Government. I propose not only to submit this petition to the test of eminent experts on the question in England, but to the opinion which the same Auditor General himself formed of his public duties as far back as 1879, when he first assumed the position, and also to the opinion given at that time from the Department of Justice, written by Mr. Lash, who was then Deputy Minister of Justice.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before I resume the observations that I ventured to begin before the House rose, I would like to add to what I said in referring to Rule 86. Of course, the Government did not take any objection, nor did any member of the House, to the consideration of this petition; and, perhaps, I went too far in the application of that rule.

What induced me to refer to it was this: The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) almost immediately—perhaps a day had elapsed, or the petition had just been read at the Table—on this motion, proposed to advert to that petition. And that was what was running in my mind, and the rule seems to refer to that. The immediate discussion of the petition and——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was the next day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—and, therefore, my reference to it was unhappy, as to that point of order, because it relates evidently to the pressing forward immediately of a petition of that character for consideration. However, the other remarks in regard to the irregularity of the course taken I will insist upon. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to some of the statements in the petition, this extraordinary document of the Auditor General. I promised to emphasize from a point of view of the Auditor General in England and the Auditor General in Canada the fact that the Auditor General's course was a course not contemplated by the legislature, and not justified by the practice obtaining in these matters; and, to show that he had unfortunately misapprehended his functions and the responsibility resting upon him. I think his course unfortunate, not only from his point of view, but in every sense, in view of his high and important office. I do not suppose there will be any dispute about this, however much we may differ about the facts—that nothing would be more unfortunate for the Parliament of Canada, and for the Audit Department, than that it should appear that the Auditor General had departed from the impartial position he should occupy. His duties, it may be said, are in some respects ministerial, and, in others, judicial. And the moment it can be feared even, by the pople of this country—to say nothing of the political parties, leaving them aside for the moment—that he is assuming a position of antagonism to the Government, or sympathizing with the party on either side of the House, the usefulness of his office would be gone; his usefulness, at any rate, would be gone. And it is with these ideas solely that I approach the criticism of this petition. To make his position strong with the country and strong with Parliament, there should be nothing that would induce a reasonable mind to assume that he wished to either attack or defend the Government of the day. To attack any party is none of his business; he is to be absolutely impartial. Now, he knows that before he presents this petition the responsibilites that lie upon the executive. He knows that the executive must stand or fall according to the opinion of this House, and, so eager is he for a verdict that he is induced, in addition to other sentences to which I have referred, to write as follows:—

> No fair-minded man can conclude that the Audit Office clerks should remain at $1,074, while the general service is at $1,228, and is advancing.

The innuendo in that sentence is obvious: the attack is obvious. And, Mr. Speaker, that innuendo is resisted and resented, and that attack, as will be seen from the observations of the Minister of Finance, can be easily met, and easily dealt with. But the Auditor General goes on to say:

> It should not be left to the executive of the day to determine the number of employees of the Audit Office, and particularly the number of their respective grades.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Parliament thought otherwise when the Bill establishing the audit office was passed, and the Government of that time, under whom the audit office was constituted, thought differently. Parliament, from that day down to this, has thought otherwise. And, in assuming the position of a critic, the Auditor General is going altogether outside of his functions that Parliament intended that he should discharge. He says further:

> That should be done by Parliament.

But he does not add, as he apparently assumes, that this should be done by Parliament upon the inspiration of the Auditor General, or upon his advice. He goes on to say:

> If the Auditor General does his duty, he and his staff will be unpopular with the Government, no matter what may be the political complexion of the dominant party.

I say that no more unfortunate sentence could come from the pen of the Auditor General; no more unjustifiable sentence, under the circumstances, could be written by him. It shows that he has absolutely mistaken his duty and his position. Why should he say, forsooth, that if he does his duty, he and his staff will be unpopular with the Government? Why should he offer, or venture, or dare to come to this House with such an assertion? I might almost term it an impudent assertion, in view of the position he is understood to occupy in connection with the legislation that this Parliament has decided to adopt, and inview of his experience as detailed by the Minister of Finance. Why did he venture such a remark? Upon what foundation could such a remark rest? Where has he ascertained that by doing his duty he became unpopular with this Government? Sir, I say, in corroboration of the statement of the Minister of Finance, that ever since I have been a member of the Government, I have never known the Minister of Finance, in Council or out of it, do otherwise than strengthen and fortify the position of the Auditor General, as his position was understood in the light of

the legislation adopted. What Government was it that asked this Parliament to increase the emoluments that the Auditor General was receiving from Parliament, but the Government of the day, under its former leader? Who was it but the Government of the party in power that came down to Parliament and asked, time and again, for increases and promotions to deserving officers of the audit office, or those represented to be qualified for promotion and increase of salary? Yet without any facts, without the slightest justification, the Auditor General undertakes to tell this Parliament that if he and his staff do their duty they will be unpopular with the Government. We have nothing to say against his staff; we assume that they do their duty. But we regretfully say that, if the Auditor General rushes into the political fray, takes sides with the hon. gentlemen opposite, places himself in confidential relation with the hon. member for Bothwell, who, of course, opposes this Government tooth and nail; that his usefulness in the country will largely be interfered with, and that his reputation for impartiality will be absolutely destroyed, and in that respect he will not be able satisfactorily to discharge his duties. He attacks, in that respect, not only the Government of to-day, but any Government that may be formed; and I venture again to submit that in that matter he cannot have the sympathy of either side of this House. There is no hon. gentleman opposite who has ventured so far as to say that the Auditor General and his staff, if they do their duty rigidly, will be unpopular with the Government, whether Liberal or Conservative. For instance, let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite, do they agree that that gentleman and his staff will come under their animadversion and cease to be personae gratiae to them, if, as he states, they simply do their duty? It would not be going too far to say that that sentence is an insult to this Parliament, to hon. gentlemen opposite as well as to us. The leader of the Opposition shakes his head; I take it, therefore, that he agrees, and I am sorry to believe it, that if the hon. gentleman peradventure should become the head of the Government, and if the Auditor General and his staff should do their duty, they would be unpopular with the Government of which the hon. gentleman would be the head. Is he willing to take that position?

Mr. LAURIER. No; if he does his duty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Exactly, and that is my contention. I say that if he does his duty honestly and fearlessly, he has a right to count upon the support of the members to your right and the members to your left. Therefore the statement of the leader of the Opposition is in support of the position I maintain, that that sentence in his statement is absolutely unwarranted. Far better that we should have no Auditor General, if there was a grain of truth in that assertion. Then he goes on and refers to a passage in his report of 1893, which evidently he thinks has not been carefully considered by this Parliament. But this reflection, I beg to say, is as much upon the hon. gentlemen opposite as it is upon us, particularly if the contention be right that was urged to-day, that he is a parliamentary officer. That statement made in his report of 1893, was as follows:—

> Is it not better to show clear-headed and industrious men that you appreciate their intelligence and zeal by giving with pleasure to three the salaries you would be forced to give to four, and get from them more work than from six of the other kind, and of an immeasurably better quality? Then, the man who is brightened by his work being appreciated, respects himself and takes an interest in everything connected with his department.

So he has to instruct us; he has to instruct gentlemen to your right and gentlemen to your left as to the manner in which the Civil Service shall be conducted. You have passed a Civil Service Act, you have laid down certain rules for promotion, certain ideas as to the basis of a Civil Service organization, that should obtain in this country. But the Auditor General says that is all wrong, it is wrong to proceed from grade to grade, it is wrong to proceed according to the spirit of the Civil Service Act, but Parliament should go further and give the Auditor General rights that no man in this House would contend it was ever contemplated that he should possess. That is another criticism that ill becomes him in his office. Personally, I have nothing against the Auditor General. My relations with him, I may say, have been pleasant from the time I became a member of the Government down to this day. But I am discussing matters of principle, just as the Auditor General wants to discuss them in his petition; and I refer to him merely as an officer, whether a parliamentary officer or an officer on the civil list, with certain privileges, certain peculiar privileges, given to him in regard to removals by this Parliament. But I say that is a criticism and an attack altogether outside of his sphere. That is a matter of opinion to be discussed on the floor of this House, that is a subject for the legislators of this country, and is no more a subject for him to bring before this House than for a second or third-class clerk in any branch of the Civil Service. That is the position that I believe I can support by good authority. Then, again, he has another sentence that I think it would have been well for him to have omitted from his petition, considering the position he occupies. He says:

> The politicians have done enough for a man when they have secured his appointment.

No doubt it was the intention of the hon. member for South Oxford, as it has been the intention of Parliament ever since, not that politicians as such should secure appointments to the office of Auditor General, but that the responsible executive of this Government should have the right of appointment to that office. That has never been questioned in this Parliament up to to-day, and we are to learn from this impartial officer, we are to learn from this Auditor, if you please, to-day that ever since 1867 there has been something radically wrong, and that only political considerations prevailed in the first appointment, either to his office, or any office of any other department. I think that is an overdrawn statement, even regarding the system under which we live and under which this country is governed. Party men, hon. gentlemen opposite me to-day, may have that opinion, but that is not a fair or impartial judgment of the considerations that prevail in appointments to office. Many good cases could be cited to illustrate the contrary. Then, again, he says:

> Supposing there were a change of government to-morrow, what efficiency would there be in the Audit Office if the incomers could put their friends, with short experience, and, therefore, insufficient knowledge of the more important work of the office, over the heads of those who have always done their duty, and have full knowledge of it?

I call attention to that in order to put in a stronger light the authorities to which I will refer later in regard to the sphere and the duties of the Auditor General. Again, there is a sentence to which the Minister of Finance, the leader of the Government in this House, referred to to-day, where the Auditor says:

> As long as your petitioner is in his present office, no matter what party holds the reins of power, every effort will be made to keep the financial affairs right, and in cases where it is impossible to do that, to make it as clear as possible to the tax-payers of the country wherein, in his opinion, the wrong consists.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask how it can be that the Auditor General should attempt to keep the financial affairs of this country right? I say that the tax-payers of this country look at present to the executive to keep the financial affairs right. I say that the Opposition are charged with the duty of seeing that the executive perform those duties themselves, and the Opposition would be the first to deride, and sneer at, and laugh down any executive that attempted to shield themselves behind the Auditor General, and to say that Parliament had put that responsibility upon him as supervisor. But would the Auditor General like to appear as the responsible supervisor, for instance, of the charges, whether exaggerated or otherwise, that have been levelled against the executive in regard to the conduct of financial affairs of this country from 1878 down to this date? We are attacked, day in and day out, because of crass negligence, as it is alleged, by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the conduct of financial affairs. We are charged with having permitted large sums of money being improperly taken from the public treasury; we are charged with having allowed thieves to break in and steal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Some hon. members say, "Hear, hear." Thank God, these charges have not been founded upon facts.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. These charges, I say, have not been founded upon facts. But suppose they were, as hon. gentlemen by their derisive cries of "Hear, hear," would intimate, would they take it as an answer from us that the Auditor General neglected his duties, that he did not exercise every effort to keep the financial affairs right? They know that if there is anything in half the cases they have urged before Parliament, that statement of the Auditor General would bring upon him a responsibility in connection with which he would occupy a very humiliating position, because, notwithstanding what he says of his powers and functions, if the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite be right, he is the man who is guilty, for he never smelled or thought of the wrong-doings those hon. gentlemen have tried to urge in this House, and before the country as having been committed by the Government of the day. With all the detectives at his command, with all the efforts to pry into this department, and into that department, it is the great boast of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to their so-called scandals, that they, out of their own peculiar ingenuity, and with all their own peculiar means, unaided by the Government or any officer connected with the Government, unaided by this parliamentary officer, the Auditor General, or any one else, got upon the track of the guilty, and they proposed in their own particular way, to ferret out these iniquities and lay them bare. I have referred to some of the extraordinary statements most unfortunately put into that document, statements that will not, unfortunately for this country, and for this Parliament, leave him in as strong a position as he was before he put his name to those statements. But I should like the House, in order to appreciate some of the criticisms that I venture to make, to hear from the Auditor General himself what he thought his proper functions were, not on the eve of a general election, mark you, Mr. Speaker, not at a critical time, as this may possibly be, but when he came to that office with good intentions, when he had studied, as no doubt, judging from his report, he had studied the legislation from which our

Act was copied, the legislation of the Imperial Parliament. The leader of the Government in this House has to-day pointed out the marked difference in volume in the report, as published in 1877, and the report as published in later years. True, it is, that business may have increased, the expenditure may be larger; nevertheless, a difference in the system on the part of the Auditor General has been made clear. He began by following the English system in reference to the statement of the audit which he had made, as to the discrepancy between the vote of Parliament and the expenditure by the Government, or in regard to the object, or omission of that expenditure. In this report of 1879, the Auditor General says:

> The Audit Act having been based on that of the Imperial Parliament now in force, the undersigned has assumed that, so far as circumstances permit, it is advisable in such contingencies as are not provided for by our Statute, to follow the system which has grown up under the English Act.

For convenience, I propose, and it is fair to the Auditor General to do so, to assume, as I have good warrant to do, that in every particular outside of the powers of appointment and suspension and matters of that kind, we follow the 'ipsissima verba' of the English Act. I take it that the Finance Minister, in the Mackenzie Government was warranted in making that statement, which he did, in 1878, that our Audit Act was practically a copy of the English Act, with the exception of those differences that were absolutely necessary; but, as regards this discussion, I have examined them, and in nearly every particular the powers are the same. After studying that Act, and studying the very valuable reports made by the Public Accounts Committee, from year to year, in England, the Auditor General wrote the sentence I have repeated. He also added this:

> The appropriation accounts are made use of to provide Parliament with explanations of causes which led to expenditures different from what were anticipated when Parliament was asked to make the appropriation.

That is clearly the rule in England. It ought clearly to be the course followed in Canada. But where do you find authority for the insertion of tittle-tattle, and correspondence between the departments that has never led to an investigation, that has never been the cause of observation in this Parliament during the period I have had a seat in the House, since 1883. Where do you find the necessity for that waste of printer's ink, printers' time, and public money? Where has there been the expression on the part of the Public Accounts Committee, or on the part of this House, that they wanted it, for a single expression of opinion would have been a justification of the Auditor General. He has the power —no one denies it—of putting all these little items into his report; but the difference, I submit, between the Auditor General in England, and the Auditor General in Canada is this: That the one waits for these suggestions from the proper authority; the other rushes, without waiting for suggestions from any quarter, or, at all events, suggestions which are openly made—suggestions from the Public Accounts Committee, or from hon. members on this side of the House, or on the other—pell-mell into this extravagance and into the extraordinary document which is now before us, one without a precedent, in any Parliament governed under British institutions. The Auditor General, I say, began well, in 1879. He was new to the business, but he had, apparently, studied, as these extracts from his report show, the practice of an Auditor General governed by similar legislation to that prevailing in Canada. I would ask the indulgence of the House while I refer to something else in the same report, to show that at that time, when it could not be supposed there was any other motive behind the Auditor General than a desire to properly discharge his duties under the supervision and control of Parliament, he repeated in his report, an opinion given by Mr. Lash, the Deputy Minister of Justice, in 1879, for his guidance, I take it, a man in every sense qualified to advise the Auditor General on a subject of that kind, as no man in this House will dispute—and with Mr. Lash I agree in every particular. He said:

> The broad question is, whether you should, or indeed whether you have the right to, inquire into the right of the Government to pass an Order in Council authorizing the expenditure of public money, or whether your duty and power as Auditor General is limited merely to seeing that any moneys, the expenditure of which has been authorized by Order in Council or departmentally, according to circumstances, have been voted by Parliament to be used for the purpose intended. I have given the matter very careful consideration, and am satisfied that your duties and powers as Auditor General are confined to seeing that any moneys which the Government seek to expend, have been voted to Her Majesty for the purpose, and that you have no right to inquire into the legal right of the Government to do that for which they seek to expend the money which has been voted to them by Parliament. The question is one of principle, not of degree.

I pause to say that in my humble opinion, the Auditor General has not followed the advice of Mr. Lash, but has arrogated to himself powers and responsibilities that were never contemplated by Parliament to be conferred upon him. He has discussed such questions as to whether you should pay the subscriptions to newspapers in advance so as to get the discount, or whether you should pay the subscriptions when the year ran out. He has occupied pages of the report to lay before Parliament that some departments paid for subscriptions to newspapers the

end of the year instead of the beginning, and had lost 50 cents sometimes upon the transaction. According to Mr. Lash, and I think, according to the best opinions upon that subject, that is not for him; that is for Parliament. The money was spent honestly, the money was spent under the vote of Parliament, in the case, for instance, to which I have referred. By an advance payment we might have saved something, but the amount was exigible from the Government when the account was sent in. The amount was voted and it was paid. His duty was done, and if he thought the members of this House were interested in the question of whether we might save a little discount, and to get that small and comparatively infinitesimal item to the benefit of the exchequer of this country, his duty would have been discharged as I believe the authorities show, by simply citing the fact that some of these papers were paid for at the end of the year instead of at the beginning, and that if we had paid for them at the beginning of the year we would have got them for less. Then the Public Accounts Committee and the Parliament of Canada, could have impressed their opinions upon the Executive, and after that it would have been a question interesting to this House. Mr. Lash, in that letter, continues to say:

If you have a right to inquire into the legal right of the Government to do something which may appear to you to be clearly beyond their powers as a Government, then you would have an equal right, and it would be your duty, to inquire into the validity, in a legal point of view, of every act done by the Government involving the expenditure of money. It is out of the question that any such responsibility should be cast upon you. Parliament never intended to make you the judge in the first instance of the validity of all the executive acts of the Crown. It must be remembered that Government is reponsible to Parliament and to the people for their acts. It is for them to satisfy Parliament and the people that they did not exceed their authority, or to justify any excess of authority on their part, and, when necessary, to ask Parliament to confirm their actions. Once it were admitted that the Government had to satisfy the Auditor General, or any other person outside of Parliament, as to the legal validity of any proposed action on their part before such action could be taken, it is not difficult to imagine that the consequences might be disastrous.

All we plead for, Mr. Speaker, is not to restrict the legitimate powers of the Auditor General, but to take good care that this Parliament surrenders to no officer, whether an officer of the Government or an officer of Parliament, the responsibilities and duties of the Executive. We ask for an open and fair trial. We ask for no mercy at the hands of Parliament, or at the hands of the country; but we do resist and we do protest against the assumption of the position of a censor of this Parliament or of the Executive being in the hands of one man, no matter what safeguards he may think he has around him. Then, again, Mr. Lash, in that part of his letter, concludes:

A reference to the provisions of the Act under which you hold office, shows, I think, that your duties and powers are confined to these I have mentioned.

I would add this to Mr. Lash's letter. In the Department of Justice, if a letter is written under the inspiration of the Minister, the deputy would refer to the Minister's approval in that connection; and it is important in this particular, because Mr. Lash was just then an officer found in the department, appointed by the Government of which Mr. Mackenzie had been the leader, and instead of that letter being, as ordinarily would appear, under the instructions of the Minister of Justice in 1879, it was a letter written by Mr. Lash on his own responsibility and subsequently submitted to the Minister of Justice, who, out of the ordinary course, added, "I concur in this opinion." But let me go further. I have in this book a statement which will justify every criticism I have made in regard to the decency of the position that the Auditor General should regard in this connection; the decencies, for instance, of the relative position of the Auditor and the Government, let alone what was the intention of the Audit Act and of Parliament. It is a rebuke, in this report I hold in my hand, upon the action now adopted by the same gentleman, the Auditor General of this country. Mr. McDougall, the present Auditor General, after commenting upon Mr. Lash's letter in 1879, adds:

It is plain that the attempt to control, against the will of the Government, their expenditure, while within parliamentary grants, through a single person, the inferior of each of the members of the Cabinet in rank, would be out of the question——

Now mark you this, Mr. Speaker.

—would indeed be as useless to the country as it would be unpleasant to the officer.

And what is he attempting to do to-day? To criticise us in the boldest manner as to the conduct of matters placed, mark you, not under the control of the Auditor General, but under the control of the Executive. Any member of this House may in reason take the whole basis of the Audit Act; they may show that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was entirely wrong when he attempted to control the administration of the Audit Office, so far as the appointments to the office were concerned; but I can urge on the grounds I have quoted, and on the authorities I have cited, that it is not for the Auditor General to interpose and become a critic. It is his place to remain outside, in every respect, of the walls of Parliament. It is his place simply to act at the bidding, so far as Parliament is concerned, of the Public Accounts Committee; and the Public Accounts Committee have every means of obtaining the fullest information on the facts that it was meant that the Auditor General should sub-

mit, through these different channels I have mentioned, to the Parliament of this country for their consideration and action as well. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, if the House will extend its indulgence to me, I will refer to a very interesting discussion on a matter of this kind that took place in the Public Accounts Committee in England. There had been there, as hon. gentlemen know, the fullest inquiry into the best system of audit, consistent with the responsibility of the executive—and that was always the marked feature—running over a long period of years. The hon. member for Bothwell to-day gave us a history of the audit system of England—and I do not quarrel with his history at all. All I say is that any student will find—and he himself, I believe, will agree with me—that while the desire was growing greater every year to secure a better check, a better audit, and if you like a better system, in regard to the disposition of the moneys voted by Parliament, the most jealous care was taken by the English Parliament that in all these particulars the executive should never relinquish their authority, or control, or responsibility.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Over administrative votes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Exactly. So that, for instance, in all these particulars it would never lie in the mouth of the Administration of the day to say: This was all done by your Auditor General; this was all passed by the Audit Department. The responsibility in all these cases remained, and properly remained, on the shoulders of the executive. In this case we shirk no responsibility; we wish to conceal nothing; but we believe we are strong enough as a Government to resist the slightest invasion of the rights of Parliament or the rights of the executive at the hands of either an Auditor General or any other person. The responsibility we claim is ours. We are responsible for the conduct of that department. If, for instance, we find that suggestions made in this debate are founded upon facts—that the Auditor General is extravagantly conducting the affairs of his department, that he is going altogether outside of his functions, that in doing that he is absolutely wasting the funds of the people of this country—I take it that hon. gentlemen would not deny that it is our duty to come down to Parliament and ask for relief—to expose the situation. I take it that the officers of this department, who are placed under our surveillance and control to a large extent by the legislation of this country, are officers of the Government of Canada, and not officers of the Auditor General. Does any hon. gentleman dispute that? If he does, I ask, how is it that the appointments lie in our hands? And in regard to this parliamentary officer so-called, how is it that under the law he is to be the appointee of the Governor General in Council, and not of Parliament? How is it that in reference to all these officers the Auditor General's complaint is levelled, not against the Parliament of Canada, but against the Government? And is the contention to be persisted in that these officers—who, so far as their appointments and their salaries are concerned, hold their positions as do the officers of other departments—are to have their grievances ventilated freely on the floor of this House, and those grievances inquired into here, while other officers in other departments, similarly appointed and similarly provided for, are to remain dumb, and to continue to be, as these officers were evidently intended to be, officers of the Government of Canada, and in the Civil Service of Canada, with all its advantages and all its disadvantages? Now, I hold under my hand a lot of evidence taken on subjects akin to the one we are considering; and as I read it over to-day, I was struck with the difference that obtains in England and in Canada in the conception of this office. For instance, while hon. gentlemen assume to be protectors and advocates of the Auditor General, and seem to have a sort of unwritten alliance with him, in England the idea is totally different. There, in regard to the Auditor General—who, mark you, by their legislation is far more independent of the Government of the day than the Auditor General of Canada, and is given with the assent of Parliament, greater and larger powers—the whole idea is to assist the Auditor General and to assist every spending department in the service of the Government, and to embarrass none of them. I will not weary the House with attempting a history of this matter in England; but before Lord Northbrook's committee, Mr. Stansfeld, a member of Parliament, who had given a great deal of inquiry into the administration of the Audit Department and into the question of a proper audit of all the accounts of the Kingdom, was called; and afterwards Sir William Dunbar, the great authority on this subject in England, the gentleman whose name was mentioned when this Act was first suggested to the House, corroborated the views of Mr. Stansfeld as to the duties of the Audit Department. I will endeavour to give to the House the evidence, and not at great length. The Right Hon. James Stansfeld, a member of the House of Commons, was called and examined before the Committee on Public Accounts in June, 1871; and in case any hon. gentleman wishes to follow this matter up, I may say that this is taken from an Imperial blue-book, entitled Reports of Committees, Vol. 5, of 1871. At question 2270, Mr. Stansfeld says:

When you audit, there are two questions which you have to ask yourself, as an auditor. The first is, For whom do I audit? The second is, for what purpose, with what object do I audit?

The Controller and Auditor General audits for the House of Commons, and his first function in auditing is to see that no money has been spent except in accordance with the votes and with the Appropriation Act. Now, as a practical man, if you were to give him the audit and put it to his discretion how he should conduct the audit of the Army and Navy departments, he would never propose to take out of the hands of those great departments the whole labour and business and responsibility of a detailed examination of vouchers. Audit has to be conducted under certain reasonable and practical conditions. Every auditor trusts to a certain extent. He judges for himself how far he may trust the ordinary conduct of accounts in a department whose accounts he has to audit. From time to time he takes up a portion of those accounts and goes very minutely into them, and institutes what I might call a detective audit, but I do not know of any system of audit applied to the accounts of any commercial firm or of any company, which professes entirely to exonerate the department or the concern itself from the duty of understanding or looking after its own accounts.

Again he says, question 2271 ;

Sometimes the Controller and Auditor General is asked by a department to undertake a departmental audit.

Then he bears in mind that he is auditing,—mark the distinction—not only for the House of Commons but for the department, and that therefore he has to exercise a much closer and a much more detailed examination.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." That is just it. The trouble the Auditor makes in this case is that he is auditing for the departments and not for the House of Commons. That is the criticism, I would make, that he goes so far as to encumber his staff ; and I have further references which will make it clear that he cannot, with any staff we can put at his hands, honestly, fairly and fully present that audit to this House. He has never yet done so or attempted to do so, in my opinion. Another expert in these matters was called, Mr. Foster, not the leader of the House here, but a gentleman who has the same broad public knowledge of the way public business should be conducted. He was asked :

What have you to say as to the possibility of detecting any irregularity from information which you might receive casually from any of the gentlemen at the War Office ?

Mr. Foster was evidently a member of the audit department. He said :

I think that under the present system there is very little probability of detection. We are bound to accept, and practically the accountants render the vouchers for the amount recorded in the books, and not the sub-vouchers. We do not look into the sub-vouchers, but we accept the account and certificate of the departmental officers. That account might be composed of a variety of things, some of which might be improperly authorized, improperly made or improperly vouched. I have, in fact, no means of discovering irregularities or of bringing them under the notice of Parliament.

That is with regard to one of the largest spending departments in the Imperial Kingdom. Sir William Dunbar affirms the evidence of the Right Hon. Mr. Stansfeld, at question 2722, and says a little more. I would trouble the House to follow what he says in that particular. He had been asked to carefully consider this evidence and to come at a later day to the Public Accounts Committee and give them the benefit of his expert and mature consideration. He said :

I entirely concur in the evidence which was given by Mr. Stansfeld upon that subject, in answer to question 2270, on page 9. The views which he therein sets forth, so much more ably and lucidly than I could have expressed them, are the views which I have steadily maintained before this committee.

Again at 2725, he says :

Then, may we take it that that was your whole object in framing the two first paragraphs of your report ?—That was my object ; I have drawn the attention of Parliament to the difference of principle, because it seemed to me that, sooner or later, it might become a question for consideration, whether the powers of the Controller and Auditor General, on behalf of Parliament, should not be enlarged as regards the Army and Navy accounts. The question is distinctly for the House of Commons.

Mark this, Mr. Speaker, if you please :

If the House of Commons is satisfied with the present audit, so is the Controller and Auditor General. He has only to obey the instructions of the House of Commons, and not to lay down regulations for them.

I think that goes a long way to support the position I have ventured to take in this discussion, that this officer is not to instruct us, but that we were to instruct him. Again, Sir William Dunbar says, in reply to the question : What extent of audit would satisfy you ? I ask the attention of hon. gentlemen to this particularly, and I hope I am not wearying the House. I only submit this evidence for what it is worth. It affected my opinion, and it may have some weight with other hon. gentlemen. Sir William Dunbar was asked what extent of audit would satisfy him, and he replied :

I hold that that is a question which ought never to be put to me. It is not a question of what will satisfy me, but of what will satisfy the House of Commons. As I explained before, I am the instrument of the House of Commons. Supposing that an audit committee had been appointed by the House of Commons ; they would have exercised the very functions assigned to the Controller and Auditor General. They would have made the whole of the public accountants accountable to them ; they would, through the instrumentality of their own officers, have examined their accounts ; they might have examined some accounts very minutely and others with a lighter hand, and, in their discretion, they might have made an audit of the Army and Navy

accounts what they have prescribed for the guidance of the Controller and Auditor General. They would then, if they had discovered any inaccuracies or irregularities, have recorded their opinions thereupon, and they would have submitted these opinions to the House. That is precisely the process that I follow under the direction of the House.

Then the question was put to him :

Supposing the House of Commons were to declare itself not satisfied with the present limited appropriation audit which you conduct, and to give you the power and the staff necessary to conduct a complete audit, would not that be really calling upon you to do a second time work which had already been done within the War Office ?

To which he replied :

That depends entirely upon the directions which may be given me by the House of Commons. An effectual audit does not necessarily mean a complete second detailed examination.

Then the question is put :

That is to say, by direction of the Act of Parliament ?—Yes, I mean by direction of the Act of Parliament ; the directions of the House of Commons under which I act, are embodied in an Act of Parliament. An auditor is not entitled to make regulations for himself ; the regulations for his guidance must be prescribed by his employers. The House of Commons, therefore, must lay down the regulations under which their officer must conduct the audit of public accounts on their behalf. For reasons no doubt satisfactory to themselves, they have laid down those regulations to which I have pointed, some more comprehensive, and others, as in the case of the Army and Navy, more limited.

Again at 2752, he says :

The duties of the Controller and Auditor General are passive ; to obey the instructions which are laid down for him ; not to prescribe what they should be.

That is the evidence which, I think, is at least entitled to serious consideration at the hands of the House in support of the position I am taking, and that is that the Auditor General should not himself undertake to instruct this House as to the system ; that that is a matter peculiar to the House of Commons ; and when we want his assistance, we will ask for it and it will be suggested in the proper way how we shall obtain it. There are other questions that I would perhaps have been warranted in going into, but I find that I have already occupied so much of the time of the House by reference to what I believe valuable opinion, that I will not venture to trespass at greater length upon your attention. But I hope that in all I have said I have in no sense led the House to misunderstand the position which I believe the leader of this House, with the assent of all his colleagues, has taken up to-day. And it is not that we desire to flinch in any particular from the most thorough and critical examination that this House considers necessary ; but that we are most jealous that there shall be no interference with the functions of this House, or with the functions of the executive, mark you, on the part of any officer of a department, either in the Auditor General's branch or in any other branch, but that in the regular and constitutional manner, subjects requiring attention shall be brought forward by members of this House upon their responsibility.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I can promise the House that, though I follow the Minister of Justice in the debate and intend to refer to some of his statements and arguments, I shall not follow him in the length of time he has thought fit to occupy in dealing with this subject. The hon. gentleman thought it necessary to occupy a half an hour before dinner and over an hour since dinner, not in discussing the petition of the Auditor General but in denouncing the conduct of that gentleman in language which I venture to say can hardly be regarded as judicious. Coming from the Minister of Justice, I will venture say that his language was extreme and ill-judged. The hon. gentleman knows that the Auditor General occupies a position in this country which the general public would be sorry to see impaired. He is an officer of very great responsibility and power. Parliament has seen fit to invest him with authority which the executive, strong as the hon. gentleman pronounced it to be, have no right to interfere with. He holds his office by the same tenure as a judge of the land—during good behaviour, and no government, I care not how strong it might be, would dare to interfere directly with the Auditor General. The hon. gentleman has seen fit to berate and denounce that gentleman by the hour as though he were a common criminal. He has told us that the Auditor General's petition was both unconstitutional and impudent. After reflection he withdrew the first statement, and before he closed admitted that the Auditor General had pursued a perfectly proper constitutional course in laying what he believed to be his grievance before this House. So we start with the fact that we have a petition properly laid before us and containing statements that demand our careful attention. I venture to say, Sir, that in the discharge of his duties for the last sixteen years, the Auditor General, has so entrenched himself in the public favour that no government would dare directly to impair the usefulness of his office. He is recognized, Sir, as the economy branch of the Government, that branch of the Government which holds control over the extravagance which in the past has been reckless. And hon. gentlemen know this, and it is because they know it that they denounced him in this House. I rise for one to enter my protest against an officer so situated being denounced as this officer has been denounced to-night. So long as the Auditor General discharges his duties fairly, faithfully and fearlessly, he can only count on enemies in the executive, but, at least, he can hope for

the endorsement and approval of members on both sides of this House who know how desirable it is that the checking of the public expenditure, should be real and not perfunctory. Now, Parliament has made the Auditor General an independent officer ; but if he is not supported with a proper staff, you may do indirectly what you dare not do directly—you may make him an inefficient officer. The hon. gentleman told us to-night about the nature of the Auditor General's duties, and cites the evidence given in Britain, I think he said, in the year 1861——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No ; 1871.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, 1871—at a parliamentary inquiry in England, showing the opinions which certain gentlemen there held as to the functions of the Auditor. I venture respectfully to submit to the hon. gentleman that three-quarters of the quotations he made are entirely beside the mark. And why ? Because the Auditor General here does not hold his office and does not discharge the duties appertaining to his office under any instructions from the executive or even from this House ; but he holds his office and discharges his functions as they are prescribed in an Act of Parliament, and if he faithfully discharges his duties, whether he pleases or displeases the executive, he will gain the approval of the better men on both sides of the House. Now, instead of referring to the opinion of gentlemen in England, whoever they may be, it would have been better if the hon. gentleman had referred to the Act of Parliament itself.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is almost a transcript of the Imperial Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In some respects it goes a good deal further. The Act provides for the appointment of an Auditor General and defines his duties. After providing for the appointment and providing that the Auditor General shall have power to order the internal conduct of his own office, it goes on to provide in section 31 :

The Auditor General shall see that no cheque issues for the payment of any public money for which there is no direct parliamentary appropriation, or in excess of such appropriation, the expenditure of which has been authorized by the Governor in Council ; and he shall report to the Governor in Council, through the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, any case in which a sub-accountant has expended money out of the proceeds of any accountable credit, for any purpose for which there is no legislative authority, or beyond the amount for which there is such authority.

Now, the hon. gentleman knows that the Auditor General dare not shirk his duties in that regard. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that if any officer of the Government, whether he is one of the executive, or a deputy head, infringes the rule laid down there, the Auditor General is not bound to call him to account and to bring the facts officially before the proper authority and also publish it in his report ? The Act goes on further to provide :

No cheque for public money shall issue except upon the certificate of the Auditor General that there is parliamentary authority for the expenditure.

So that he is bound in every case where expenditure takes place to see that there is proper parliamentary authority for it. Then, after certain cases are provided for, the Act provides :

If the Auditor General has refused to certify that a cheque of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General may issue, on the ground that the money is not justly due, or that it is in excess of the authority granted by the Council, or for any reason other than that there is no parliamentary authority, then, upon the report of the case prepared by the Auditor General and the Deputy of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, the Treasury Board shall be the judge of the sufficiency of the Auditor General's objection, and may sustain him or order the issue of the cheque, in its discretion :

2. The Auditor General shall in all such cases prepare a statement of all such legal opinions, reports of Council, special warrants and cheques issued without his certificate, and of all expenditure incurred in consequence thereof, which he shall deliver to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, to be by him presented to Parliament, not later than the third day of the session thereof next ensuing.

So, when the hon. gentleman talks about the Auditor General publishing what he is pleased to call a not very dignified language, the tittle-tattle of his report, he forgets that in all these instances the Auditor General is merely discharging his duties devolving upon him under the statute.

Mr. FOSTER. What you read does not give him the power you claim.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, it does.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a special case when certain contingencies arise.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say, in all these excepted cases, where he refuses to pass the cheque and is over-ruled by the treasury board he must publish the correspondence in his report.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not what I referred to as tittle-tattle ; but the ordinary correspondence that takes place daily.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The next section goes on to provide :

No payment shall be authorized by the Auditor General——

And this is a most material section of the law——

—in respect of work performed, or material supplied, by any person in connection with any part of the public service of Canada, unless, in addi-

tion to any other voucher or certificate which is required in that behalf, the officer under whose special charge such part of the public service is, certifies that such work has been performed, or such material supplied, as the case may be, and that the price charged is according to contract, or, if not covered by a contract, is fair and just.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But there is nothing about puting it in the report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to show that every expenditure is to be examined by the Auditor General, and the requirements of this section have to be examined into by him to see that they have been complied with. Now, I want to say that every expenditure has to be examined by the Auditor General according to the requirements of this section, and he has to see that they are complied with, and to see that the charges are just and fair. Very well, if these are his duties, and he has to see that these charges are just and fair, in what better manner can he discharge that duty than by publishing the prices which the Government pay for these articles in his annual report? I submit to the Government that this ought not to be a matter of political recrimination at all; I submit that when the Auditor General publishes his report, containing the items, and the amounts paid for the particular services, he is, in that way, offering the best audit that could possibly be offered. And why? Because his report goes throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and the taxpayers themselves and their representatives here are then enabled to judge whether impositions are being practiced upon the Government. I say, in that regard, that the Auditor General's hands should be strengthened. I repeat what my hon. friends from this side have already said, that the general public receive his report with the greatest possible satisfaction. Before that report was published, the people of this Dominion were in almost absolute ignorance of what took place with regard to the expenditure of public money. The hon. gentleman says that the Auditor General has made the most unfair representations that can be made, on page after page, of his report; but the hon. gentleman failed to support that reckless assertion with any proof whatever. The hon. gentleman made the assertion, but I did not see him take up the report and give one single instance that an unfair representation was made by the Auditor General.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I gave one instance.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman said that the Auditor General had an ulterior design in probing the accounts. I think it was an ungenerous assertion for the Minister to make; nevertheless, it was cheered by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills). It was an ungenerous assertion to make, and one that is not based upon a tittle of evidence. So far as my intercourse with the Auditor General has gone during the time I have sat in this House, I have found him most scrupulously careful to keep himself absolutely within the terms of his duty, and not to give the slightest word or hint to any member of the Opposition, beyond the information derived from his printed report. He is a man who has conducted himself in a way that deserves commendation at the hands of members of Parliament upon both sides: and I heard with extreme pain and regret members of the Government, and the Minister of Justice, especially, trying to throw a doubt upon the probity, and the honour, and the integrity of that official. Sir, the hon. gentleman ventured to give a most unfortunate illustration in respect to the criticism which the Auditor General has passed upon money spent for newspapers. What do I find in that particular? The hon. member treats that as if it was a two-penny-ha'-penny matter of a few dollars. As a matter of fact, during the last ten years, I find that the Government have spent no less than $37,000 on newspapers for the several departments alone. While the hon. gentleman may not think that is a matter deserving of any comment or criticism by the Auditor General, I think the general tax-payer will thank the Auditor General every time his attention is called to that extravagant expenditure.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How much could we have saved if we had paid them in advance?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know what you would have saved, but I know that if you do pay an unfair price for newspapers, the Auditor General is bound by the statutes to examine into it and point it out; and if the hon. gentleman thinks he should not do it because the amount is only a trivial $37,000, I venture to differ with him, and I think the House and the country will differ with him. It is just the same in the matter of cab hire. They tried to laugh it down at the time, but, as a matter of fact, the expenditure in that regard has been so enormous for the past few years that it has properly challenged the direct attention of the Auditor General. And so through all the Auditor General's Report. Now, the Minister of Justice says that suspicion in the mind of the reader is formed by publicity. I venture to say that if the Auditor General's report was not published, and was not circulated throughout this land, the suspicion would be intensified tenfold, because the public would never understand how these people can have managed to run up the expenditure from $24,000,000 to $40,000,000, as they have done. But the Auditor General's Report is calculated to allay suspicion, and, in all respects where the expenditure is defensible, the defence

comes out on a page of the Auditor General's Report, and requires no further comment. But where the shoe pinches is here, that in thousands of instances the expenditure is indefensible, and they know it, but they do not want the public to know it. Now, I venture to ask the hon. gentleman himself, who has had a large experience in the Public Accounts Committee, what position that committee would be in to-day if we had not the Auditor General's Report before us? We get two days out of the week for that committee, at the latter end of the session, with a great deal of trouble. We sit for two hours, and it takes five or six sessions to go through any large inquiry at all, and I say that if the details of the expenditure were not published in the Auditor General's report, if we had to move for them, and wait until they were brought down from the Public Accounts Committee, as formerly had to be done, all audit and all criticism of public expenditure would be avoided. The hon. gentleman would then live in his political Utopia; he could spend what he liked, and challenge hon. gentlemen to show how it was extravagant.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman asks me a question; does he want an answer?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am replying to the hon. gentleman's statement that the publication of the items generates suspicion in the minds of the reader, and I wish to repeat again that if the expenditure has been just and fair, or within the limit of what is just and fair, no suspicion can be generated; everybody who wishes to defend the expenditure can do it, because the purpose for which it was expended, the amount which was expended, the time it was expended, and the person to whom it is paid, are all published.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says that I made that statement. I know he does not wish to misrepresent me, and I wish to say that I was referring particularly to the police account. I did not say that the publication of the account misrepresented the facts; I said that the manner in which it was published did misrepresent the facts, and cause an unfair suspicion, and I instanced one particular case, the case of gloves. But I did not make the general statement that the fact of making the publication created an unfair suspicion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am willing to accept the hon. gentleman's withdrawal, and I am willing to let the statement he made with respect to the gloves, go for what it was worth. But I want to ask the House this: If the Minister of Justice believes, as he says to-night he does, that the manner in which that expenditure is set out in the Auditor General's Report is unfair, how is it that with the Auditor General attending every meeting of the Public Accounts Committee for years back, the hon. gentleman, with the book in his hand, has never called the attention of the committee or of the Auditor General to the fault? How is it that he has not called upon the Auditor General where he can answer for himself, and rise in the Public Accounts Committee, and explain? Instead of that, the hon. gentleman gets up in this House, where the mouth of the Auditor General is shut, and he can make no reply, and makes a charge which is calculated to undermine his character for impartiality. I venture to tell the hon. gentleman that the position he took to-night is an undignified one, as well as an unjust one. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman in quoting a phrase which he read from the evidence given in England, in this inquiry, said: "The duty of the Auditor should be a passive duty." Well, Sir, in the sense that the Auditor General is not to give instructions to the Government, no one disputes that position. The Government have not to give instructions to him in his own sphere; he is independent of the Government, just as the Government is independent of him. He has been made so by Parliament, and it will be a dangerous step when the Government asks their parliamentary majority to withdraw that independence from the Auditor General; it will be a dangerous day for the tax-payer of this country when the only check upon extravagant expenditure is taken away. I venture to submit this to the House, that when the hon. gentleman made use of that expression that the Auditor should be a passive Auditor, his object was to compel him to act with just such a staff as the Government choose to give him, whether that staff is an efficient one or an inefficient one.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman cheers that. That shows I am right. Very well, now let us examine where this is gong to end. Suppose, for instance, that the hon. gentleman supplies him with an an inefficient staff, and the Auditor General finds that he cannot discharge his duties as prescribed by statute with the staff given him. Still, my hon. friend would say to him: You must remain perfectly passive, with the knowledge that you are not discharging the duty which you are paid to discharge; you are not to say a word, you are not to come to Parliament with a complaint. I charge that if the hon. gentleman's argument was carried to a logical conclusion the result would be this, that you would destroy the efficiency of the Auditor General's Department by an indirect blow, by a stab below the ribs; you would do that which you have not the courage to do openly. Now, Sir, I was sur-

prised to hear the Minister of Finance make the statement he did respecting the increase of expenditure in the different departments. Why, the hon. gentleman, after hearing the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), should have been more ingenuous. He talks about the expenditure of the Auditor General in 1880 and compares it with 1894, and triumphantly asks his followers: Has there not been a very large increase in the staff of that department between 1880 and 1894? And asking the question, he supposes he has answered it. Did not the hon. gentleman here read to him that since 1880 there has been an enormous amount of work thrown on that department, work that did not devolve upon it in 1879 and 1880. What are the facts? The whole Indian accounts in 1882 were placed upon the Auditor General; the whole accounts connected with the Franchise Act were placed upon him in 1886, and the examination of the revenue returns in 1887—a new branch altogether—the Auditor not having been charged with this work until 1887 when it was entrusted to him by an Order in Council. The hon. member for Bothwell reminds me that this work required four additional clerks. Then there were the accounts of the banks, the currency account in 1887, and stores account in 1894. These go to show that it is not fair or just to the Auditor General to take up the staff as it stood in 1879 and compare it with 1894, and say, look at the great increase in the staff, and then declare that no increase should be asked. Such a course was calculated to mislead the judgment of the House and the country. The administrative audit was also added after that time. I will not trouble the House by attempting to justify the phraseology and verbiage of the Auditor General's petition. The Minister of Justice has criticised with the greatest severity the language used in that petition; but he failed to tell the House this, that the language although used in a broad and general sense must be understood to have reference to the specific duties of the Auditor General's Department, and understood in that sense, it is quite defensible. The Auditor General does not assume to dictate to this House and the country as to the mode of regulating the financial affairs, except in so far as the expenditure is concerned and so far as it comes within the purview of his powers as laid down by statute. I am not here to justify the Auditor General in attempting to dictate to the House and the Government the financial policy; that is a matter altogether beyond his ken or control. I have never heard that he has assumed any such power, I think he has kept fairly well within the duties of his office, difficult and onerous as they are, and not calculated at all events to make him a most popular officer, but I repeat that he is an officer whose hands should be strengthened by this House on all proper occasions, and I venture to say that this is an occasion when he should receive the moral support of members on both sides. I am not competent to judge whether there should be an increase of one or two, or three clerks in his department; all he asks is that a joint committee should be struck, composed by members of both sides of the House, to determine that question. The proposition to my mind does not seem to be an unfair one. I do not think it should be refused, as the leader of the House refused it, and I think that the language in which that officer was denounced by the Minister of Justice is altogether indefensible.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) generally begins a judicial speech by saying that the hon. gentleman who previously addressed the House did not speak in a judicial manner, but before he closes his speech it is evident that he preaches that which he does not practice, because no one will charge the hon. gentleman with having delivered an eminently judicial speech.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. DICKEY. There is one opinion only. In my remarks I will follow the hon. member for Prince Edward Island in reply to the Minister of Justice. The hon. gentleman said the quotations made by the Minister of Justice had no reference to this case. The quotations made by the Minister were with respect to the English Act, which is admitted to be in terms almost identical with the present Act, and where there is a difference from the present Act it is in favour of powers given to the English auditor. And yet the hon. member for Queen's said that the quotations of the Minister of Justice, which showed the limitations which the constitutional authorities in the mother Parliament deemed it necessary to throw around the power of the Auditor General of England, were not relevant to this discussion. What does the hon. member for Queen's think of the opinion of Mr. Lash, the Deputy Minister of Justice of the late Government, an opinion that was adopted by the Auditor General himself? When did the constitution of the office of the Auditor General change? Was the Auditor General right when he assumed office and stated his view of his functions in his report of 1879? And was Mr. Lash right when he gave his view, because if Mr. Lash was right, delivering a responsible opinion for the guidance of the Government, the hon. member for Queen's and other hon. gentlemen opposite are wrong in the opinions they are maintaining to-day, possibly for political purposes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We did not go on Mr. Lash's judgment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Auditor did.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman says we could do nothing without the Auditor General. I am not here to find the slightest fault with the office of Auditor General; it is not only a very desirable office, it is almost a necessary office. The hon. gentleman said that previous to the appointment of an Auditor General, in 1878, the people of the country knew nothing about the finances.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No; I said the details.

Mr. DICKEY. I beg to remind the hon. gentleman that the Opposition in the days before 1878 took very good care that the people understood the details and the general plan of the finances, and without the assistance of an Auditor General they showed so many irregularities on the part of hon. gentlemen who now sit opposite that they were forced into Opposition, where they have remained ever since. So although this is a very important office, still it is not an office absolutely essential to enable the people to understand the finances, and the vigorous opposition was quite as good in that way as is an Auditor General himself. What is the gist of this matter? This is not a large question in extent, though perhaps it is in principle. There are two matters at issue here between hon. gentlemen sitting on the opposite sides of the House. The first is: Should this petition be considered by the House? The next is: What action should be taken upon it? In the first place, with respect to the presentation of the petition to the House, I do not suppose it is unconstitutional, or that it should be ruled out of order, although there might be some ground for a contention of that sort. But I submit to the House in all sincerity that, if this is a practice which it is desirable for this House to favour, what is the result of the Auditor General's request? It is that the Governor in Council shall take action with respect to his department, either by the promotion of clerks, by the appointment of new clerks or by the granting of money for extra clerks. Therefore the Auditor General, who is a civil servant, is coming to Parliament by petition, and asking that the hand of the executive be forced with respect to the disposition of public money. Is it to be said here, that the Deputy Minister of any of the different departments—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman pardon me. I am quite sure he would not want to do an injustice to the hon. gentleman. I may have misread his petition, but if I have read it correctly, the Auditor does not ask anything except that a committee of both sides be struck to see how far his demands might be reasonable.

Mr. DICKEY. Quite so. Does the hon. gentleman think it a proper system to obtain, that the deputy heads of the various departments of the Government should petition Parliament to review the acts of the Executive?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No.

Mr. DICKEY. Certainly not. Sir, if there is one thing that strikes a man who comes to Ottawa and remains here for a few years, it is that here, as in other countries, there is a tendency in human nature for a man to magnify his office. There is a tendency for a man who has become the head, or a permanent officer of a department, to become wedded to the routine of that office, and I do not know any officer in which that is more patent than in the Auditor General himself. He began a very humble individual, discharging functions which he thought the Parliament of Canada had placed upon his shoulders, and discharging them properly. The hon. gentlemen opposite got hold of his report, and they began to praise the Auditor General, and to persuade him that he was the 'imperium in imperio,' that he was the man on whom they depended for all the material they found against the Government, and from the time that the Auditor General fell under the evil influence of the counsel of hon. gentlemen opposite, he began to magnify his office. I ask any hon. gentleman who is unprejudiced to read that clause in the petition to which the Minister of Justice has referred:

> As long as your petitioner is in his present office, no matter what party holds the reins of power, every effort will be made to keep the financial affairs right, and in cases where it is impossible to do that, to make it as clear as possible to the taxpayers of the country wherein, in his opinion, the wrong consists.

I ask any hon. gentleman to read that and tell me, if it is not the utterance of a man who is so puffed up with the office he holds and the functions he discharges, that really he begins to consider himself the whole electorate, and the whole Opposition, and the whole press of the country as well. He says, I will do this. I will keep financial affairs right, and if I cannot keep financial affairs right, I will inform the country about it. That is the utterance—not in the slightest degree of a man who is actuated by any improper motive—but it is the utterance of a man who is suffering from this disease of official magnificence which I have described.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That disease is very contagious.

Mr. DICKEY. I have not myself been long enough in office to acquire it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We are warning you.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not think the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) will acquire it for some time to come.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He is not very anxious about it.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not think he is. Now, the clerks of the Auditor General's office are appointed by the Governor in Council under the express authority of the Act. The hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) says that the Auditor General was made an independent officer by Parliament. I entirely disagree with him in that. Parliament was invited to make him an independent officer, and to give him the right to appoint and promote and classify his own clerks, as under the English system, but Parliament deliberately refused to make him an independent officer in that regard. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) may read that Act through and through, and he will find that the only way in which the Auditor General differs from the ordinary civil servant is in his tenure of office, in which respect, of course, he is entirely independent of the Executive of the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is the great thing.

Mr. DICKEY. But the clerks which he appoints, and the clerks which inferentially his petition asks should be appointed, are the appointees of the Governor in Council.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In the first instance.

Mr. DICKEY. You may try to get around it any way you like, but in the end it comes to this, that this is an attempt on the part of the head of a department under this Government, to come to Parliament by way of petition, and through the means of a committee of the House, to force the hands of the Government to promote the expenditure and importance of his own department. It is a bad principle. It would lead to trouble. It would take from the Executive of the country the responsibility which it is forced to bear for the expenditure of the public money. Suppose that the Government acceded to this request, and as they could do, put a majority of their own friends on the committee, and suppose the committee recommended extravagant expenditures in the Auditor General's Department, what would be the position of the Government? I would like to know from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) what would be the ministerial responsibility then? How could you graft on the English system of ministerial responsibility any such odious excrescence as an Auditor General who is independent of the Government in that way, and for whose expenditure nobody is responsible. He is not responsible himself, the committee of the House would not be responsible, the Government would not be responsible, and the result would be that public money would be spent without anybody being responsible. One more point, Sir, and I have done. What is the substantive trouble here? What is complained of? Why, if you listen to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), you would imagine that there was some great wrong being perpetrated on the Auditor General; that he was subjected to persecution by this Government; that he had been carrying out his duties in the midst of all the difficulties that could be thrown in his path; that this Tory Government, in order to cover up their own iniquities—which the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) alluded to in such a judicial and calm manner in his speech—that this Tory Government, in order to hide these, had been oppressing the Auditor General. Well, there is nothing in the petition whatever to endorse that. The petition says that the Auditor General complains that his men are not promoted fast enough. What has that got to do with their work? Will John Smith, who is a first-class clerk, do any more work because you make him John Smith, a chief clerk, or will Tom Jones, a third-class clerk, do any more work if you promote him to the second-class. It is not proposed to add a single man to the department. It is not alleged that the Auditor General is short handed. It is not alleged that in any one instance he has been hampered for want of hands. And yet these hon. gentlemen opposite make the statement, when the petition which they hold in their hand shows to the House and to the country that the only thing which the Auditor General complains of is that he cannot promote fast enough the men whom he has worked with and got fond of in his association with them. It is not a suggestion that they cannot do the work. It is not a suggestion that he cannot produce the bulky volume, half of which is work that the Auditor General—at least, if he took a more modest view of his functions—ought not to feel obliged to perform. The Auditor General complains that the vote for his extra clerks is reduced in the Estimates. Now, I will make a proposition to hon. gentlemen opposite. If they will go through the whole departments of this Government, and find any deputy head of a department that does not grumble at the Finance Minister for cutting off his appropriation for extra clerks, I will give them leave to say that the Auditor General has been badly treated. But if the hon. gentleman finds, as he would find, that the Auditor General, with respect to this matter of extra clerks, is treated better than any head of department in the whole range of the departments of the Government, then he will find that the Auditor General has nothing to complain of compared with other officers of the Government. Sir, we know that this is a time when we are trying, hon. gentlemen opposite may think not very successfully, to promote economy; the hon. member for South Oxford was candid and fair enough to say that he believed the Finance Minister

was making every endeavour to cut down expenses ; and what is the complaint ? That the Auditor General, in this general cutting down, which affects every department, has lost $500 with which to employ special clerks. That is the whole sum and substance of it. Hon. gentlemen opposite need not expect it to go forth to the world, that the Auditor General has stated in this petition that he is hampered in his work, or that he finds difficulty in criticising the Government, or that he has not hands enough with which to do his work. No statement of that kind is made. The Auditor General goes out of his way to say, as he should say, and as it was perfectly proper for him to say :

> Your petitioner does not want it to be understood that he complains about the treatment of this office until the last year or two. The success of the office, such as it is, has been brought about in a great measure by Ministers who supported it when it was placed on its present basis, particularly by Sir John Macdonald.

So that the Auditor General tells you that during all these years he has been handsomely supported in his office by the Ministers of the Conservative party, and that it is only as to the last year or two, when we have found the stress of falling revenue obliging us to cut down expenses, that he begins to complain almost as badly as an ordinary politician would, that he has not enough to pay his extra clerks. That is the sum and substance of the matter. I do not propose to detain the House with any further argument, except to restate the position I take—that this petition is a bad precedent, a precedent that will come home to roost some day in quarters where it is not anticipated ; that the Auditor General was badly advised, whoever advised him, when he made this petition ; and that substantially there is no grievance complained of, and nothing suggested but a committee to go into a fishing excursion in connection with this matter. I beg to state along with the Minister of Justice, that there is not the slightest wish on the part of the Government to do anything in this matter other than to uphold what we consider to be the ancient practice and just privileges of this House and the executive Government which leads it.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have only a few observations to offer to the House on this occasion, and I would not have opened my mouth at all were it not for the fact that a doctrine altogether inadmissable in my judgment has pervaded all the speeches which we have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite on this question. In the first place, I think it is to be deplored that the spirit in which the hon. member for Bothwell approached this question has not been at all reciprocated by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House. My hon. friend from Bothwell presented the question, which undoubtedly is a very important one, not so much in regard to the particular matters referred to as in regard to the principle involved, in a calm, temperate and judicial manner ; and I think the judgment of the House must be that the answer given on the other side was not at all in the same spirit. That is to be deprecated ; but what is more to be deprecated, in my opinion—and this is the only reason why I offer any observations to the House—is the doctrine which has been asserted, that the Auditor General is nothing more than an officer of this Government. Sir, this is a very important distinction to be made. If the Auditor General were nothing more than an officer of the Government, I quite agree with the Minister of Militia, that the petition which he presented to the House would be worse than unwarranted, and should not be even received by this House. But, if, on the other hand, the Auditor General is not an officer of the Government, but an officer of this House, independent of the Government and directly responsible to Parliament, and to nobody else, then this petition was quite within his rights. If he felt that he was not properly treated, or that he had a grievance, he had the right, like every other subject of Her Majesty, of petitioning Parliament. This is the whole question. Now, two reasons have been given for the statement, unheard of until this evening that the Auditor General is simply an officer of this Government. The first reason is that he is appointed by the Governor in Council. That is true ; but the Governor in Council who appoints him has no authority over him. As to all the other officers appointed by the Governor in Council who are officers of this Government, the power which appoints has the power to remove. That is what constitutes an officer of the Government. But when an officer is appointed by the Government whom the Government has no power to remove, manifestly the intention of the law is that that officer should not be responsible to the Government. Judges are not appointed by the Governor in Council, in exactly the same manner as the Auditor General ; but they cannot be removed by the Government. They can be removed only by a vote of this House, and not an ordinary vote, but by a vote recorded in a certain manner and with certain formalities observed. Another reason put forward in support of the contention that the Auditor General is an officer of the Government is that he has not the power to appoint his own clerks. The same reasoning would apply to the judges. I do not know of any judge appointed by this Government who has the power of appointing his own clerk. The judges of the Supreme Court have not that power.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman ever hear of a judge petitioning Parliament for a clerk ?

Mr. LAURIER. I have not heard of the judges petitioning Parliament for a clerk ;

but I have heard of them petitioning to the Government; and I dare say that if their petition were not heeded, it would be their privilege to petition the House. It would be monstrous to contend, on the grounds of these two reasons, that the Auditor General is an officer of the Government. He is an officer of Parliament, and the very nature of his duties must necessarily make him independent of the Government. What would be his usefulness if he were to be dependent on this Government? The law gives him the power to check the Government—to refuse the payment of moneys authorized by the Government. Would there be any sense in supposing that the law would vest such power in an officer dependent upon the good will of the Government? Why, Sir, it is manifest that if an officer subordinate to the Government were invested with that power, he could not discharge it in an independent manner. He would be altogether dependent on the power of the Government. But the very duties of the office which he has to discharge could not be discharged efficiently unless by an officer quite independent of the Government. If the Auditor General is an officer of the Government, I ask hon. gentlemen on the other side to tell me who is the Minister responsible for him to this House? I do not know of any other officer of this Government who carries his responsibility directly to this House. Every one is responsible to a Minister, who is responsible to this House and Parliament. Now, who is the Minister responsible to this House for the conduct of the Auditor General? It is not the Minister of Finance, although the Auditor General would come more properly within his province, nor is it any other Minister. In fact the Auditor General is not dependent on anybody, except Parliament. The only authority to which he is responsible is Parliament. If this be admitted, and I do not see how it can be successfully controverted, the Auditor General was properly within his rights when, finding there was between him and the Government a difference of opinion, he appealed to the House to which both he and the Government are responsible. There is something more behind. The Minister of Militia let out a word which may give us the key to the long debate we have had on this very simple question—a debate three-fourths of which was not germane to the petition or to the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes; three-fourths was not germane to the question brought up by the hon. member for Bothwell. But it was a debate on the powers of the Auditor General, as they are exercised, with the view of establishing the opinion just uttered by the Minister of Militia (Mr. Dickey), that the audit office is altogether useless and must be abolished before long. This is the gist of all the speeches we have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite to-day—that the audit office is useless; and we are coming evidently very rapidly to the day when it will be said that the Government expenditure must not be attacked at all. And I can well understand how much better that would be for the Government. But I say this, which the hon. gentleman and everybody will admit, that it is in the very nature of public expenditure—nay of any expenditure by trustees—that it must be audited and checked. Now, the contention of the Minister of Finance this afternoon—a contention supported afterwards and repeated both by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Militia, was simply this: that the Auditor General is not an auditor but simply an accountant; that all his duties are simply to go over the figures and to see that they come in their proper place and within their proper appropriation. The Auditor General, it is said, must not be a critic: he must be gingerly in all his dealings with the Government. Why, no audit, either of Government expenditure or of any expenditure, can be effective unless it be made in a critical manner. I maintain that the duties of any audit, whether it be of the expenses of a Government, or a bank, or of a simple municipal council, must be undertaken with a critical eye. An auditor must not undertake his duties with the idea of simply passing over the various items, but must enter into them with a critical eye and the determination to detect anything that may be wrong, and he is quite justified in supposing that there has been wrong. Why, whenever we put money into the hands of trustees, the experience of mankind has shown us that every item of the expenditure should be audited. Otherwise human nature might be carried away, and it is because we believe that trustees may be carried away from the sphere of their duties that an audit is necessary. If we were to trust them implicitly, in the belief that they would always do right, there would be no necessity to look over their accounts; but it is simply that, either through design or accident, there may be a discrepancy or something wrong with the expenditure that wherever there are trustees there must be auditors. This is a fundamental principle and this is the reason the Audit Act is necessary. But what is the fault found with the Auditor General after all? This debate has taken a wider range than it should, because the subject-matter of the petition is very small after all. It simply relates to the expenditure of $500, but the debate has taken a wider range, and the whole special duties to be discharged by the Auditor General have been brought into it. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made a

long contention that he does not properly discharge his duties. But what is after all the whole blame they put upon him? Simply that he burdens his reports with too many details. If there is any other criticism that has been made this evening I would like to know what it is. Simply that his report is too elaborate and long.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And misleading.

Mr. LAURIER. That is only an inference. The complaint simply is that he burdens his report with too many details.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And shows carelessness.

Mr. LAURIER. That is the opinon of the other side, but I do not believe that it is the opinion entertained by the Canadian people at large. The contrary was said by the hon. member for South Oxford this afternoon. There is no public book of greater value to-day than the Auditor General's Report as it is made. There is nothing that has thrown greater light into the actual work of Administration than this very blue-book, and I believe this is the secret of all the objection we have heard against the Auditor General. My hon. friend said a moment ago, if the Auditor General properly discharged his duty he should not incur the enmity of any political party. I agree with him. If the Auditor General discharges his duty properly, he should not incur the enmity of any political party. He should not, but he does. I believe from the very speech of the hon. gentleman that all they have to reproach him with is simply that he threw too much light on their administration, and had, therefore, incurred their enmity. As to the merits of the petition, I have not a word to say for or against. I do not pretend to be able at this moment to form any judgment upon the merits of the complaint. The Auditor General asks for more power and more help. This is denied by the Government. I am not prepared to condemn the Government. The Government may be right and the Auditor General may be wrong. That is a point upon which I have not formed any opinion at present. But what is the case here? We find a difference of opinion between two independent powers—because, I repeat again, the Auditor General is independent of the Government and responsible only to Parliament. Here are two powers equally responsible—the Government and the Auditor General. There is a difference between them. I am not prepared to say which of them is right, but I say that when one of them comes to Parliament and simply asks that the matter be investigated, the demand is so very reasonable that I am surprised it was not granted at once.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to detain the House only for a few moments to read the report of a speech with regard to this office made by Sir Sir Charles Tupper when Minister of Finance, on the occasion of the proposed increase of salary to the Auditor General. Perhaps it will be the best answer to the criticism of the Minister of Justice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What year?

Mr. McMULLEN. This speech was made on 17th April, 1888.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a long time ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. Sir Charles Tupper said:

I have no hesitation in saying, as head of the Finance Department, and so being brought in constant and frequent intercourse with the Auditor General, that I believe that it would be impossible for members on either side of this House to over-rate the careful and painstaking ability of that officer or his conscientious devotion to the duties of the most important office which he discharges. He is in every sense of the word an officer of Parliament. Although he has felt it occasionally to be his duty to differ with members of the Administration, and with the conduct of the affairs of the public departments in carrying out the details of his office, I have no hesitation in saying that he has discharged his duty in such a way as to win the confidence and hearty approval of every member of the Government, as I am sure he has earned it of every member of both sides of the House.

Then again, he says:

I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite, that the last thing the Government had in view in this Bill, was to do anything that should enable us to interfere in the slightest degree with the position Parliament has given to the Auditor General. I quite concur in the views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the value of this officer, to a very great extent, depends on the position he holds as an officer of Parliament, and the sole object we had in view in giving the benefit of the Superannuation Act, was to give a deserving officer the privileges which the Act would confer. But I do see a point in what has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that this involves the contingency of the power of removal of the officer by the action of the Government, which certainly was not the intention. I will leave the clause over for such amendment as will enable us entirely to avoid any such thing.

I give the quotations I have just read as a reply to the lengthy tirade against the Auditor General by the Minister of Justice.

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

(In the Committee.)

North-west Mounted Police—Required to meet the service of the year..... $15,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is not an addition to the amount which was voted for the current year. That amount was voted under five or six different heads, the division being made according to the best knowledge of the Controller at the time. The expenditure under some of the heads has been larger and

under others has been smaller than was estimated. But it is impossible to transfer from one item to the other. This amount is necessary to adjust the expenditure for the different heads, and will still leave a balance on the whole unexpended.

Indians—Ontario and Quebec—	
To provide for excess of expenditure over revenue in the account for the payment of Robinson treaty annuities	$1,000 00
To pay Messrs. Strickland and Burnham for islands Nos. 82 and 83, in Stony Lake	228 20

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the position in regard to this Robinson treaty ?

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will recollect, by the treaty made in 1850, the sum of £4,160 cash in hand was paid to the Indians, and a perpetual annuity of £1,100 was agreed to be paid to them, and in 1868, $88,000 was funded at 5 per cent to produce the annuity of £1,100, or $4,400 in currency ; and it was provided in the treaty that when the value of the lands was sufficient to produce an amount that would permit the province, without incurring loss, to increase that annuity, it should be augmented to a sum not exceeding $4 per capita. Since 1875 the annuity has been increased to that amount ; and it appears that during the last three years the parliamentary appropriation required has averaged $16,816 per annum. In addition to the annuities there were expenses which amount in some years to about $750.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was not so desirous of obtaining the particulars the hon. gentleman is giving, as to know what arrangements have been come to with Ontario and Quebec. My recollection is, that the Dominion Government have always contended that the province of Ontario was responsible for this Robinson treaty annuity. I want to know whether that matter was decided in the course of the late arbitration ; and, if so, how ?

Mr. DALY. It was decided by the arbitrators in favour of the Dominion, with the exception of the interest on the arrears.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, under the statement, the Dominion would be entitled to a very considerable sum of money.

Mr. DALY. Yes. The province of Ontario has appealed from the decision, and the case will be decided by the Supreme Court. The Dominion has entered a cross appeal on the question of interest. I think the case has been argued, speaking from memory, but decision not given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We ought to get a decision within a year ?

Mr. DALY. It seems to me it ought to be within a few months. As to the item of $228 for islands, it appears that in 1886 a Mr. Newson was sent up to survey certain islands in the eastern portion of Stony Lake, among which were the islands numbered 82 and 83. These islands were sold to a Mr. Grubb, of Peterboro', in 1888, for $40 each. The department subsequently learned that these islands were part of the mainland, and that the building of the Trent Valley Canal had raised the waters of the river, and had made what was originally part of the mainland these two islands that were surveyed by the surveyor. The surveyor failed to notify the department that they had been part of the mainland, and it is doubtful whether he knew himself. This Mr. Grubb, to whom they had been sold, made improvements on island No. 82 to the amount of $250, and the department offered to cancel the sale to Mr. Grubb and pay him his purchase money at the rate of 3½ per cent, which is the rate of interest we get for Indian funds, which, with the $250, would make $346.80. Then Strickland & Burnham were asked if they would pay the department for the improvements that were made, and they replied that these improvements were of no benefit to them, and they would rather not do so ; but they were willing to let Mr. Grubb retain the island if the department would pay them $250 for island 82, and $75 for island 83, making a total of $325. This offer was accepted, but as the department had no funds, and the mistake had been made by the officers of the department, it was not fair to make it a charge on the funds of the Indians, the department now ask Parliament to vote the sum of $228.20 to repay Messrs. Strickland & Burnham the value of the land which was sold to Grubb as islands 82 and 83. It does not come out of the Indian fund.

Indians—Nova Scotia—	
To provide an additional amount for medical attendance and medicines	$1,000 00
To pay Mr. Daniel McNeil for legal services in the case of McLean vs. Livingston et al, as taxed by the Department of Justice	229 25
To pay Mr. Alexander McDonald for legal services in connection with trespass on the Malagawatch and Whycocomagh reserves, county of Inverness, N.S., as taxed by the Department of Justice	90 00

Mr. BORDEN. Can the Minister give some particulars with reference to this item of $1,000 for medical attendance and medicine to Indians in Nova Scotia?

Mr. DALY. The appropriation made in 1894-95 was $2,000, and we have accounts remaining unpaid amounting, up to the time the Estimates were before Council, to $740. This is to meet the difference between the amount that was appropriated by Parliament and the bills that have already been rendered by medical men for services to the

Indians. We have exercised every economy, but there has been a great deal of sickness among the Indians, and the bills are large.

Mr. BORDEN. Can you give the items?

Mr. DALY. I will read you the list:

Name.	District County.	Population.	Amount.
			$ cts.
E. J. Elderkin, M.D.	1a Annapolis	82	29 95
A. Robinson, M.D.	"	82	44 25
R. J. Ellison, M.D.	1b Digby	183	267 15
E. F. Bowles, M.D.	2 King's	68	2 00
G. A. Smith, M.D.	3 Queen's	85	16 50
Chas. Gray, M.D.	4 Lunenburg	73	147 50
T. Freeman, M.D.	5 Halifax	117	6 00
M. B. A. Smith, M.D.	"	117	26 45
S. Dodge, M.D.	"	117	41 00
T. S. Ford, M.D.	"	117	38 25
T. N. Gourley, M.D.	"	117	26 50
G. D. Turnbull, M.D.	"	117	17 00
F. McMillan, M.D.	"	117	34 50
R. A. Adlington, M.D.	6a Hants	199	104 75
A. Hawkens, M.D.	"	199	15 26
D. H. Muir, M.D.	6b Colchester	100	85 50
F. A. Rand, M.D.	7 Cumberland	97	71 00
W. D. McKenzie, M.D.	"	97	22 00
J. F. Macdonald, M.D.	8 Pictou		14 00
C. S. Elliott, M.D.	9 Antigonish and Guysborough	160	31 40
J. C. Cameron, M.D.	" "	160	182 40
J. A. Macdonald, M.D.	10 Richmond	139	78 95
H. N. Macdonald, M.D.	11 Inverness	144	154 00
John Cameron, M.D.	"	144	117 75
D. McDonald, M.D.	12 Victoria	106	244 00
J. L. Bethune, M.D.	"	106	112 23
D. F. Dinsmore, M.D.	15 Shelburne	47	22 50
C. J. Fox, M.D.	"		20 50
Victoria Hospital			22 71
Executors, Chas. Murray, M.D.			4 00

The amount paid is $2,000 for a total of 1,806 Indian population in Nova Scotia.

Mr. BORDEN. It seems to me that some of these charges are very large, and I notice that the same names run through the accounts from year to year. In the county of King's, where there are quite a number of Indians, the medical attendance is $2, and the year before it was $48. In the county of Digby last year the medical attendance was nearly $500, and Mr. Ellison figures there as receiving $311. I see that in the list read by the Minister, his name appears for $267. I notice in the county of Hants that a Dr. Adlington received $146.50, and in the list read by the Minister his name figures for a larger amount. Now, taking the county of Digby, it is remarkable to find such a large expenditure for medical attendance and medicine as compared with the relief given to the Indians in other respects. There is nearly $500 for medical attendance there, while the amount given for blankets was only $18; for flour, $48; for oats and seed, $6; teaming, &c., $53; potatoes, $16. Now, from some knowledge of the subject, I suggest to the Minister that it would be worth his while to examine somewhat closely into this account for medical fees for Indians in Nova Scotia. I know that in one or two counties some years ago, gross abuses existed, and when the matter was inquired into and changes were made, the expenditure was reduced from hundreds of dollars down to $50 in the same locality. I think that if more money were expended in giving these unfortunate people blankets, flour, potatoes, food, &c., it is possible that less money would be required for medical attendance and medicines. I must say that $500 for medical attendance on the Indians in the county of Digby is altogether too large, unless there was some extraordinary epidemic prevailing there; but I have not heard of any, although I live not many miles from the county of Digby. This item requires explanation. I merely make these suggestions to the Minister, because I think he will find in that direction reason for inquiry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total Indian population in Nova Scotia?

Mr. DALY. One thousand, eight hundred and six. In answer to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), I may say that I am not myself familiar with the facts in relation to the expenditure for medicine in Digby, but I find we paid $267 to Dr. Ellison. By the report of the agent, it appears that there has been much sickness on the reserve during the winter; that

seven deaths occurred ; that there were nine births ; the population being five more than last year, the total population being 183. During last year we have adopted a new principle, and intend to cut down the expenditure for medicinal and other supplies in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and the other provinces. Matters have not been running as satisfactorily as they might have done. No effort seems to have been made to make the Indians independent, but they have been brought up with the idea to look to the agent in case of distress and also for medical attendance. With the inauguration of the new system we expect next year to be able to show different results as regards medical expenditure.

Mr. BORDEN. The amount expended in 1892-93 for medical supplies and attendance was $500 for a population of 180, or an average of about $3 per head. If this rule were applied to the white population, the expenditure would be equal to $60,000 a year for medical attendance and medicine, which would be ridiculous. How are the medical men paid ?

Mr. DALY. The Indian population for the province is 2,141. Doctors receive 50 cents per mile going and coming and the cost of medicine, and nothing for attendance unless the patient requires surgical treatment ; for an office consultation the doctor gets 50 cents. All the accounts are audited here.

Indians—British Columbia—	
To provide additional amount for medical attendance and medicines.....	$4,000
To provide an amount sufficient to pay the Department of Lands and Works, B.C., for the transport of Mr. F. A. Devereux, Indian Reserve Surveyor..	500

Mr. McMULLEN. Excessive charges appear in connection with the agencies in British Columbia. In one agency I observe out of a general expenditure of $3,531, no less than $925 was paid to doctors. At Fraser agency the total expenditure was $10,984, and of that $1,796 went to the doctors. At Kamloops station the total expenditure was $3,860, and of that, $1,532 was paid to the doctors. At the North-west Coast agency, over $3,000 were paid to the doctors out of a total expenditure of $10,000. At another agency, out of a total expenditure of $2,458, over $700 was paid for medical attendance. Such expenditures requires explanation from the Minister, because he is asking for an additional grant of $4,000. In some cases, half the amount is paid to the doctors, and in other cases, 25 per cent, and from reading the report of the Department of Indian Affairs, I gather that the fewer doctors sent there the better, because the Indians appear to die more rapidly when they have medical attendance.

Mr. DALY. The appropriation made by Parliament in the main Estimates last session has been exceeded by the amount we now ask. We had at the time the Estimates were before Council, unpaid accounts in the department for medical attendance in British Columbia to the amount of $2,279. It will take fully that amount to meet the bills for the current year, up to 30th June. That will make a total expenditure in British Columbia of $10,000 for medical attendance on an Indian population of 25,807 for the current year, as against an expenditure of $11,044 in 1892-93, and an expenditure of $13,600 in 1893-94. So we have effected a saving of $3,600 compared with the former year, even with this $4,000 added. No doubt we would not have required this additional amount if the sum asked last year had been granted in the main Estimates, but the Finance Minister thought the amount would not be required. No doubt this appears to be a large sum, but, in view of the large Indian population, the long distance to travel, and the fact that medical attendance is more expensive there than elsewhere in the Dominion, the amount does not appear excessive. We have already reduced the expenditure $3,500 in one year, and the department is making efforts to effect still further reductions. I can give the exact expenditure on each of the reserves for medicine during the present year in British Columbia, which shows that between 1st July, 1894, and 7th January, 1895, it amounted to $5,996.85. This $4,000 will make up the $10,000 expended, as against $13,600 in the year previous. Where there are no doctors the medicines are handed out to the Missionaries to whom we supply them. Te medical tariff in British Columbia is 50 cents a mile going, and 50 cents a mile returning, and 50 cents for medicines and $1.50 for professional services. The department is very much in disgrace with the medical profession in British Columbia because we have seen fit to cut down their bills, and the doctors and the representatives of the province have made complaints. We have succeeded in cutting the expenses down $3,500 in one year and I hope to reduce it still further.

Mr. PATTERSON (Brant). Have these bands no trust funds ?

Mr. DALY. Very few of them. We support them principally in medical attendance, and if we do not do so they go back to the old habits of their tribes, which would result in something far worse to us than our expenditure in this direction.

Geological Survey—	
Artesian boring in North-west Territories	$9,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What amount of money has been expended altogether for artesian boring ?

Mr. DALY. There was appropriated last session for boring for petroleum at Athabasca $7,000, and of that sum $5,000 has been expended up to January last according to details given at pages 7—A to 12—A of the

Geological Report. On October the 24th the boring reached a depth of 1,011 feet and Mr. Fraser reported this year, that he succeeded in getting down to 12,000 feet. He has some difficulties there on account of shale and some other matters, but he hopes during the present month to get to the contract depth, and this money is to enable them to go to 15,000 feet in the event of our not striking oil at 12,000 feet. We have expended the greater portion of the money in material and freight, and it would be lost if we did not get 300 feet below the contract depth. In the event of oil not being struck at Athabasca, Mr. Fraser will remove in July to Pelican Lake where the tar sands are visible to the naked eye, and where according to the report of Mr. McConnell in 1890, it is expected oil will be struck at 700 feet. Dr. Dawson's report says :

> It appears to be most important that the investigation of the petroleum fields of Athabasca and Northern Alberta, thus begun during the past summer, should be continued until the main features at least of the character and value of these fields shall have been determined.

We expect to have the boring at Athabasca and Pelican Lake finished before September.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What explorations are intended for 1895-96 ? and what parties have been entrusted with the work ?

Mr. DALY. The explorations this year will be confined to the fields which have been covered by the ordinary officers of the department during these last few years. Mr. McConnell will continue his work in the Kootenay district, Dr. Bell is going up to the Temiscamingue and Mr. Fletcher and others employed in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, will continue their work. The other officers of the department will be employed in Ontario in completing the sheets of the Geological maps that have been under survey during the last few years. There is no extraordinary work being undertaken, in view of the fact that my estimates have been materially reduced. We are doing only the necessary work in the different provinces to complete the work which the department has undertaken during the last eight or ten years.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will Mr. Tyrrell not be doing anything further in the unexplored territory ?

Mr. DALY. No. He is to complete some work which he started several years ago east of Lake Winnipeg. There will be no further exploration outside of the bounds of civilization.

Miscellaneous—

To meet balance of expense incurred in connection with the Colonial Conference held in Ottawa in June and July, 1894 ..... $4,443 32

To remunerate the following officers for services in connection with the Colonial Conference, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary :—J. L. Payne, joint secretary, $200 ; Douglas Stewart, joint secretary, $200 ; John Carleton, messenger, $100..... 500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the total expense of the conference ?

Mr. FOSTER. About $14,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman must give a little more explanation of this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. The amount asked for here is for travel from Vancouver to Ottawa, sleeping-car accommodation, dining-car accommodation, a slight stop at Glacier House, Mount Stephen House and the Banff Springs Hotel, more dining-car accommodation, the Hotel Manitoba at Winnipeg, tickets from Ottawa to Toronto.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know why the Government asks us to consent to these extra payments to J. L. Payne, Douglas Stewart and John Carleton ? I notice that these men are already well paid. Mr. Payne gets $1,750 a year, and Mr. Stewart $2,800 a year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He did not get that then. At that time he was Sir John Thompson's private secretary.

Mr. McMULLEN. In the Civil Service List he is set down as receiving $2,200 and $600 as private secretary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, he got $2,400 altogther as private secretary.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, $2,400 is a very good salary, without asking the country to vote more. I notice that the names of these two men appear every year as subjects of special votes, in violation of the Civil Service Act, and I would like to know why it is.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no vote in violation of the Civil Service Act. These two gentlemen were secretaries to the Colonial Conference. It was a very important conference, and there was a great deal of work in connection with it. These gentlemen not only kept a record of the proceedings of the conference, and superintended the printing of the report, but for a considerable length of time they were at work night and day and carried on a large correspondence in connection with it. They also made preparations for the different entertainments and festivities which it was thought Canada should give in honour of the visiting delegates, and they had charge of some of the excursions which were taken by the delegates to the different cities of the Dominion. It is usual in cases of this kind to recognize the services of the secretaries in some slight way. As we have not titles to give them, we ask Parliament to vote them this small sum.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to correct the Minister of Justice. He said the salary received by Mr. Stewart was $2,400. I find by the Auditor General's Report that Doug-

las Stewart received, as clerk of Justice Department, $1,800; as Minister's private secretary, $600, and for services, Behring Sea, $400, making $2,800. Now the Minister of Finance says that some extra services were performed by these individuals in connection with the Colonial Conference. Were they not paid their full salaries for serving the country—$1,750 in one case, and $2,800 in the other case? I would like to know if their whole time is not at the country's disposal for any duty they may be called upon to fulfil? This system of extra payments is taken advantage of to pay every clerk in the different departments for every little incident on which they can base a claim for extra services. I say that the system is an abuse, and should be stopped. The committee has no right to grant to these men, who are receiving now more than their services are worth, any further sums of money. We have too many blood-suckers in this Dominion who are ready to take advantage of every little excuse to draw money out of the public treasury and put it in their own pockets. There is no excuse for the Minister of Finance, in the face of the impoverished condition of the people of this country, in the face of his deficit of $4,500,000, and in the face of the necessity of providing for other things which are pressing upon the Government, coming forward and asking the committee to vote $200 additional to each of these two men, who are already amply paid. It is a gross piece of injustice, and, for my part, I intend to resent all such payments in the interest of the people of this country.

Further amount required to meet expenditure in connection with the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic..... $8,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a fair opportunity for the hon. gentleman to let us know what this commission has really cost us, and, I might add, what conceivable good it has done to any human being other than the three or four gentlemen who have extracted a good many thousand dollars for sitting on the commission and obtaining an amount of information, of which the most important item I have found is that, if the general cookery of Canada were improved, and the women would make themselves better cooks, there would be fewer drunkards in the Dominion. It may be true, and it is, no doubt, a valuable thing to pay $100,000 for it, but I think we might have had it for considerably less expenditure of time and money.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has had his usual blast. I do not suppose that this is quite the time for us to go into the merits of the commission. That was the outcome of a resolution passed by Parliament. As to the cost, I find that up to the 7th June, 1895, there was expended $63,184, and $8,000 is asked for here, so that the cost, as appears from that calculation, will be about $70,000.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the meaning of the transfer. Is that to reduce the amount by $20,000?

Mr. FOSTER. That is to make available for printing, $20,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That has to be added to the $70,000?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The evidence has already been printed and distributed—that is the parliamentary supply. The report is now being printed, and the printing of the report, and any further copies of evidence required will come out of the $20,000, so that the whole cost of the commission, printing, and all, will be between $80,000 and $90,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will that be the whole expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a very considerable item, between $80,000 and $90,000 for the hon. gentleman to find out whether Parliament should legislate in the direction in which some eight or ten years ago he contended there is no doubt it ought to legislate. It seems to me a very serious responsibility devolves upon the Minister of Finance. He was perfectly sure, ten years ago, that Parliament ought to legislate. Now, he has put the country to the expense of $80,000 or $90,0000 to find out whether the opinion he entertained was good or not, so that the hon. gentleman's faith in his former convictions was not, when it came to the test, after all, as strong as he led the country to suppose it was. The hon. gentleman, of course, will be able to tell us whether he has got in the report, which he has no doubt digested and thoroughly mastered, that information which has removed all the doubts which had arisen in his mind, and he will be able to tell us perhaps now what course he thinks, in the public interest, should be taken. The hon. gentleman, we know, was an ardent advocate of prohibition. He appointed this commission to remove doubts and to secure, perhaps, that fortification and support from it, which you may call courage if you like but not the courage of the kind with which the hon. gentleman proposed to fight. He will tell us now whether he proposes to submit any legislation upon this question. I suppose the report is premature, but it is here now, and the elections are not over. Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether the Government propose to act on this report before the elections, or whether they intend to submit it as a question for the consideration of the people as to submit to the sovereign people in the matter, or whether they intend to act upon the views of the commissioners, and to fight those men who are in favour of prohibition? It is a very important question, certainly very important, or the hon. gentleman would never

have put the country to the expense he did in connection with this matter. If he had not thought it important, I am sure that his regard for the public treasury and economy and his strong conviction of duty, would have all stood in the way of the appointment of such a commission. Now, the hon. gentleman has had his commission and report, which, although it might have been light literature in the days of Methuselah, cannot be called so in the lives of men of three score and ten; and I question whether the hon. gentleman, with all his industry, can afford sufficient time to make himself conversant with the views of the commissioners, and the witnesses they examined. Notwithstanding the heat of the evening, the House will listen with interest to any opinion the hon. gentleman can give us in this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has put several questions to me, and made known a number of wants, but I have some conscientious scruples against going into that matter just at present, because such great constitutionalists as my hon. friend and myself ought to set a good example; and it is altogether out of order to discuss the policy of a question of this kind over a supplemental vote simply meant to finish up the expenditure heretofore authorized. On that account, to set a good example to the House—and I am sorry my hon. friend has lapsed so often, but he has made several this session—I must refuse to put myself out of order. There is another reason why I should not care to discuss the question brought up by my hon. friend. The report is a long one, and the evidence still longer, and I would not like to take my hon. friend at a disadvantage. Although I have some knowledge of what is in the evidence and the report, I would like to give my hon. friend longer time to make himself sufficiently conversant with the case to discuss it upon its merits.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not require this report to fortify my opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not asked to fortify my opinions or to give my particular views with reference to it, but to inform other members of the House who needed information.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The benighted members.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman got the courage of his opinions?

Mr. FOSTER. I always had.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the first place, we ought to have some detailed statement as to how this amount was spent, and in particular I should like to know what were the amounts which were paid to the several commissioners individually for the time they expended. The hon. gentleman says that the sum total of expenditure is $63,000, and $20,000 for printing, making $83,000 altogether.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is this $8,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose that is included.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, say $90,000. I would like to know what amounts were paid to these parties. I may say that I look upon this whole expenditure as a gross waste of public money. I do not believe that one copper's worth of good has resulted to the country from this expenditure. There are some indications that the Government was anxious that every interest should be represented on this commission. Inasmuch as the president, a very worthy gentleman and a gentleman of importance, is believed to be either directly or indirectly interested in a great brewery in or near the city of Montreal, it is peculiarly proper that he should be made president. I have no doubt that he was by no manner of means the least useful member of the committee. I should like to know what these gentlemen were paid for their valuable services and for the valuable report they have presented.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman wants to know what this $8,000 is to be devoted to?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I wanted to know what sums were paid to the commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think I can give that, for that carries back to the expenditure of previous years, and I came prepared to explain this item. In the $63,000 which was expended up to 7th June, $13,636.27 were for the Queen's Printer; $3,874.75 for translation; $7,776.95 for reporting; $2,393.52 for reporters' travelling expenses; $2,591.47 for sundries——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friends seem very suspicious. Sundries in this case means paper pads and that kind of thing—$4,629 for clerical and other assistance. That makes a total of about $35,000, and all the rest of $63,000, or about $28,000 was paid to the commissioners.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How was that divided—how much to each commissioner?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot give the hon. gentleman that. The information has appeared in the Auditor General's Report.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will look up the Auditor General's Report, page C—26, he will find the information.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many commissioners were there, and at what rate were they paid ?

Mr. FOSTER. There were five, and they were paid $10 per day.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What proportion of the $8,000 is to be paid to each of them ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think this $8,000 is to pay some balances due to the commissioners, also clerical assistance, travelling expenses and reporting.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. What amount was paid for translation ?

Mr. FOSTER. $3.000.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. To whom ?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Montpetit.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Was there a contract?

Mr. FOSTER. The regular rates were paid to him, as recommended by the Queen's Printer.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Was not the contract broken ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so. Mr. Monpetit is not being employed at the present time.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I saw some letters in the press complaining that the Government had broken their contract.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt that he was complaining.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Was there anything in his complaint ?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not see the complaint.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. He complained that the Government were not willing to pay for his work, and had taken away his contract.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government, when they had all the work they wanted from him paid what was due him. That is all.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Was any money paid to Mr. Kribbs, or Mr. Spence, for gathering the evidence ?

Mr. FOSTER. There was not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister of Justice referred us to the Auditor General's Report, page C—26. But that does not give the information my hon. friend asked for at all. What was asked for was the amount paid each of the commissioners ?

Mr. FOSTER. To get that it would be necessary to add the payments for the two years during which these payments had been running.

Mr. FRASER. This is the last time the House will be called upon to vote any sum for this commission, I understand ?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon gentleman is anxious to give another vote——

Mr. FRASER. Not in the least. I do not think I would stand very well in my county if I recommended more expenditure for this commission ; enough has been thrown away already. But if this is the last vote to be given for this commission, I think it would be well that the expenditure under each of these heads should be given definitely.

Mr. FOSTER. A vote has passed the House for a return covering all this information, which return will be ready in a day or two.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is very doubtful that it will be ready in a day or two. We have had a good many returns ordered by the House that have not yet been brought down.

Mr. FRASER. There will be some difficulty when this item is passed in getting back to this important subject. I do not know whether the Finance Minister was trying to restrain his laughter when he was giving his answers, or whether he was trying to hasten through this as a disagreeable subject. But when he spoke of "sundries" he could hardly help laughing outright. I think this subject should be gone into.

Mr. FOSTER. But this is scarcely the time.

Mr. FRASER. Then I wonder when the time will come.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman has a policy he would like to set forth, he might bring forward a motion. If my hon. friends opposite have a policy that they would like to be sharply defined before the House, I will be very glad to hear it.

Mr. FRASER. We have a policy, but if we were to attempt to present it, we would be met by the statement that there is no item before the House. I do not say that all commissions are frauds, but I do say that the time spent to get that information has been wasted. Mr. Kribbs was worth all the commission put together, because he issued his work some six months ago, in which he gave the results of the inquiry to the men engaged in the traffic which he represented. I cannot see why this report was delayed so long, when Mr. Kribbs, who had no better opportunity than the commissioners, was able to make his report six months ago. In looking at these volumes, I think the reference made by the hon. member for Bothwell is very appropriate. I think if Lord Macaulay had those volumes before him, he would never have complained of Dr. Nairn's book as he did. These huge volumes contain the most trifling things, everything that any man wanted to say before that commission is presented in those volumes for the information of Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) While it may be very well open to any member of Parliament to propose a policy, the question we are now discussing is the fact that the groping for a policy which the hon. gentleman has indulged in, has cost this country $90,000, and we want to know who got the money. The hon. gentleman thought he had a policy some years ago, but he found he had not, and he went groping for one. Now to whom has he paid that $90,000 ? This item should not pass until we get that information. The item is before us, and the hon. gentleman ought to have been prepared to give us this information. He tells us where some of the money has gone, but how much has been paid to each of these commissioners ? That is the question many people are seeking information upon outside this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Nobody questions the right of my hon. friend to have the information. The statement I made, I think, ought to be reasonably satisfactory ; I said that on that item of $8,000 for finishing up the vote, I did not happen to have the figures with me. I said also that the return had been called for, that the House had passed it, and that it was being prepared, and it would give all the particulars. I think that is reasonable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not exactly. Here we are asked for $8,000 to make up the total of $90,000. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that when it is the last vote, the custom is to receive full information as to all the disbursements that have gone on, and I think he should have been prepared with details. I am quite sure that when the hon. gentleman's colleagues were on this side, they insisted on every ample information about any similar vote, but I do not think they had any similar vote to discuss.

Mr. FOSTER. We are going to give all the information, of course.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did not notice that the Minister read the travelling expenses of the commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. They come in with each commissioner's account.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to a statement made by Sir John Thompson in July, 1894, in replying to the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson.)

Up to the present time the Royal Commission has cost about $100,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was wrong.

Mr. McMULLEN. That was the statement that was then made. Now, before we finally pass this item, it is but fair that the committee should know what has been paid to the several commissioners. Can it be possible that the Minister of Finance is not in possession of the facts to enable him to answer that question ? If he is not, I think the item should be allowed to stand until he is able to answer the question. He asks now for $8,000 finally to settle up the matters connected with this commission, but he declines to tell us what each commissioner has received.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman admitted himself a moment ago that the question was a fair one. He says that this commission is to cost $90,000, $10,000 less than was estimated last year, and he asks $8,000 to complete the whole thing. He admits we should have a detailed statement of the expenditure so far, and we require it in order to see whether the further amount he asks for is justifiable. If he is not ready to give the information at present, I think he will save time by allowing the item to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to be unreasonable at all. What is the point at issue ? It is simply to determine the amount received by each commissioner, that is all. I have given you the item, $63,000 to date, and $8,000 asked for. I have given you what has been spent for printing ; I have given you an estimate of what is still required for printing ; I have given the cost of the translation, the cost of the reporting, and I have given other items that I have read out. If you take these from the $63,000, it leaves about $30,000, which has been expended among the commissioners. Now, we know exactly what the commissioners did get—they got $30,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite are curious to know what each got, and they have a perfect right to that information. That information is being made up in detail in answer to an address passed by the House, and it will be laid before it. Have I not given the committee all essential information ? Is there any reason why the item should stand because I cannot, for the moment, divide the amount paid to the commissioners among the different commissioners ?

Mr. LAURIER. Is there anything to be concealed in that ?

Mr. FOSTER. No. What is to be concealed ? An Order in Council was passed, under which they obtained so much per day and so much for living expenses. It is as plain as can be, and the sum I mentioned was divided among them. What is there to keep back ? The hon. gentleman is oversuspicious.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not understand that there is anything to keep back. The hon. gentleman said that it was quite true the information should be given, but he is not ready to give it. When is the proper time that such information should be given if not at this very moment, when the hon. gentleman asks for a further vote.

Mr. FOSTER. If I had the information I should be glad to give it.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman should have it at this moment, and he has no right to ask the committee to vote money unless he is prepared to give the necessary information. If the hon. gentleman is not prepared to give it, let the item stand.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, if the hon. gentleman chooses to be unreasonable, when I have already given every detail of expenditure under the heading of this item, and the total amount paid to the commissioners, only I am not able at the moment to say what amount was received by each. If the hon. gentleman says no, I am willing to stay here, and I am not willing to let the item go. It is, of course, within his right to stop the voting of supplies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is not putting the matter fairly. There has been considerable discussion as to the respective amounts paid to the several commissioners. The information has been asked by a number of temperance newspapers and anti-temperance newspapers as to how the division took place. Members of Parliament are expected to obtain the information at this time, because it is the proper time. The hon. gentleman stated that he has not that information to-night. The leader of the Opposition then asked that the item be allowed to stand, which he is entitled to do. In what respect is he unreasonable? The Minister is seeking to force this item through the committee without furnishing information, and which our constituents are demanding.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to force the item through. If hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to pass it, let it stand.

Item allowed to stand.

To pay to the Medicine Hat General Hospital—

For the maintenance of R. VanLuven from 10th May, 1891, to 30th November, 1892, 561 days at 50c. per day..	$280 50
For the maintenance of S. Johnson from 15th November, 1890, to 30th November, 1892, 746 days at 50c. per day	373 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cause of these payments?

Mr. DALY. The explanation is this. These two men are paralytics and have been in the Medicine Hat hospital since the date given. Previous to being taken into that hospital, one had been in the Mounted Police barracks at Fort Saskatchewan, and the other in the barracks at Prince Albert, and as it was not possible to look after them there, the Medicine Hat hospital authorities took them over. In 1892, an order was passed in the North-west Territories Assembly giving 50 cents per day to the hospital. This is to pay 50 cents per day to the hospital for the accommodation up to the time the order was passed.

Mr. FOSTER.

To cover expenses of the late Hon. Sir J. S. D. Thompson's funeral (Governor General's warrant)..... $25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some explanations must be given as to this item. Here is a very large sum for expenses of this kind, and details ought to be furnished to the committee, and fully. I must say, with respect to these expenses, that there appears to be ground for suspecting or believing that very unusual and very lavish and unnecessary expenditure in that respect was incurred, and full details should be given.

Mr. HAGGART. I will give the hon. gentleman full details, for I have them all here. $3,000 was paid to the Nova Scotia Furnishing Company on account of public buildings. Then there is the sum of $911 to James Monoghan & Sons for building vault, building roadway, &c.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to ask if that is the full account of the Nova Scotia Furnishing Company?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. Halifax Illuminating and Motor Company, $1,600; lighting provincial buildings, $333; rations to militia, $31; Kenny & Co., bunting, $1,228; E. A. Neill, $39 for services and use of horses; also an account from Dodwell & Greenwood; Gordon & Keefe, $5,000; Snow, $1,800.

Mr. LAURIER. What goods were supplied for the $5,000?

Mr. HAGGART. Draperies and furnishings, among the items being 13,600 yards of black material. There is an account of $86 from A. P. Sherwood, chief of Dominion Police. The cost of car service on the Intercolonial Railway, special train Ottawa to Halifax and return, and disbursements, was $3,616.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are we to understand that the bills now laid before the House cover all the claims of which the Government have any knowledge, with respect to the funeral of the late Premier?

Mr. HAGGART. That is all that has come to my knowledge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And that there are no other claims placed before the Government?

Mr. HAGGART. That is all I have any knowledge of.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do those bills amount to $25,000?

Mr. FORBES. There is only about $15,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I think they do. The whole expenditure, except the railroad account was under the management of the Minister of Public Works. I was one of the committee, but I am not acquainted with the details.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You only account for $15,000. You ask us to vote $25,000, and you don't say what the other $10,000 is for. It is a subject which one does not care to discuss very much, but the hon. gentleman will see that the amount asked for is so much beyond what any reasonable being would suppose could be expended for a public funeral, that the public will insist upon correct details being given to show how the money was gotten rid of. We all know that the circumstances attending the death of the late Premier were such, that public opinion, I think, fully supported the Government in giving his remains a public funeral. I do not think there is any complaint about that, but the sum total of the expenditure put down here is so outrageously beyond what any person's idea of the expenditure would be, that there should be full particulars given.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps we had better let the item stand until the Minister of Public Works is in the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask that copies of these accounts be laid on the Table, or that they be published in some way so that members can know what they are. We do not want to criticise this item unjustly, and I think there is a disposition to allow everything that is generous, but unjustifiable extravagance will not be endorsed by myself, at least, even if it is for a public purpose, the propriety of which I am not slow to acknowledge. I do not wish to say one word against the propriety of giving the remains a public funeral, but in this, as in other matters, there is a measure to the extravagance that should be tolerated, and painful though it may be, I will insist upon having this matter discussed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Are these accounts to be placed in such a position that members can have access to them ?

Mr. FORBES. Cannot copies be laid on the Table ?

Mr. HAGGART. The original accounts are here, and there are objections made to a number of items by the officers of the department, I will try and get copies laid on the Table.

Item allowed to stand.

Contribution to the Lady Thompson fund $25,000

Mr. LAURIER. This item had better be allowed to stand along with the other one.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no connection between the two votes.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will see that it will save a great deal of time if the two items are taken one after another.

Item allowed to stand.

Collection of Revenue—Customs—
To pay Mr. Miles Cowan, clerk in Her Majesty's Customs at the Port of Windsor, Ont., an allowance in addition to his salary for services rendered while acting collector at that port, from 1st June, 1889, to 30th November, 1892. (Revote.)..... $600

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this for ?

Mr. WALLACE. This account was voted last year, but was not paid out. Mr. Cowan acted as collector of customs for about two and a half years, and this is as the vote states.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is his salary ?

Mr. WALLACE. His salary was $1,100 a year then, and it is now $1,200.

Mr. McGREGOR. This amount is all right. Mr. Cowan acted as collector for nearly three years, and as the collector in that district gets $1,900 a year, the country saved a large amount by availing of Mr. Cowan's services. They have twenty-five officers under the collector there, and there are three railways, and the ferries cross every five minutes. This is a very active customs point, and the amount collected is very large, being in the neighbourhood of $250,000 a year. Mr. Cowan is a very efficient officer, and instead of the amount being $600, it should be a good deal larger, and should be $1,200 at least. He is one of the best officers I know of in the department, and even now, after the death of the old collector, the new one having been appointed, this gentleman (Mr. Cowan) and Mr. Morton have to take full charge of the office at times, because the collector who has been appointed is not an efficient officer.

Legal expenses Toronto Railway Company vs. the Queen $1,143 79

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was a litigation between the company and the Crown to ascertain whether the electric car rails were free of duty or not, under the general item in the tariff, and the decision was that they were not free.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did it cost $1,100 to ascertain that point ?

Mr. FOSTER. We have to have a case made up and argued before the courts.

Mr. FRASER. Were the other parties not able to pay ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They will pay the costs taxable against them.

Mr. FRASER. Did the Government agree to pay their costs ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Mr. FRASER. Then, why does not the Government claim the costs from the other side ?

Mr. WALLACE. The reason we have asked this amount is this : We have won the suit, but the other party has appealed the case to the Supreme Court, and we have to pay our lawyer in the meantime until the case is decided. If we win the case again, the amount will be taxable, and repaid to us.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the solicitor ?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Hodgins, of Toronto.

Weights and Measures—
To pay Levi Werner compensation for loss by use of improperly verified measures $63 19

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do we come to be called upon to pay this ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). This represents half the amount of the claim made by Mr. Werner. One of the assistants of the Weights and Measures Department made a mistake in verifying a measure belonging to Mr. Werner, the result of which was that for five or six years he suffered a loss. In 1891 a claim was sent into the department, but the amount of the claim was disputed. Efforts were made to get at a proper estimate of the loss sustained by Mr. Werner, because it was felt that it was not fair that the merchant should suffer loss in consequence of a mistake of one of our officers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What was the size of the measure ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I cannot tell at this moment. It was used for vinegar and such articles. The mistake was apparent, because it was discovered when the measure was sent for reverification by Mr. Assistant Inspector Fitzgerald, of Hamilton. The whole amount of the claim was $126.38. Mr. Werner's books were examined by officers of our department, and it did appear that he had sustained a loss ; but the amount which the department agreed to submit to the Treasury Board, and which the Treasury Board passed, was only about half the amount claimed. I may say that while I had some doubts and have still as to the liability of the department to pay a claim of this sort, the equity of the case appeared to me to be with Mr. Werner ; and when I discovered that the department had before my time paid a similar claim in the case of one Mr. Bennett, the circumstances being exactly the same, I did not hesitate any longer in making the recommendation.

Mr. RIDER. What is Mr. Werner's business, and where does he reside ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). He is a merchant in Dunnville.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I would like to know if the Minister will follow the same principle in the case of Mr. Rousseau, of St. Ignace, from whom a quantity of liquor was improperly seized by the department and sold. The court has decided that the man was not at fault ; it was proved that the duty was paid ; and I would like to know if the department will refund Mr. Rousseau the money ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am surprised at the hon. gentleman asking that question. He knows that the two cases are entirely different. The hon. gentleman was counsel in three cases of seizures. These cases were decided in favour of the Crown. The hon. gentleman claimed that the decisions were not in accordance with the law or the facts, and appealed the cases to the Superior Court, which decided them in his favour. There is no reason why the hon. gentleman should obtrude a question of that kind here, especially as he and I are discussing whether the Crown should pay his costs and the value of the liquors seized and sold.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. The case of Mr. Rousseau is the same as this case. An officer of the department went to Rousseau's store and seized three barrels of whisky, brought them to Quebec and sold them, and then took action against him. The case was decided in the district against Rousseau. I took it to Quebec, where the three judges of the Superior Court decided that I was right and that the officer of the department had no right to seize the liquor. I would like to know if the precedent established in this case will be followed in the case of Mr. Rousseau ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a trifling sum in itself, but it appears to me that the hon. gentleman is establishing a mighty curious precedent. I find considerable difficulty in supposing that an average country merchant would have used a measure to his own disadvantage for five years and never found it out. If he did, he is an unusual specimen of a country merchant, and I am bound to tell the hon. gentleman that he may have a considerable number of other claims of the same kind if he does not take care. How does the hon. gentleman know that this particular measure was the one used at all ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). We know by the marks of verification on it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should think the hon. gentleman and his officers were showing great faith. A good many men would have been apt to detect the inaccuracy of the measure after a very short period of use, and they might very easily use another measure to their own advantage, and then bring in a claim. I fail to see how the hon. gentleman could test the accuracy of Mr. Werner's statement.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville.) I think I said to the hon. gentleman that I had some difficulty myself in commending this claim, and it had been under discussion for over two years. It arose before my time in the department. There was a precedent exactly

similar, and I did not make the recommendation until every fact was thoroughly investigated. The merchants' books of accounts and his sales were checked, his character was known, and we all believed he actually suffered a loss through the mistake of the officer.

Mr. RIDER. Do I understand from the Controller that inspection takes place only once in five years? Inspection should take place oftener; and I fail to see how the inspector performed his duty if he allowed the article to be used five years without being inspected.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). We allowed less than one-half of the claim. We did not allow it for two years. There was some evidence, clear evidence, that this particular measure was in use and had been used by the merchant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did the discrepancy amount to?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I have the whole account here. The claim consisted of 63 gallons of molasses at 40 cents; 41 gallons of syrup at 52 cents; 298 gallons of oil at 20 cents; 89 gallons of vinegar. The account is a very long one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears this was a measure of general utility. If he used the same measure for coal oil and molasses, all I can say is that the stomachs of the natives of that locality must have been well fortified.

Mr. FRASER. When did the Minister decide the question?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Some two or three months ago.

Post Office—Outside Service—
Amount required to complete the payments for mail service on the Intercolonial Railway for the year 1894-95. $19,289 09
Amount required to complete the payments for ordinary mail service.... 40,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cause of these two large amounts, $20,000 and $40,000?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. With regard to the $19,289, a portion of the Intercolonial railway, by statute, was placed upon the main line, and became therefore entitled to receive pay at the rate of $130 per mile, and that is Government railway in Cape Breton.

Mr. FRASER. Has that made any difference in carrying the mails in Cape Breton? When you pay the Intercolonial, did you pay as much for carrying the mails as formerly?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Of course not. The hon. gentleman means that the contracts for carrying the mails before the railway took charge were different from what they are now. When the railway took charge, several contracts which we had given naturally had to be cancelled, and are now replaced by the railway which carries the mail.

Mr. FRASER. Has the Minister applied the same rule to all the contracts?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. It is very strange that one man there should be getting $9,000 when he only got $6,000 before.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We have not come to him yet.

Mr. FRASER. I will come to him when we get to the other estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the explanation of the vote of $40,000 required for additional mail service?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The whole service costs about $800,000, and it is impossible to get any closer than we have done so far, and this is to complete the amount to pay for the whole service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is rather a loose way of doing business. Surely the department could estimate within $40,000. Have there been additional routes opened? Has any additional service been rendered for this $40,000? It does seem a loose way to come down and say you want $40,000 because you could not estimate within that amount. Has there been any additional number of new post offices brought into service to account for the discrepancy?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There are new tenders coming in every day and the old ones running out. When I say that the whole service represents $800,000, I think I am quite within the bounds in saying that $40,000 is not to be considered as very large.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 12th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 115) for the relief of Helen Woodburn Jarvis (from the Senate).—(Mr. Edgar.)

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. DALY introduced Bill (No. 116) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. EDGAR. Explain.

Mr. DALY. This Bill is similar to an Act that passed last session in regard to certain school lands that were occupied by squatters prior to 1st January, 1880. It was thought when the legislation was introduced last session that we had succeeded in dealing with all the claims ; but since that date representations have been made to this Government, and also to the Government of Manitoba, that certain other persons whose names are mentioned had occupied school lands prior to 1st January, 1880 ; and this legislation is on the line of the legislation introduced and passed last session. It is introduced with the concurrence of the local government of Manitoba, and it is proposed to give to these people entry to these lands on proving to the satisfaction of the agents of the Dominion lands that they had performed homestead duties prior to 1st January, 1880, so as to entitle them to homestead entry, the Government substituting other lands for the same, so as to make up the necessary quantity for the school lands.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COST OF RETURNS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked, What have the returns asked for by the members of this House from the different departments cost for making said returns, giving name of each member asking for said return during the years 1891-92-93-94 and 1895 ?

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to say to my hon. friend that it is impossible to answer that question in anything like brief form, and in order to answer it some search and accounting will be required. If the hon. gentleman will move an address and thus secure the return, the information will be furnished, because the Government possess most of the information, though, perhaps, not all.

SAVING BANKS DEPOSITS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, 1. What is the total amount of the deposits in the several classes of savings banks operated by Government under $500, and the number of such depositors ? 2. What is the total amount of such deposits between $500 and $1,000 each, and the number of such depositors ? 3. What is the total amount of such deposits on sums above $1,000, and the number of such depositors ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I shall, in answer to that question, submit the information I have received from the department. The answers to the above questions, so far as they relate to the Post Office Savings Bank, will require the examination and re-arrangement into three distinct classes of the balances at the credit of 120,000 depositors' accounts, and to do that, at this season of the year, with an office staff provided for current daily work, will necessarily involve considerable delay. It may be possible to give the required figures before the close of the present session, and a special effort will be made to do so. I think that if the hon. gentleman would kindly put it in the shape of a return, it would be more convenient to bring down.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the return ever be brought down ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I can answer half the question. I will give the hon. gentleman the information he asks for, with reference to the Government savings banks, and that will be an instalment which may satisfy him. The following is the statement : him. The following is the statement :—

Provinces.	No. of Accounts.	Amounts under $500.	No. of Accounts.	Amounts under $1,000.	No. of Accounts.	Amounts over $1,000.
		$ cts.		$ cts.		$ cts.
Nova Scotia	19,568	2,830,239 81	2,336	1,725,218 00	1,809	2,604,729 00
New Brunswick	12,996	2,299,254 32	2,094	1,506,400 00	1,778	2,554,652 00
Ontario	1,242	180,696 51	127	82,550 00	157	290,000 00
Manitoba	3,377	157,549 77	271	185,350 00	206	358,340 00
British Columbia	2,719	94,391 95	209	137,790 78	292	486,882 00
Prince Edward Island...	5,218	726,961 52	917	522,778 00	499	1,032,977 00
	44,420	1,289,093 88	6,654	4,160,086 78	4,741	7,327,580 00

Total accounts, 55,815 ; amount, $17,776,760.66.

GALOPS RAPIDS—DISMISSED EMPLOYEES.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Lister) asked, Were any of the engineers employed on the Galops Rapids works dismissed or suspended? If so, what were the names of such engineers, and were they dismissed or suspended? If dismissed or suspended, what was the cause? Is it the intention of the department to reinstate such engineers? Has any recommendation been made to the Government in that direction? Has a suit been pending between the Government and the contractors respecting the said works? If so, has a decision been rendered in favour of the contractors? Were the engineers given to understand that they were suspended only pending such suit? Was there any evidence of collusion between the contractors and engineers?

Mr. HAGGART. The services of Mr. Haycock and Mr. Ross were dispensed with; their services were no longer required. Dr. Reid, M.P., has asked that Mr. Haycock be re-employed, as has also Mr. Haycock's brother. A suit has been pending with the contractors for deepening and straightening the Galops Rapid channel. A judgment has been rendered in favour of the contractors. There was no evidence proving collusion between the engineers and the contractors.

SEWER IN VALLEYFIELD.

Mr. BERGERON asked, Is it the intention of the Government to repair the sewer of Victoria Street, in Valleyfield, in the way asked for by the Council of the town? If not, what do the Government intend to do in the case?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government have not come to the conclusion to repair the sewer on Victoria Street, Valleyfield, in the manner asked for by the Council of that town. The Government have not decided what they will do in the matter.

GILBERT DREDGING AND BLASTING COMPANY.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Has the claim of the Gilbert Dredging and Blasting Company, arising out of the cancellation by the Government of their contract for the construction of a portion of the Cornwall Canal, been settled? If so, when, and on what terms? If not, in what condition is it now?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. The claim in connection with the cancellation of Messrs. Gilbert Dredging and Blasting Company of a portion of Sections 5 and 8 and the whole of Sections 6 and 7 of the Cornwall Canal, has been settled. 2. On the 18th April, 1894, by payment of 15 per cent on the value of work estimated as remaining to be done, amounting to $29,350.

ANTIGONISH AND SHERBROOKE MAIL ROUTE.

Mr. FRASER asked, Have the Government received petitions from a large number of persons urging that the mail route from Antigonish to Sherbrooke be changed and run from Sunnybrae, Pictou county, to Sherbrooke? Do the Government propose making the change?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Government has received petitions from a number of persons urging that the mail route from Antigonish to Sherbrooke be changed and run from Sunnybrae, Pictou County, to Sherbrooke. The Government does not propose to make the change asked for.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT LAND—ISLE AUX NOIX.

Mr. RIDER asked, 1. Did the Government duly advertise the sale of the Government land, consisting of over 135 acres, situated on the east side of the Richelieu River, in the county of Iberville, opposite "Isle aux Noix," before selling the same to Hiram Sewell Foster, under patent dated the 16th May, 1894, for the sum of $600? 2. What reasons had the Government for selling said property at that time? 3. Was it sold after valuation? If so, who was the valuator? When was the valuation made, and what was the amount named in the report? 4. Were the negotiations carried through by any member of Parliament? If so, by whom? 5. How was payment made? If by cheque, on what bank? 6. Is the Government aware that any member is, or was, directly or indirectly personally interested in the purchase thereof?

Mr. DALY. 1. The Government did not advertise the sale, for the reason that the property was sold under the provisions of the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 55, section 5, subsection 3. That subsection authorizes the sale of any ordnance lands which are occupied with the consent of the Crown to the person in possession without resorting to public auction. 2. Because it was considered a desirable thing in the public interest to sell the property, and the leaseholder had expressed a desire to buy. 3. It had been inspected in 1888 by the late Mr. Mills, the clerk in charge at the time of ordnance and admiralty lands, and appraised at $600. 4. The negotiations were not conducted by a member of Parliament. 5. Payment was made by deposit to the credit of the Receiver General in the Merchants Bank of Canada. 6. The Government have no reason to think that any member of Parliament is interested in the property in any way.

ISLE AUX NOIX.

Mr. RIDER asked, Does the Government still own the property known as the "Isle

aux Noix." and what use is being made of the premises? If leased in whole or in part, to whom? For how much yearly, or otherwise, and how are payments made? If not leased, has permission been granted to any one to use the lands for pasturing horses, and to whom?

Mr. DICKEY. The Government still own the property known as the "Isle aux Noix." The buildings are only used as quarters for a caretaker. The property is leased in part: 155 acres are leased to Mr. Peter Smith for pasturage at an annual rental of $80. A small plot of garden is rented to Miss O'Hara at a yearly rental of $4. The rentals of both tenants are payable half-yearly. No permission has been granted by the department to any parties, apart from the tenants on their holdings, to use any of the land for pasturage purposes.

KILDARE STATION POST OFFICE, P. E. I.

Mr. PERRY asked. Has a postmaster been appointed at Kildare Station, lot 2, Prince Edward Island, in the place of Avit Perry, deceased? If so, who is he? If no appointment has been made, who is acting postmaster? Has he given security? If so, who are his securities?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A postmistress has been appointed at Kildare Station, lot 2, Prince Edward Island, in place of Avit Poirrier (not Perry), deceased. The name of the postmistress is Marguerite Poirrier. She has given security. Her sureties are Sylvain E. Perry and John B. Arsenault.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SUMMER VACATION.

Mr. FRASER (for Mr. Forbes) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to grant to Intercolonial Railway operators and clerks the usual summer vacation with salary continued in the same manner as is accorded to officials of other Government departments?

Mr. HAGGART. It is proposed to give two weeks vacation with pay to the despatchers, telegraph operators, and stationmasters, as their hours on duty are very long, but not to the clerks, as there does not appear to be the same reason for it.

BUTTER TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. McMILLAN asked, What was the weight per package of the packages of creamery butter purchased by the Government last winter for shipment to Great Britain? What sales have been made, and what prices have been realized per pound since the statement made by the Secretary of State on the 16th of May? Have all the packages been sold, or do any remain at present in the hands of the Government? Was any of this butter sold in Montreal not for shipment to Britain? If so, for what reason, and how much was thus sold, and what price per pound was realized for it?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Nine hundred and fifteen packages of butter, shipped from Montreal, weighed 48,937 pounds net, being an average of 53·48 pounds of butter per package. No account sales of them have been received since the statement made by me to the House on the 16th of May. Two hundred and forty-six packages of butter were sold in Montreal, which were paid for by an advance of 20 cents per pound by the Government. Payments have been made on three lots of butter at 20 cents a pound, which were not included in the former return; and payments are to be made on two lots. The reason why the butter, which was inspected and for which payments of 20 cents per pound were made, was not sent to England, was because it was not in packages which appeared to be suitable for export to Great Britain, to enhance the reputation of the packages of our butter there. The following lots of creamery butter were received at Montreal, intended by the consignees to be shipped to Great Britain by the dairy commissioner, and were sold in Montreal, on account of being in packages unsuitable for export:—

21	packages,	1,294 lbs.	sold for	..22	cents per lb.
9	do	490	do	..22	do
19	do	961	do	..21	do
56	do	2,938	do	..21½	do
43	do	2,244	do	..21	do
2	do	56	do	..21½	do
4	do	224	do	..21½	do
5	do	274	do	..21½	do
1	do	56	do	..21	do
7	do	392	do	..21½	do
21	do	621	do	..21½	do
21	do	620	do	..20	do
21	do	1,067	do	..21½	do
16	do	874	do	..21	do
40	do	1,970	do	..21½	do
5	do	280 lbs.; 4 at 23 cents per lb., 1 at 22 cents.			
6	do	330 lbs.; 5 at 21½ cents, 1 at 21 cents.			

There are also thirty-one packages, totalling 930 pounds, and twenty-eight packages totalling 1,438 pounds, of which the returns have not yet been received. The dairy commissioner has received information from some of his correspondents in England, stating that there would be no difficulty in doing a steady trade in butter, similar to that contained in the best lots shipped last winter, especially now that buyers are getting to know it.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say a word or two with regard to a matter of privilege.

I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, if you would reconsider a decision given by you on Monday last during the debate in connection with the Portage la Prairie post office site?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend is scarcely in order in bringing up a decision made by yourself, some sessions after that decision was made, and I would ask your ruling on that point.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman has risen to a question of privilege, and I do not think the Speaker has yet heard what the question is.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, the hon. gentleman has just stated it.

Mr. CASEY. The point of order just taken cannot be considered, as the hon. gentleman who has risen to a question of privilege has not yet been able to state the question, and he has a perfect right to do so without being interrupted.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may state the question that he desires to bring up.

Mr. MARTIN. What I desired, Mr. Speaker, was to ask you to reconsider the decision given by you in calling me to order for certain expressions I used in the debate on the Portage la Prairie post office site, which occurred on Monday last. I would ask you to reconsider whether the words I used then were not strictly parliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may state to the House that I have no doubt at all as to the propriety of my ruling on that occasion. I will draw the attention of the House to the 8th Rule, which says:

> The Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and shall decide questions of order, subject to an appeal to the House.

And Rule 12 says:

> A member called to order shall sit down, but may afterwards explain. The House, if appealed to, shall decide on the case, but without debate. If there be no appeal, the decision of the Chair shall be final.

My own view is that the appeal must be made when the decision is rendered.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not wish to make any appeal to the House, Mr. Speaker. All I wish to do is to ask you yourself to reconsider the matter——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MARTIN—and to give certain reasons to endeavour to show you, as I was not in a position to do at that moment, that my expressions were parliamentary. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that I bowed to your decision at the time——

Mr. SPEAKER. I gave my decision in regard to that matter, and I have no doubt as to its correctness. If my conduct is to be impugned, of course that may be done in the ordinary parliamentary way; and upon this point I may say this: The House has invested the Speaker with very extensive powers. If, in the exercise of those powers, his conduct is to be called in question in an irregular manner, it seems to me the authority of the Chair would be very greatly jeopardized, and those who wish to maintain the authority of the Chair will agree with me that that is not desirable. So much with regard to the result which might follow if these irregular attacks were permitted to be made upon the Chair. With regard to the question of order, I have to say that it is my duty to see that the rights of every member of this House are respected; but, as a member of the House, I have my own rights, which I think the House will agree with me ought to be recognized; and one of those rights is that if my conduct is to be called in question, it should be done by a motion properly put upon the paper, susceptible of being discussed and susceptible of being amended. I am quite willing to submit my conduct to the decision of the House, and to abide by whatever decision the House may arrive at.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to dissent, to a certain extent, from the views of Your Honour that have just been expressed. There is no desire to find fault with your ruling of two days ago. There is no desire at all, and I would be sorry if the impression were to prevail that my hon. friend's object was at all to impugn the ruling you gave the other day. I humbly bowed, and so did my hon. friend, to your ruling; but while it is the duty of every gentleman, when called to order by the Speaker, to bow to his decision unless there be very strong reasons for not doing so, even if at the time his judgment was not at all in accord with that of the Speaker. I can recall to your experience, Mr. Speaker, that you have yourself, of your own motion, reversed a decision which you had given on a previous day. On reflection you came to a different conclusion, and in reversing your previous decision you did a manly and honest act for which you deserved to be commended. But if instead your attention had been called to the decision, without any object at all of impugning your motive, and if a discussion had ensued, I do not see that the authority of the Chair would have been impaired in any way or that anything derogatory to the dignity of the House would have taken place. In the matter before us, my hon. friend from Winnipeg conceived that the ruling of the Chair might be questioned and proposed to give reasons for his opinion. I deprecate the idea that in so doing he is wanting at all in respect to the Chair. On the contrary, I am sure I voice his own feeling when I say that he has the highest respect for your authority, Mr. Speaker, but that respect is

not inconsistent with an opinion of dissent in the case of any special ruling. In this matter my hon. friend acted properly at the moment in bowing to the ruling of the Chair; but he is quite within his rights in caling the attention of the House, at a subsequent period, to the interpretation of the rule as given by the Speaker and to submit his own views as a question of privilege. I have not heard the argument of my hon. friend, and I do not know what he intends to say; but if after hearing my hon. friend I came to the conclusion that Mr. Speaker erred in the application of the rule, that would in no way impair the respect which I give him.

Mr. FOSTER. The tenor of the remarks of my hon. friend is entirely counteracted by the assertion which Mr. Speaker has already made at this sitting with reference to this very point of order on which he ruled the other day and to which the hon. gentleman bowed, as was his duty. Mr. Speaker has declared to-day that he can give no other decision. He has not intimated that he can reverse his decision. On the contrary, he has told the House, at this sitting, that he maintains his decision to be good and cannot reverse it. What does my hon. friend want to do? He was here the other day when the ruling was given. It is a very simple question; there is nothing complex about it. My hon. friend from Winnipeg offended against one of the plainest rules of the House—that rule which requires the courtesy of not imputing to an hon. member corrupt or wrong motives with regard to any statement he has made. He offended that rule of this House, which is an indispensable rule and condition of debate in any deliberative body, and he was called to order. The question is a plain, simple one, free from any technicality or ambiguity. Mr. Speaker gave his decision, and to that decision the hon. gentleman bowed. When he attempts to bring it up again, Mr. Speaker intimates that his mind has not changed but that in his opinion the ruling was right and proper. If then, in these circumstances, any hon. member is free to precipitate a discussion at any time he may choose, and have the Speaker's ruling debated in the House, the Speaker will no longer have the authority which he should possess in order to enforce order and decorum in the conduct of our debates. I am astonished that my hon. friend, in so plain a case of disobedience to the rules of the House and in so plain a case of opposition to the Speaker's decision without any indication from the Speaker of a change of opinion, would support a procedure of this kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Without saying a word on the subject of the ruling, I wish to say a word or two with regard to the proposition of the hon. member, which I understand to be this. I understand that he asks, not that the House shall review the decision of the Speaker, but that the Speaker himself shall reconsider that decision with the aid of such other reasons and authorities as may be given to him. I only remember one case since I have been in Parliament where a matter of that sort has come before the Chair, and that was a case in which Mr. Speaker Cockburn had ruled against the Hon. Sandfield Macdonald on some matter which the latter had brought to the attention of the House. On a subsequent day Mr. Macdonald, who had himself been some time before, Speaker of the House and was fairly well familiar with the rules, called the attention of the Speaker to the fact that he had erred, and asserted what he considered should have been the ruling of the House in a discussion somewhat similar to that which my hon. friend proposes to bring up now. The hon. gentleman says that the conduct of the hon. member for Winnipeg was a clear offence against the rules of the House. I am not going to say that it is not against the rules as they at present stand, but I have myself a very distinct recollection of many rulings in England where a distinction was made between charging a member with having said what was untrue and characterizing the statement itself—a distinction between a personal charge against the individual and an assertion of the inaccuracy of the statement. Whether that distinction is preserved in the modern rules or not, I do not pretend to say.

Mr. SPEAKER. The most recent decision I find with reference to the matter is perfectly applicable to this case. Mr. Speaker Peel decided on the 15th May, 1884, that any question affecting the conduct of the Chair or any ruling given by the Speaker should come before the House in such a way that the whole House would be able to decide upon it. The proper way is to give notice and put a motion in specific form before the House, so that the whole House may have cognizance of it.

FUNERAL EXPENSES—LATE SIR JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the Public Bills and Orders are called, I wish to call the attention of the leader of the House to the conversation we had late last night in Supply with reference to the proposed vote of $25,000 for the funeral expenses of the late Sir John Thompson. I understood at the time that the agreement was come to that the accounts should be placed on the Table of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that statement was made. The accounts were handed to me by the Minister of Railways, but as they were the original accounts I did not wish to produce them, but will furnish copies.

Mr. HAGGART. I expect to have the copies by to-morrow. I ordered them to be prepared.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

On the order:

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If it is in order, Mr. Speaker, I would move that this order be discharged. I think that with the consent of the House this might be done. I might say that the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, though I did not make this suggestion to him, was perfectly satisfied with the intimation I gave, in compliance with the general understanding of the House, that the provisions of this Bill were to be introduced as an amendment to the Criminal Code, so I thought with the general consent, this order might disappear.

Mr. LAURIER. I imagine the better way would be to transfer it to the Government orders.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I showed the hon. member who has charge of the Bill the draft of the substitute proposed, and he was perfectly satisfied with it, and returned it to me with an expression of his satisfaction.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will say that he has the authority of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to this motion——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I cannot say I have that. The Bill had better stand.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House divided on proposed motion of Mr. Mulock for second reading of Bill (No. 5) in further amendment of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Laurier,
Bain (Wentworth),	Lowell,
Beith,	Macdonald (Huron),
Belley,	Maclean (York),
Bennett,	McCarthy,
Boston,	McGregor,
Bowman,	McLennan,
Bryson,	McMillan,
Campbell,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Martin,
Christie,	Mills (Bothwell),
Davies,	Mulock,
Dawson,	O'Brien,
Denison,	Paterson (Brant),
Devlin,	Perry,
Edgar,	Rider,
Fauvel,	Robillard,
Flint,	Rowand,
Fraser,	Semple,
Gibson,	Somerville,
Grieve,	Sutherland,
Innes,	Welsh, and
Landerkin,	Yeo.—46.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Hazen,
Bain (Soulanges),	Henderson,
Beausoleil,	Hutchins,
Béchard,	Ingram,
Bergeron,	Joncas,
Bergin,	Lachapelle,
Bernier,	Langelier,
Blanchard,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bowers,	Leclair,
Cameron,	Leduc,
Cargill,	Legris,
Carling (Sir John),	Macdonald (King's),
Carpenter,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McAlister,
Carroll,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Casey,	McDougall (Cape Breton)
Chesley,	McGreevy,
Choquette,	McKay,
Cleveland,	Madill,
Coatsworth,	Marshall,
Cochrane,	Metcalfe,
Cockburn,	Mignault,
Colter,	Mills (Annapolis),
Costigan,	Monet,
Craig,	Montague,
Curran,	Ouimet,
Daly,	Patterson (Colchester),
Davin,	Pridham,
Davis,	Reid,
Desaulniers,	Rinfret,
Dickey,	Ross (Dundas),
Dugas,	Ryckman,
Dupont,	Scriver,
Dyer,	Simard,
Fairbairn,	Smith (Ontario),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Sproule,
Forbes,	Stairs,
Foster,	Stevenson,
Fréchette,	Tarte,
Frémont,	Taylor,
Gillies,	Temple,
Gillmor,	Tisdale,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Godbout,	Turcotte,
Grandbois,	Tyrwhitt,
Grant (Sir James),	Vaillancourt,
Guay,	Weldon,
Guillet,	White (Cardwell),
Haggart,	Wilmot, and
Harwood,	Wood (Brockville).—100.

Motion negatived.

SUPERANNUATION ACT.

On the Order for resuming adjourned debate for second reading of Bill (No. 6) further to amend the Superannuation Act.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have not yet had time to look up the authorities on the question raised with regard to this Bill. I would ask that it be allowed to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. No. My own opinion is very decided: this Bill is one that must be introduced on the authority of the Crown and by resolution.

UNLAWFUL ASSOCIATIONS AND OATHS.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) further to amend the tenth chapter of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, respecting Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths. He said: This Bill is of so simple a character, and as it seems to me, so commendable, as to require only a few brief words of explanation. The object of the Bill is to remove certain disabilities under which the Masonic body acting under the jurisdiction of the grand lodge of Quebec now rests. But I desire it to be well understood that the Bill makes no innovation and confers no new privileges. Before the union of the old provinces of Canada, I think about the year 1840, an Act was passed by the legislature of the province of Lower Canada, entitled "An Act respecting Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths," prescribing certain penalties to oath-bound associations, for instance:

> Every society or association, the members whereof are, according to the rules thereof, or to any provision, or any agreement for that purpose, required * * * to take any oath or engagement * * * not required or authorized by law, and every society or association, the members whereof, or any of them, take, or in any manner bind themselves by, any such oath or engagement,

were made subject to certain penalties. But the last clause of this Act—which, let it be well understood, was passed by the legislature of Lower Canada about the year 1810, and which appears in the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, provides:

> And whereas, certain societies have been long accustomed to be holden in this province, under the denomination of lodges of Free Masons, the meetings whereof have been in great measure directed to charitable purposes—nothing in this Act shall extend to the meetings of any such society or lodge, holden under the said denomination and in conformity to the rules prevailing among the said societies of Free Masons; provided, such society or lodge has been constituted by or under the authority of warrants in that behalf, granted by, or derived from, any grand master or grand lodge in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Now, at the time of the passage of this statute, all Masonic bodies in the province of Quebec were acting under the jurisdiction of the grand lodge of Great Britain. Subsequently the grand lodge of Canada was constituted, and, in 1885, a statute was passed by the united provinces extending the same exemption to Masonic lodges acting under the jurisdiction of the grand lodge of Canada. Again, subsequently, about the year 1870, the grand lodge of Quebec was formed out of the grand lodge of Canada. But the exemption and relief from these penalties respecting unlawful associations and oaths was not extended to the lodges acting under the jurisdiction of the grand lodge of Quebec. The object of this Bill is to give to the latter the same measure of relief which the Masonic organizations acting under the jurisdiction of the grand lodge of Great Britain and the grand lodge of Canada enjoy. As I have said, there is no innovation, and I take it to be wholly unnecessary to address to this House any argument whatever as to the propriety of passing the Bill which I have now the honour to ask the House to read a second time with respect to a society whose character is so high, whose members occupy so prominent a place in the country and whose purposes are so well known to be of a benevolent character. I move the second reading of this Bill, seconded by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson).

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McKAY. I would move that another clause be added to this Bill. This measure is intended to exempt the Masonic order from all penalties they may labour under at present in respect of the law referred to. I think the same exemption should be extended to other charitable and benevolent associations, so as to relieve them from the disabilities under which they labour. I would move that the following clause be added:—

> That all societies, associations and lodges, whose members are bound by oath, and whose objects are exclusively of a social, charitable and benevolent character, are hereby exempted from the penalties prescribed by chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada.

I move that this clause be added to the Bill for the purpose of relieving members of other charitable associations in the province of Quebec from the disabilities which they may labour under.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I believe that this amendment is out of order, not being relevant to the Bill which has just passed its second reading. The hon. gentleman cannot move it until notice is given the House.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CONTRACTS TO ALIENS.

Mr. McLENNAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 9) to prevent the letting of contracts to aliens. He said: Mr. Speaker, it may be necessary for me to offer some explanations in regard to this Bill. I have no fault or quarrel with the contractors who are doing work in this country, and I believe many of them are very good men. It is the principle and not the individuals that I object to. This Bill only deals with the letting of Government contracts. It does not interfere with the investing of capital in our country; neither does it in-

terfere with men entering into enterprises of any kind or description, and letting contracts to whom they please. Even this is a privilege which is not extended to us by the people of the United States. It does not interfere with immigration, nor deprive foreigners from getting employment in Canada. Any person coming into our country is treated with a consideration, which is not extended to the people of Canada in the United States. In every advertisement of a contract to be let by the Government of the United States, the attention of tenderers is drawn to the Acts of Congress depriving aliens from getting employment or labour in that country. It is true, perhaps, that the Government have not legislated against an alien getting a contract in the United States, but they have placed conditions in their statutes, specifications and forms of contract, and the securities necessary to be furnished are such that it is impossible for a Canadian to carry out such stipulations, and the consequence is that it practically means "No Canadians need apply." If a Canadian does apply, it is with the distinct understanding that if he comes to the United States, he must leave his staff and men behind him, including the foreman, superintendents and men who helped him to carry on his former work. This denial to him of the privilege of taking his staff with him to engage in a contract is a very serious loss, as I know from personal experience that one of the greatest difficulties a man has to contend with is the getting up of a thorough organization in the commencement of the work. Canadian contractors have had to provide expensive plant and material to be prepared to take the Government contracts, and the Dominion of Canada is spending a good deal of money in improvements for the sake of these improvements themselves, and also for the purpose of giving our men employment in the country, so as to prevent them from leaving and seeking it elsewhere, and we should certainly have the privilege of earning and retaining the money expended by our Government in the country. With Canadians carrying on the work, they would, no doubt, employ their staff, superintendents, foremen, horses, plant and machinery which is manufactured in Canada, instead of allowing American contractors to come here and take the profits of their contracts away with them as well as their staff, and the savings of the men employed, depriving our people of employment and reducing the wages of our labouring men. They refuse us the privilege of being employed upon their works and we should not continue to allow them to take the money contributed by our people from Canada. There are certain restrictions in the contract law by the Government of the United States, that where plant can be purchased as well and as cheaply in the United States, they are bound by contract to do so. In Canada, I understand, the plant and machinery of alien contractors has been allowed to be brought in under bond, and if charged any duty, it was but a nominal sum. However, I am told by the Controller of Customs that such is not the case now, and I am glad to know it. But in the case of a Canadian contractor going to the United States, if he has plant in this country, the terms of the contract and the law governing contracts sets forth, that "United States plant is preferable." If a Canadian did get a contract in the United States, he would be expected to leave his machinery in Canada and purchase that of the United States with which to carry on the work. Canadian contractors bringing machinery into the United States have to pay the United States with which to carry on the work. Canadian contractors bringing machinery into the United States have to pay 40 or 50 per cent duty thereon; while the American contractors were allowed to bring their plant and machinery in here in bond, and take it back with them. The Canadian Government received no duty on the material brought over to perform the work of the contract let to such Americans, and in any case we would have to pay a higher duty than they would. This might amount to more than the difference in the price for the contract, even though the Americans were the lowest tenderer. The savings of the contractor, the earnings of the men invested in the country, and the labour employed in manufacturing the plant in Canada would certainly more than balance any loss that might be sustained in any other way in regard to contracts. The following sections are from the Acts of Congress of 1884-85, "Alien Contract Labour":

Section 3. Any person, partnership or company knowingly assisting, encouraging or soliciting the migration or importation of any alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners into the United States, its territories or the District of Columbia, to perform labour or service of any kind under contract or agreement, express or implied, parol or special, with such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners previous to becoming residents or citizens of the United States, shall forfeit and pay for every such offence the sum of one thousand dollars, which may be sued for and recovered by the United States or by any person who shall first bring his action therefor, including any such alien or foreigner who may be a party to any such contract or agreement, as debts of like amount are now recovered in the circuit courts of the United States.

Section 4. The master of any vessel who shall knowingly bring within the United States on any such vessel, and land or permit to be landed, from any foreign port or place, any alien labourer, mechanic or artisan, who, previous to embarkation on such vessel, had entered into contract or agreement, parol or special, express or implied, to perform labour or service in the United States, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanour, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars for each and every such alien labourer, mechanic or artisan so brought as aforesaid, and may also be imprisoned for a term not exceeding six months.

Section 5 (as amended by chapter 551, Acts of 1890-91). Nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to prevent any citizen or subject of any foreign country temporarily residing in the United States, either in private or official capacity, from engaging under contract or otherwise persons not residents or citizens of the United States to act as private secretaries, servants or domestics for such foreigner temporarily residing in the United States as aforesaid : nor shall this Act be so construed as to prevent any person or persons, partnership or corporation from engaging under contract or agreement skilled workmen in foreign countries to perform labour in the United States in or upon any new industry not at present established in the United States ; provided, that skilled labour for that purpose cannot otherwise be obtained.

Section 8.—"An Act to prohibit the immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract to perform labour."—And the same is hereby amended so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in case he shall be satisfied that an immigrant has been allowed to land contrary to the prohibition of that law, to cause such immigrant, within the period of one year of landing or entry, to be taken into custody and returned to the country from whence he came, at the expense of the owner of the importing vessel.

I have here the specification of contract of the United States Government. Clause 1 of the specification is as follows :—

The attention of bidders is especially invited to the Acts of Congress, approved 26th February, 1885, and 23rd February, 1887, as printed in volume 23, page 332, and volume 24, page 414, United States Statutes at large, which prohibit the importation of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in the United States or territories or the District of Columbia.

Clause 2 is as follows :—

Preference will be given to articles or materials of domestic production, conditions and quality and price being equal, including in the price of foreign articles the duty thereon.

Clause 7 says :—

Surities must be citizens of the United States.

So the House will see that preference is given to articles and materials of domestic production, thus making it almost impossible for Canadians to go to the United States and take work. Even if a Canadian contractor took his plant to the United States, he would be compelled to pay a duty of 40 or 50 per cent on its admittance. I was led to understand some time ago—I do not know what is done now—that American plant and material was allowed to come in from the United States under bond, it being agreed that the plant should be taken back when the contract was finished. I have spoken to the Controller of Customs on this matter, and he informs me that such is not the case. I am very glad to know it, because it would be very unfair to compel the payment of duty on Canadian plant entering the United States, and allow similar plant and material to come in from the United States free of duty. Another difficulty that stands in the way of Canadians going to the United States and getting contracts is, that sureties must be citizens of the United States. It is also found that the amount of the security is very large, and that the sureties must be well-known men, living in the United States, and they must make affidavit on the back of the bond or in contract that they justify in double the amount of the penalty. Then, when the contractor obtains the sureties, they must be endorsed by officials of the United States Government, thus making it still more difficult for a Canadian or alien to get work in that country. I have received several letters from Canadian contractors in connection with this matter, including one from Mr. John S. Henry, of Hamilton, who says that ten years ago we could go freely into the United States and compete for contracts, but at the present time no Canadian need apply ; that if he was fortunate enough to get the work, he would be so harassed by every one that he would be glad to give it up, and that it is practically impossible for any Canadian to get any federal or state government contract. I find that the legislatures of the different states have passed legislation preventing Canadians getting contracts under any consideration. At page 134 of the statutes of Illinois, Acts of 1889, I find the following :—

Section 1. It shall be unlawful for any board or commission, or any officer or other person acting for the state, or any county, township, city, village, district, or other municipality in the state, or any contractor or sub-contractor, under any or either of said municipalities, to employ any person or persons other than native-born or naturalized citizens, or those who have in good faith declared their intentions to become citizens of the United States, when such employees are to be paid, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, out of any funds raised by taxation.

Section 2. It shall be the duty of any person or persons employing labour or other services, to be paid for, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, out of any funds raised by taxation, to file with the treasurer or disbursing officer of such funds a certificate showing, to the best of his knowledge and belief, that the persons so employed * * are citizens of the United States, or have in good faith declared their intentions to become such citizens, or are of such age or sex, that they cannot declare their intentions to become citizens, or cannot be formally declared to be citizens by an order of a court of record.

Section 5. Whenever any employer, contractor or sub-contractor, by written or oral information, or from any source, has reason to believe that he has in his employ persons other than native or naturalized citizens, or those who have in good faith declared their intentions to become citizens, whose pay is to be drawn, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, from such public funds, he shall at once investigate the matter, and if he shall find said information to have been correct, he shall discharge such employee or employees, and a failure to do so shall render him liable to the municipality * * for any of such funds paid to such alien.

Section 6. In all cases where an alien, after filing his declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall, for the space of

three months after he could lawfully do so, fail to take out his final papers and complete his citizenship, such failure shall be prima facie evidence that his declaration of intentions was not made in good faith.

In the state of Idaho, Article 13, referring to employment of aliens on public works, section 5 says:

No person not a citizen of the United States, or who has not declared his intention to become such, shall be employed upon or in connection with any state or municipal work.

In New York the law is similar to that of Illinois, and in almost every state of the Union there are conditions introduced into the law, so as to prevent aliens from getting the work. The law of the state of Wyoming, says:

Labour on public works, citizens of the United States only to be employed.—Section 1. No person not a citizen of the United States, or who has not declared his intention to become such, shall be employed upon or in connection with any state, county or municipal work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have shown to the House what they do in the United States with respect to alien labour. Some years ago our people used to go to the United States and get contracts there, and Canadian contractors have been the builders of some of their most important works. Even in some cases where the contractors of that country failed in carrying through the work, our Canadian contractors went over there and completed it. I might mention in this connection the case of the Hoosac Tunnel, which was completed by the Messrs. Shanly Bros. Formerly we had free access to the United States, and if we could do the work as well, and cheaper, than their own contractors we had the privilege of competing with them. But now, they have shut out Canadians from getting employment, and their specifications, and forms of contract are so fixed as practically to exclude us from doing any work there. In the first place the Canadian contractor is handicapped by their refusing to allow his plant to go into the United States, unless by paying a higher duty than an American contractor would have to pay for bringing his plant into Canada. Again, a Canadian contractor would have a staff well trained and organized in Canada, and if he could not take them with him into the United States he would be at a great disadvantage. A contractor from Canada would have to buy his plant in the United States and leave his own plant at home, a fact in itself which effectually would prevent a Canadian contractor taking work there. I have no desire to do anything to interfere with labour coming into Canada. When a man puts his foot on British soil here, he is placed on a level with every other man, and if there is employment and he is willing to work, he gets the opportunity. I have no wish to do anything that would interfere with that in any way, but I do say, Mr. Speaker, that in justice to the contractors of Canada they should be protected in their own country so long as other contractors are protected against Canadians. There is another consideration in this matter which is of very great importance. The profits of United States contractors who do work in Canada are not invested in Canada, but they are taken back and invested to the advantage of a foreign country. Again, these contractors, very often, bring over their labourers with them, and these labourers return and spend their earnings at home. If these profits were properly invested in Canada, there is no doubt but that they would be beneficial to the country. I do say, Sir, that this capital kept within the country, and well invested, might be of greater benefit to us, than the saving of any little difference which there might be in the contract price. I wish every man who is in this country doing work, if he be an alien, to distinctly understand that I have nothing against Americans. Canada and the United States are on the most friendly terms, and I hope they will remain so, but as a matter of business, and as a matter of justice and fair-play to Canadians, I believe that while we are treated in this way by the United States, we should stand up for our rights at home. I do not believe in the principle of letting Canadian contracts to aliens, sometimes in preference to our own people.

Mr. HAGGART. I was very much interested in the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan). He points out that the alien laws in the United States prevent Canadian contractors getting work in that country, and he also instanced the difficulty contractors had in moving their plant into that country. The hon. gentleman also referred to the effect of the alien law upon labourers, and how impossible it was to employ Canadians for the purpose of carrying on contracts in the United States. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) will look at his Bill he will see that it has a much wider scope than one would infer from listening to his remarks. His Bill would apply to Frenchmen, or Belgians, or aliens coming from any country in the world. For instance, if the Bill passed, it would prevent the Government from entering into a contract with a Belgian firm for supplying a bridge. Perhaps we would not have power to pass such an Act as this, and if we had the power, perhaps we are bound to the contrary by obligations in treaties which the British Government has entered into with foreign countries. The remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) have been devoted entirely to the legislation which has passed in the United States, and in order to reach the citizens of that country, he has given this Bill a scope that would apply to aliens from any country in the world. I doubt very much the necessity or the

desirability of any such legislation, which would apply to people of other countries whose legislation is, perhaps, most favourable to contractors belonging to this country, such as Germans, French, Belgians, and other Europeans. Canadian contractors might also go into South America and make contracts for any public work. This Bill would apply to all these. It would also apply to contracts for locomotives, or materials for a railway, and to any contract which a Government might enter into for building a railway for which material could be got from a foreign country. Surely the hon. gentleman does not intend that his Bill should have a scope of that kind. He intended, perhaps, that the Bill should be allowed to go to committee, and that its scope should be limited to that class of aliens who reside in the United States. Legislation of that kind is exceedingly objectionable. We could not embody in a Bill passed by this House a direct statement singling out the inhabitants of the United States as against the inhabitants of any other country, and say that any alien from any other country in the world could enter into a contract in Canada, while an inhabitant of the United States could not do so. The policy of the Government, in reference to these matters, without any legislation at all, has been proved in the contracts which I myself have let on behalf of the Crown for carrying on works in certain portions of the country. I make it a condition that the labourers employed on these works shall be Canadians, or British subjects, or such labour as would be acceptable to the people of Canada; and I think that might be fully protected if left to the Government. The Government might also make it a condition that the parties tendering for any contract let by the Government should be British subjects; or, in awarding a contract, they might skip a lower tenderer who was an alien. They could regulate the matter in that manner, without the objectionable form of an Act of Parliament, by which aliens, no matter from what country they came, would be deprived of the opportunity of entering into a public contract of any kind with Her Majesty in Canada. There may be times when it may be requisite to enter into a contract with aliens, and it might be against public policy, and the interest of the country to deprive the Crown of the liberty to secure what might be a benefit to this country. Under the hon. gentleman's Bill, ipso facto, a contract with a foreigner would be void, and penalties would be attached to it. I know that the hon. gentleman has no other object in view than to secure legislation of a reciprocal character, applying to others the same measure that they apply to us; and his intention was solely to prevent citizens of the United States competing with contractors in this country, when the United States Government do not allow the same privilege to our contractors going over there. But that might be accomplished without this Bill at all; and I think the hon. gentleman should take the assurance of the Government that in any contracts which may be entered into, the Government can exercise the liberty of rejecting any tender which they think is not in the interest of the inhabitants of this country, by skipping a lower tenderer from the United States, and awarding the contract to a resident of this country.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister of Railways has concluded with a very remarkable proposal. He proposes that the Government should do something which, under the Public Works Act, I do not think they can do—which they have always felt it necessary to give some technical excuse for doing when they have done it. He says it is open to the Government to accomplish the purposes of this Bill by passing over a lower tender put in by an alien in order to accept a higher tender put in by a Canadian, if they see fit to do so. That is how I understood him, and I was astonished that he should make that statement at the close of a speech which, in the main, tended towards opposition to the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Glengarry. As to that Bill, I am sorry to say that we in this part of the House have only the face of the Bill to go upon, as the hon. gentleman's explanations were entirely inaudible here, although, from the voluminous nature of his brief, they were doubtless very valuable. The Bill, on its face, is a move in the direction of creating a new monopoly—a monopoly distinctly opposed to the public interest. We have already, I think, as many monopolies as the country can afford. We have a sugar monopoly, a cotton monopoly, a woollen monopoly, an agricultural implement monopoly, and so forth; and now, the hon. gentleman, a contractor himself, who knows the needs of that poverty-stricken class, who have not yet, apparently, shared in the benefits of the National Policy, wishes to create a monopoly for the Canadian contractor. Judging from the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways, the hon. member for Glengarry must have said something about the Alien Labour law of the United States. That has no connection whatever with the subject-matter of this Bill. This Bill does not deal in any respect with the employment of aliens to work on contracts in Canada. It deals purely and simply with the letting of contracts. The question before the House is: Shall we limit the choice of the Government in letting contracts to such tenders as are put in by Canadians? I say that would be limiting the power of the Government in letting a contract, in a way that would be distinctly inconsistent with the public interest. It would mean that rings could be formed amongst Canadian contractors in the same way in which

rings have been formed amongst Canadian manufacturers, only more effectually, because the manufacturers have only high protection in their favour, while the contractors would have a prohibitory law in their favour. That combination would exclude all competition, except such as the Canadian contractors' ring would be inclined to permit. The Canadian contractors' ring would have all the contracts among themselves and all the extras and all the boodle. It is absurd to contend in this House that the Canadian contractor has not a good chance for making money out of Canadian public works as things stand. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) is a proof, in his own person, of the fact that Canadian contractors can, and do, make a good thing out of Canadian public contracts. The hon. gentleman has certainly made a good thing out of more than one public contract. He has shown his enterprise, ability and management in making very handsome profits out of these contracts. He is himself a striking proof that the Canadian contractor has a chance, and the allegation that he has not any show in comparison with foreign competitors, would be the only possible reason which could be urged for adopting a Bill of this kind. Therefore, I say that the suggestion of the Minister of Railways that this Bill should go into committee, and be changed in some mysterious way in committee, is one consistent with the public interest, and with the tone of the hon. Minister's own speech. If we were to give this Bill a second reading, we would be adopting a principle which the hon. Minister himself declares is not capable of adoption by this House, namely, that we have the right to exclude aliens from taking contracts in this country, or that it would be advisable to exclude them. He intimated that the principle of the Bill was bad and impracticable, and yet he proposes that we should give it a second reading and go into committee on it.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not propose that.

Mr. CASEY. I certainly heard him say that it might be as well to go into committee.

Mr. CURRAN. He said that the hon. mover of the Bill might suggest that.

Mr. CASEY. I did not mean to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, and certainly thought he used the words I quoted. I am satisfied that the hon. Minister will agree with me, judging from the tone of the rest of his speech, that we would be doing a very unwise and improper thing if we gave this Bill a second reading at all.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I have a great deal of sympathy with the hon. member for Glengarry. He has ably stated a grievance which Canadians feel in this country. He speaks from experience, and also for a large number of contractors who have gone from the county of Glengarry, which he has the honour to represent in this House. The men of Glengarry, without much capital, but with unbounded energy and industry, have gone from that county and spread all over this continent, especially the United States, where they have built millions of dollars' worth of public works. Now, however, they find themselves so harassed by laws and restrictions that they are no longer able to carry on such works in the United States, and they think that the law of retaliation should be put in force in this country. The Americans ought, at least, to treat us as we treat them, but they are not disposed to do that. They are not disposed to treat us generously or fairly with regard to the fisheries, wrecking laws, quarantine regulations, and hundreds of other things; and if we sit quietly down and allow them to smite us on the one cheek, they will expect us to turn the other and will harass us in every way. The time has come, or will soon come, when we, as Canadians, ought to insist on a reciprocity of treatment. As they treat us we should treat them. I would not like to see the measure made as strict as the hon. member for Glengarry proposes, but I would like to see something carried out in the line suggested by the Minister of Railways and Canals, namely, that if the Americans insist on treating us as they have been doing, and if they intend making these harassing acts of theirs still more stringent, we ought to adopt some scheme for treating them as they treat us, and in that way, at least, protect our people. Especially should that be done by a Government or party who say that their policy is a national policy. It is because the Americans are so strongly national, so patriotic, that they have passed all this legislation, and the result has been that they have built up their own industries and contractors, and kept their work for their own people. As Canadians, we ought to do the same; and in standing up for that principle, I have a great deal of sympathy for the hon. member for Glengarry, and hope there will be such an expression of opinion from the House that the Government will be strengthened in following some such line as the Minister of Railways and Canals has indicated.

Mr. TISDALE. I must say that, like the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), I have a great deal of sympathy in the line of the Bill which the hon. member for Glengarry has introduced. I am very sorry that the hon. gentleman did not speak loud enough for all of us to hear what he said, because he gave a very interesting and lengthy account, not only of the legislation of the general government of the United States, but of the still stronger laws of the different states on the line of his Bill. Now, I deprecate such legislation by any country. Of course, I concede the right of the general government

and the different states to pass any legislation they see fit, but I deprecate such legislation, for this reason. I do not believe that legislation upon the extreme lines they have seen fit to adopt is such as will in the end tend to their best interests. While I have this sympathy for the hon. member for Glengarry, and while the time may come when, if the United States should continue that class of legislation—and particularly if it should be aimed especially at Canada, as some of the state legislatures have done by mentioning Canada in particular—I should be prepared to go the whole length which the hon. gentleman proposes to-day, there is one difficulty which seems to me insuperable at present, and which has been explained by the Minister of Railways, and that is the difficulty of making such a law apply to the United States, by especially naming the United States, and not making it apply to other countries. The United States, in their legislation, do not designate any particular country, but apply it to all countries alike. But in order that a law of that kind might be of any adequate relief to us, we would have to specially apply it to the United States. That at present would be very difficult. In fact, I think it is impossible, and certainly it would be a very undesirable class of legislation. It would be a class of legislation which the United States so far have not applied, because their legislation applies to all aliens indiscriminately. In that they have the advantage of us; and although their legislation may hit us hard, we cannot say that it is aimed entirely at us, so far as I understand the laws they have passed in relation to this class of contracts. Then comes the question, in some respects possibly more important than the other. And that is that such legislation might involve our paying a much higher price for the construction of public works of a certain nature. It can hardly be urged that the general interests of the country would be served by our having to pay larger prices for the construction of public works, for the cost of which the people have to pay. That is a very grave consideration, especially in a country such as Canada, where we are building and will have to continue to build extensive public works if we go on improving, as I think we should, our different systems of transportation. Now, I do not agree with the hon. member from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) in saying that the Minister propounded an improper proposition in saying that the Government, so far as they could see their way to do it, would take care that on our public works, the work should go to Canadians. Mind you, he limited his proposition to the application of this rule in so far as consistent with the public interests. I do not care whether it is a Liberal or Conservative Government—of course, I have my preferences which party should control public affairs, but I apply the same principles to both—I believe that they should do everything possible, consistent with a due consideration for the public interest, to utilize the labour upon these public works for the benefit of our own people, along the general lines suggested by the hon. Minister. I understand that in some contracts where the contractor was an alien, the hon. Minister has insisted—and this was agreeable to both sides—that Canadian labour should be employed. So, though we cannot legislate on lines that would look like directing the law against one particular people, I, for my part, shall be prepared to strengthen the hands of any Government, Conservative or Reform, in saying—and I am prepared to say it and take the responsibility of it—that our public works should be carried on in this manner, so far as it can be done consistently with the interests of the public. And I want to say further, and I am glad to say it now that a subject has arisen upon which such a remark is pertinent, that, while I am not prepared to go so far as suggested by my hon. friend from Glengarry, and while all my feelings towards the people of the United States are of the friendliest character, I still hold that there is room here for two great Anglo-Saxon nations, managing their affairs on the lines of free government; yet, if they believe it necessary in their own interest to impose restrictions which are aimed especially at us, the time may come, if they drive us too far, when it will be our duty to say that we can get along without them as well as they can get along without us, and when, by express enactment of our legislature, we shall retaliate on the same lines. So, while I am not prepared to support the hon. member for Glengarry to the full extent he proposes to go, I am prepared, and I will insist, so far as I have any influence with our Government, that the rule of fair-play to our own workmen shall be applied so far as it is not inconsistent with the interests of the country at large. And I will go this much further—I will give my support in carrying out a policy of this kind, even to a Government to which I may be opposed. I think the thanks of this House and this country are due to the hon. member for Glengarry for the trouble he has taken—and it must have involved no little trouble—to gather the information he has laid before us, information which, spread upon the pages of "Hansard," will be of value in the future.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. member who has just taken his seat gives a great deal of credit to the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) for gathering the information he has given to the House this afternoon. I notice that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals also extended his sympathy to the hon. member for Glengarry. But neither of these hon. gentlemen has offered the hon. gentleman of the

Bill any support. Now, I quite agree with the objection to the Bill raised by the Minister of Railways and Canals, that it will be too specific in its character in declaring that no American should be allowed to take a contract under the Canadian Government. We Canadians, I think, are quite able, whether as contractors or in any other walk of life, to hold our own, even against the Americans. Canadian contractors are able to go over to the United States and take contracts, and they are even able to take their plant over. I have done a little of that kind of thing myself, Mr. Speaker, even with a 40 per cent duty against me. The only item upon which the Americans insist in the exclusion of alien labour, is on Government works. Any private enterprises, such as railways and other large undertakings, that are not under the direct control of the Government, are as free to all contractors as public works are free to all contractors in the Dominion of Canada. Now, the hon. Minister says that he can get over the difficulty of opposing the Americans in the awarding of contracts. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the House and to the country that he has never taken much care to have this kind of work kept in the hands of Canadians; for, upon the Welland Canal, the pick of all the contracts, and all the good portions of the work along the line of the canal were let to the Americans. I am sorry to say also, Mr. Speaker, that to-day all the large public works that are being carried on by the Dominion Government are in the hands of American contractors. Of course, we are to be protected so far as the workmen are concerned; for the Minister says that under the new order of things, while he is in his present office, he will insist upon the American contractors employing Canadian labour. But he does not say anything about insisting upon the American contractors staying here with the profits they make out of Canadian works. The workman is to be protected, but the contractor is to be free to take the whole of the money out of the country. I have just this to say: We cannot possibly legislate against any one country; and if the principle of this Bill were carried out, then, as pointed out by the Minister of Railways and Canals, not only labour, but all materials for public works would be prevented from coming into Canada. If I understand the hon. gentleman's idea, and I think I do, it is to prevent American contractors from coming into Canada and competing with Canadian contractors. But his Bill goes further than that. If he would confine his Bill to the principle of reciprocity, going only as far as the Americans go, then he would attain his object. But I think the Bill in its present shape will be thrown out by the Government on account of its overreaching character.

Mr. McALISTER. As has already been pointed out by the Minister of Railways, the scope of this Bill is wider than was anticipated, I presume, by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), who introduced it. The Bill not only provides that all contracts let to aliens shall be void, but it makes no provision for aliens residing in Canada getting contracts. We know that a great many people come from foreign countries to Canada and reside therein without becoming citizens for a number of years; and under the provisions of this Bill they would be precluded from entering into any contract with the Government. Now, this would be unfair. There are many Canadians residing in the United States who prefer to retain their Canadian citizenship, and who refuse to become naturalized citizens of the United States; for the same reason people from the United States and other countries coming into Canada to reside, may prefer to retain their citizenship rather than become naturalized citizens of Canada. Now, under the provisions of this Bill such men residing in Canada are precluded from entering into any contract with the Dominion Government for the construction of any public work. There are many men living in this country who are not citizens of Canada, and who are not allowed to vote, yet they own a great deal of property in Canada upon which they pay taxes, and are citizens of this country to all intents and purposes. If this Bill were passed in its present shape, it would shut out from taking contracts from the Government all these men who are in the position I have described. I do not imagine that the hon. gentleman intends his Bill to apply to people of this class, but in its present shape it makes no exception in favour of men who are practically residents of Canada without being citizens. But a foreigner could come in and get a citizen of this country to enter into a contract with the Government, and he could import his alien labour which I understand from the hon. member from Glengarry is the chief evil which his Bill is designed to remedy. I think, therefore, that the principle of the Bill is bad and it should not be adopted. Even though the United States pass laws which are detrimental to the interests of other countries, I do not think it would be wise for us to pass retaliatory laws where such laws may be injurious to ourselves. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), this Bill may prevent the Government from accepting the lowest tender, and consequently the cost of public works may be materially increased. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) referred to important contracts that are now let by the Government to Americans, and I think that is another reason why it is inadvisable to pass this Bill. Although contracts are let to Americans, I am informed that in every instance they were the

lowest tenderers, and therefore they received the contract; and if the Government were precluded from giving contracts to Americans, it is evident that the cost of our public works in some instances would be somewhat increased.

Mr. MACDONELL. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) has undoubtedly been actuated by the very best motives that can possibly sway a member of this House. in introducing that Bill I am satisfied that his object was to protect Canadians against outside competition. It was not intended to prevent the Government of the day from letting contracts in France, or Belgium, or any other country, where it is found that material, &c., can be bought to better advantage than it can be manufactured in Canada and supplied on public works. I think that if the Bill was framed so as not to prevent the Government from letting such contracts as it is absolutely necessary that they should let out of the country, it would supply a long felt want in the Dominion of Canada. I was pleased to hear the fair and manly criticism made by the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Gibson), who undoubtedly is the strongest advocate of the Bill that has yet spoken in the House. There is no doubt that Canadian contractors can hold their own with any other contractors in the world, I care not where the others are. Very large public works have been constructed in Canada from 1875 until 1885. Indeed, you may go back to the time of the construction of the Intercolonial and from that time until the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, very large public works have been under construction in the Dominion of Canada, both of railways and canals. Now, as long as Canadian contractors stood upon the same plane as American contractors, I would be the last to advocate a Bill that would look like a retaliatory measure. But when we find that Canadians cannot take contracts, either from the United States Government or from many of the states in the union, I say that the Canadian contractor and the Canadian workingman are placed at a disadvantage as compared with Americans, and it is the duty of a fraternal and protective government to come to their aid and give them that protection they deserve. Now, Sir, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) attempted to make a point by representing that this Bill would create a monopoly. Well, it is only an exhibition, such as we often see in this House, of gentlemen speaking on subjects that they know nothing whatever about. I would like to ask what possibility there is of the creation of a monopoly among 3,000 or 4,000 individuals? In every town and city in the Dominion of Canada to-day there are a number of contractors, some large and some small. The cities of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Quebec, Halifax, in fact every city in the Dominion, has its quota of contractors; and I would like to ask any sensible man how it is possible for these 3,000 men, doing each a distinct business for himself, to form a combination and create a monopoly in case a Bill of this kind is passed. There is no probability of such a result taking place. If the Government are going to let contracts—and no doubt the Bill of the hon. member for Glengarry was intended to cover such contracts—for the construction of railways, canals and public works, and I do not think the Bill was ever intended to cover the letting of contracts in foreign countries, if we pass a Bill to protect Canadian contractors we pass a Bill also to protect Canadian labourers, and the Bill would apply also to every man employed here by a citizen of the United States or any other country. In practice this Bill would come to be applied more particularly against the people of the United States than against those of France, Germany, Belgium, or any other country, for as the United States lie alongside of this Dominion, it is natural that its citizens should come over here and tender for contracts. Canadians are not allowed to go over there and contract for public works, and therefore it is unfair to the contractors and labourers of Canada to allow the Americans to come in here and tender for our public works, and if there is any possibility of placing this Bill in such a shape that it could be passed and the relief asked by the hon. member for Glengarry granted, I say that, irrespective of our political faith or creed, we are not true to our trust unless we carry out the views enunciated by that hon. member on the floor of the House this afternoon. Very many persons do not know the number of contracts let in this Dominion. Nor do they know the amount of money that has been invested in plant to carry on the works that have been under construction during the last twenty years. If there is one business more than another that suffers as regards depreciation of investment in plant, it is that of a contractor. A contractor may obtain a contract on which he may be employed for a couple of years. He will probably be obliged to expend $100,000, or even $200,000 in purchasing the necessary plant to carry out the work. If a similar contract does not present itself for some years, the contractor's investment is tied up. Someone may say: Well, if the money is invested in plant, why does he not realize on the plant? No one fully appreciates the difficulty of realizing on plant until he has had some experience in selling plant. I have known cases in which plant has not brought 10 cents on the dollar after the work was finished, simply because nobody wanted it. Possibly a boiler or an engine might be sold which could be utilized on another work, but if you take railway plant or canal plant, such as is required for any public work, it is simply impossible to sell it. To-day,

all the contractors in the Dominion have more or less plant on hand, and they will only be too glad to obtain contracts. And let me point out this fact, to show that it is simply absurd for any one for a moment to suppose that there can be a monopoly created by passing a Bill of this kind, that any work put up to tender is contracted for at prices extremely low, in fact, prices have decreased during the last twenty years over 50 per cent, and in some cases even over 60 per cent. On railway works, where formerly 30 or 40 or 50 cents were paid per yard of earth, to-day the work is done for 7, 8 or 10 cents. The consequence is that any protection which can be given to the contractors in Canada—and when you are doing that you are at the same time protecting the labourers—will receive my most cheerful support, and by my voice and vote I will endeavour to pass such a Bill as has been introduced by the hon. member for Glengarry to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no doubt whatever that those who have been noticing current events of late years, must observe the strong provocation that exists for the introduction of such a Bill. The action of Inspector Debarres at Buffalo, who appears to be engaged during his whole time in shutting out of the United States Canadians who happen to go there under contract, either individually or otherwise, makes it a matter of regret at such times that we have not a law so that we could retaliate to some extent in the same direction. This action is not confined to that locality, but prevails all along the whole frontier of the United States. What we find to prevail opposite Buffalo and Rochester, in New York State, we also find in Detroit and Michigan. For several years past the Americans have come over from Michigan in large numbers under contract and have worked in the pine woods of Canada, to the detriment of Canadian labour; they have taken away thousands of saw-logs; many have employed Canadians, and have taken their logs to the lakes, where they have been shipped to the other side, and the wages not paid, and many Canadians who expected to have been employed had not been employed on account of men having been brought from the other side. On this account it is to be regretted at times that we have not put a law on the statute-book such as that proposed by the hon. member for Glengarry. But that Bill does not go far enough to reach such cases, for it only applies to contracts entered into by the Government on behalf of Her Majesty; and therefore it would not reach this class of cases to which I have referred. Notwithstanding the fact, as I believe, that we are fairly entitled to pass such a law to protect ourselves, still I do not think it would be good policy to go that far, because, as one hon. member has already remarked, if we do so we may be doing something that will react on ourselves in a most injurious manner. It is said that works when open to tenders from the world must naturally result in being done at the lowest possible prices. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) said that the pick of all the contracts are to-day in the hands of Americans, but he also told the House that Canadians are quite able to meet the Americans in open market and can carry out contracts as cheaply as they do. He also told the House that there are plenty of Canadian contractors. It is pretty difficult to reconcile these two statements, and I fail to understand what explanation he can offer. If Canadians are able to compete with Americans, both as regards intelligence and enterprise and means, and in the next breath he says that the pick of all the contracts are in the hands of Americans, how does he account for that fact? Is it not clear that Americans have underbidden Canadians? and, if so, Canada and the Canadian Government would be saving money when contracts were let to Americans. That is the case, I think, and I do not believe we should go so far as to violate the principle by trying to make Canada a close corporation for the benefit of Canadian contractors. But I would advocate the adoption of all measures to protect Canadian labourers, who are too often supplanted by Americans to their disadvantage. While the provocation for enacting this measure is very strong, I do not think we have reached a time in the history of the country when we should go so far as to embody in an Act of Parliament the principle contained in this Bill. Nor do I think it would be wise to go so far as to carry out the provisions of the Bill, even if we could do so. Section 3, of this Bill, says:

> No alien shall be interested, either directly or indirectly, as a partner or in any other way, in any contract for any public work to be constructed for Her Majesty in the Dominion of Canada.

Now, as Canadians we would be glad at any time to see foreigners investing their money in the public works of this country, whether they are Government works or those promoted by private individuals. We are always willing to accept their capital.

Mr. McLENNAN. This would not interfere with that.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill must go that far when it says, that aliens cannot be interested in such work directly or indirectly. If an alien sends capital here to be employed by a Canadian in public works, surely he would be indirectly interested in that contract, and so, if the Bill became law, Canada would be deprived of the advantage of the investment of that capital. In that respect, I think, the Bill is at fault. I believe the time will come, however, and perhaps in the near future, when we will be obliged

of necessity to protect Canadians. I am glad to hear from the Minister of Railways that in letting recent contracts he did make reasonable efforts to protect Canadian labour. That is in the right direction; but if we went the full length of this Bill, we would go too far, and, therefore, I would be sorry to see its principle become law.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) is entitled to the thanks of every hon. member on both sides of the House, for having introduced this Bill, and I hope he will carry it to a successful issue. I have on the Order paper myself a Bill dealing with alien labour, which I hope we will reach before the session closes, and if not, I will ask the Government to take it under their charge so that we may pass it. I have received letters from one end of the Dominion to the other in favour of that Bill. In glancing through them, I see there is one from Nelson, B.C., one from Fort Erie, and one from the county of Charlotte, N.B., asking that this Bill be put through. The course that I intend to take with reference to my Bill I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) to adopt in relation to his, namely, that it should come into force by proclamation of the Governor General when it is found that other countries that have Bills against Canadian labour and Canadian contractors, refuse to withdraw them; or if a satisfactory arrangement is made with foreign countries in the matter, then that the Canadian law should not be proclaimed. It is a fact that Canadians cannot go into the United States to compete with the citizens of that country for any public contract, nor can workmen living on this side of the line cross to the United States for their day's labour, and return to Canada at night. That is unfair to the Canadian labourer. It is consequently unfair that citizens of the United States should come in here taking contracts, not only for buildings, but for hauling the minerals of British Columbia into the United States, employing American teams and labourers, and bringing their profits back to the United States with them. I think, that as soon as the Government of this country protects the labouring men by passing an alien labour law similar to that of the United States, the better it will be for our country. I shall have much pleasure in supporting the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan). I think with my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) that it should be amended in a few minor particulars, and that it should be brought into operation only by proclamation of the Governor General. Perhaps it might be that correspondence between our Government and the Government of the United States might result in their suspending their law, in which case, of course, the proclamation of the Canadian law would not issue.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) has brought this matter forward not at all too soon, and I think that the contractors, the labourers, and the mechanics of the Dominion owe him a debt of gratitude for so doing. I am thoroughly in accord with the principle of this Bill, and although the Minister of Railways stated that he does not believe it would be a good thing for us to pass it as it is, still I think that we should insert the thin end of the wedge anyway. The question has now been brought before Parliament and before the country, and we all can see the unfairness which is done to Canadians as the matter stands at the present time. Many cases have been brought to my notice in which the Canadian mechanic especially, has been unfairly dealt with by the United States alien law. Canadians are not allowed to work on public works in the United States, and, therefore, I think that Americans should not be allowed to work on similar works in Canada. I was glad to hear the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) state that he was bringing in a Bill in regard to alien labour, and when that matter comes up, I shall have something to say about it, because I think it is a subject which deserves the serious consideration of the Parliament of Canada. I shall have very great pleasure in supporting the Bill of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), as I think it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. McGREGOR. As I live in a city on the border, I am free to say that we have almost free trade with reference to our labourers crossing backwards and forwards to the United States. We have a population of 12,000 in Windsor, and from six to seven hundred cross daily to the States, and come back at night and spend their money on our side of the water. It is true that a few from the American side work on the Canadian side, but we reciprocate in that matter. Now, Sir, I have never heard of the Americans interfering with our people, except at times when they are crossing in large numbers, or bringing in valuable tools when it is required that they should be properly entered and the duty paid. If this alien labour law came into effect along the borders where we live, it would have a very bad influence indeed, because a large portion of our people employ one part of their family on the Canadian side, and the other, on the American side. I think, that we are just a little too soon in introducing such a Bill as that proposed by the member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan). There is no doubt that Americans have been engaged on some contracts in this country, but as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) said, Canadians are prepared to compete with the world for contracts in Canada. I think we might safely allow this Bill to stand over for a time and see what our American neigh-

bours will do. They may before long give us the advantage of their country for labour purposes. I am opposed to the Bill.

Mr. GILLIES. I listened this afternoon with considerable attention to the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), when he was making the motion for the second reading of this Bill. I am sure the members of this House are considerably indebted to him for the very valuable information he gave to us in regard to the laws existing on the other side of the line with respect to the letting of public contracts. While in sympathy with very many of the views put forth by the hon. gentleman, I cannot support the present Bill. His idea in the main was, I think, to introduce legislation that would benefit the labouring classes; but, while that was his object, I think the Bill will be very far from giving practical effect to that very desirable end. The hiring of labour is not touched in any way by the hon. gentleman's Bill. If it should succeed in confining the letting of public contracts to Canadians, the Bill would have the effect to a certain extent of boycotting the public contractors of Canada by other countries; because, if we look abroad for a moment, we shall find that there is not a single country in the civilized world, so far as I know, that has such a law as the hon. gentleman proposes to put upon our statute-book. In France, Spain, Germany, Belgium, Russia, and the South American Republics, government contracts, with certain limitations, are as free to Canadians as they are to natives of those countries. We know as a matter of fact that many British people have made enormous fortunes out of government contracts in Russia; and if we passed this Bill, what would be the effect? Legislation of a similar character might very fairly be enacted against us by those countries in which government contracts are now free to Canadian contractors, and Canadian contractors would find that the only field they could enter would be their own country. For these reasons, I am opposed to the Bill.

Mr. INGRAM. I think a great deal of credit is due to the hon. member for Glengarry for introducing this Bill. Whether it passes its second reading or not, it deserves to be favourably received for this reason if for no other: that it will show our neighbours across the line that there are many members of the Canadian Parliament who believe that we should treat American contractors in Canada as Canadian contractors are treated in the United States. It has been alleged that the object of the hon. gentleman, in moving this Bill, is to create a monopoly among the contractors of this country. Well, Sir, knowing the hon. gentleman as I do, I believe he has no idea of doing any such thing. I believe he has an interest in the labouring classes of this country. If Canadian contractors obtain government contracts in Canada, they will naturally employ Canadian workmen; but how is it with American contractors? I myself have known American contractors who obtained contracts in Canada, to bring in American labourers to do the work and to compete with the honest labour of Canada. I am sorry that the question of the Alien Labour law has been mixed up with the consideration of this Bill. I hope that before the close of this session the hon. members of this House will have an opportunity of discussing that question. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) says that the passing of this Bill will do a great deal of injury to the city of Windsor. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman is correct to a certain extent; but he must bear in mind that there are other places along the border, such as Fort Erie, Niagara Falls, and St. Stephens, in the county of Charlotte, N.B., where it would operate in the interest of our Canadian people. So far as I am personally concerned, I am not in favour of legislation of the kind introduced by the hon. member for Glengarry, nor that introduced by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). But where the American people have shown a disposition to treat our people in the unfair manner they have done, I believe the duty devolves upon us as Canadians to show that we do not appreciate that sort of treatment. It may be said that two wrong acts do not make a right, and that is true; but under the circumstances I think we are justified in showing them that we do not appreciate the kind of legislation which they have put into force against our people. It has been charged, and I have read it in some of the newspapers, that the Bill of the hon. member for Glengarry had reference to private works. That statement is unjust to my hon. friend, because this Bill does not affect private contracts at all, but simply contracts made by the Government. I trust that whatever may be the result of this discussion to-day, the attention of our friends across the line will be drawn to it, and that they may be induced to treat our contractors with greater fairness than they have hitherto done.

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

After Recess.

CONTRACTS TO ALIENS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. EDGAR moved second reading of Bill (No. 15) in amendment to the Criminal Code of 1892. He said: The object of this Bill is to amend the Criminal Code so as to provide that the directors, or officers, or

contractors, of any railway company, to which any subsidy, advance, or loan, or bonus, of public money has been granted by Parliament, and while any part of such subsidy is a subsisting claim against the Government, shall not, directly or indirectly, contribute towards election funds, following exactly the words of the present law as regards contractors for public works. The principle of prohibiting the beneficiaries of public works from contributing to election funds is embodied in section 131 of the Criminal Code of 1892. That was an amendment which the late Sir John Thompson adopted on the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, in the year 1891, and it was included in the criminal code when consolidated the following year. Now, every one, as the law stands, who has a contract with the Government is prohibited from contributing to the election expenses of any candidate, directly or indirectly, and I cannot possibly see why contractors and officers of railway companies which receive subsidies from Parliament should not also be restricted in the same way. The principle has been adopted, and I would merely apply it to another class. It is much worse in the public interest to have those who are interested in subsidies to railways at liberty to contribute to election funds than it is to allow small contractors for public works to contribute, because, while an ordinary public work may be let by a department by tender to the lowest bidder, his contribution to an election fund is a comparatively trifling objection; but when Parliament is called upon to vote subsidies for certain railways, those who are benefited have a direct interest in making their influence felt by contributing money towards the election of members of Parliament who vote these subsidies and in favour of the candidiates of the Government by whose Orders in Council these subsidies are distributed. Therefore, I contend, that in this case which I submit to the House there is much more necessity for applying a strict legal provision. Now, I cannot see why it should be necessary to give illustrations of the evils that have already been proven to exist in the way of election contributions by railway companies that are receiving public subsidies. But, Sir, it is very easy for me to refer the House to some of these abuses. There is a well known case. In 1872, Parliament authorized the Government to grant 50,000,000 acres of land and $30,000,000 in money in aid to a Pacific Railway.

Mr. CAMERON. That is old.

Mr. EDGAR. "That is old," the hon. gentleman says. Perhaps it is old, but it is very applicable to present circumstances.

Mr. CAMERON. It was played out long ago.

Mr. EDGAR. Played out long ago, was it? Let us see. The subsidy authorized by this Parliament to the old Pacific Railway, and the contribution of $300,000 odd by Sir Hugh Allan, the beneficiary of that fund, is old and stale is it, Sir? I say it is not old and stale. There is a member sitting in this House to-day who was a director in Sir Hugh Allan's company, and that hon. gentleman is the recently elected member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy). And, Sir, there is an hon. gentleman who, two or three minutes ago was in his seat here, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), who was the recipient of over $32,000 of that election fund. And, Sir, the gentleman who is the leader of the Government to-day, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, voted in this House against granting the inquiry moved for by Mr. Huntington into the Pacific scandal. So the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) is altogether astray when he says this instance is old and stale. The people are in this House and directing the Government to-day who were interested in that transaction, and as an illustration of the evils I seek to prevent, a more proper instance could not be given. Why, Sir, if this proposed amendment to the Criminal Code had been in force then, that great scandal would never have happened; and I propose to try to prevent hon. gentlemen opposite from getting themselves into scrapes of that kind in the future, if I possibly can do so by legislation. Coming down a little later we have the case of the Lake St. John Railway. Now, this is not stale. The Postmaster General I am sure would not say that that was a stale affair. Nobody now in this House would say that this was stale. Why, was it not proved to a demonstration under oath, over and over again, in the committees that the parties beneficially interested in the subsidy to the Lake St. John Railway contributed $25,000 towards the election funds of hon. gentlemen opposite. Then there was the Temiscouata Railway Company, in which case the late J. J. Macdonald, the contractor—the company having received a subsidy of about $500,000—swore that he expended $25,000 for political purposes, being, as he explained, "a real Conservative right through." These are instances, flagrant instances, of the evils which I desire to check. The House, as I said, has gone the length of saying that it shall be a penal offence for any contractor with the Government for the smallest service to contribute to an election fund. A penalty is provided of imprisonment and fine, and if the contribution has been large, the fine may be increased to double the amount of the contribution. And, Sir, consider the anomaly that presents itself. Suppose the $2,500,000 should be given to the Hudson Bay Railway—would it not be an anomaly for us to allow it to be possible that any officers or directors or contractors for that railway should contribute to the election fund of either party. Why, Sir, that would be unfair when we know that Mr. Onderdonk, the contractor for the Trent

Valley canal, cannot, without risking criminal prosecution, make any contribution. The contractors on the canal here cannot make contributions legally. Mr. St. Louis even, was not legally entitled to contribute to election funds. If he did so, he took great risks. I want to put the contractors and the officers of railway companies that are receiving large public grants in the same position in that respect—no worse and no better, but exactly the same position—as the contractors for other public works under this Government. Sir John Thompson, leading the House, assented to that principle in 1891, and that principle is embodied in our statutes to-day. If it is not observed, it is not the fault of the statute. And, Sir, I propose simply to extend that principle; and I shall be very much surprised if the House will not assent to the principle which I propose in this Bill, and therefore I move its second reading.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman intends by this Bill to secure electoral purity. It is an object worthy of praise, but it is to be asked whether he is taking the proper means to reach that end. He intends to prevent Federal contractors from contributing to electoral funds; why does he not include likewise the contractors of the various local governments?

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to make an explanation. If the hon. gentleman will read the Act of which this is an amendment, and in which this clause is proposed to come in as a subsection, he will find that it will apply to provincial governments as well as to the Dominion Government.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I read the section as it is, and it is not complete by itself:

Or (j) being a director, officer or contractor of any railway company to which any subsidy, advance, loan or bonus of public money has been granted or made by the Governor in Council or by Parliament.

This section does not say "by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba or any other province." All the contractors of the local governments are, therefore, not subject to this provision, and even though the hon. member may graft it on the most formal statute, I take his amendment as it is, and, as worded, it only includes the contractors of the Dominion Government. I say, therefore, that this Bill is not complete. There is a whole class, and a numerous one at that, of local contractors who ought to be included in this Bill. Does the hon. gentleman consider that the contractors of the Ontario Government have more right to subscribe for election purposes than the contractors of the Dominion Government? Does he consider their money is purer than that of the Federal contractors? If the hon. gentleman should really be anxious for such an electoral purity as we all ask for, let him earnestly take thorough means to secure it. Now, there is another class of persons who receive favours from the local governments: I refer to the license holders in Ontario. Why not include these in the Bill? I have heard a great many persons from Ontario say: If we do not belong to the Grit party, it is useless for us to think of getting a license. We have splendid places, houses very well built, nicely suited for a licensed hotel, but the moment we are Conservatives, there is no more chance for us. They would rather grant a license to an individual owning a little shop far from the middle of the parish; provided, he belongs to the Grit party. Now, why should these licensees of the Ontario Government enjoy the right to contribute to electoral funds, while those who receive moneys from the Dominion Government should not have the same right? This exclusion of an important class of contractors shows to me that the hon. gentleman has a secret end in view. If he should earnestly be anxious to prevent any contribution to electoral funds, I would say to him: Provide that any subscriptions of anything or by any one for an election will be strictly forbidden. But if you are going to make a selection and say that a class of citizens will have rights that another class will not enjoy, then I say: You are only partially carrying out your principle. We are always told about scandals in this House. It seems to me the time has come when we should say: Faults were committed on either side in the past, let us try and avoid them in the future. But what is astonishing is to see the party which indulged in the last scandal falling under the censure of this Parliament; the party which spent large sums, the proceeds of the stealing of public money, in order to secure power, which used fraudulent subscriptions, what is astonishing, I say, is to see that very party crying out most loudly: Thieves! Reference was made to the Baie des Chaleurs scandal. It is now known that a special law had been framed and passed by the local legislature in order to enable some parties to lay hold, through this enterprise, on the public moneys of the province of Quebec. It required all the investigations, which were called the "petit banc" investigations, to enable us to fully realize the extent of the plot formed against the public moneys. That special law was for the purposes of applying a large amount to the political organization of a political party, under the pretense of giving it to a railway company, but it is only a drop in a sea of dilapidation of the moneys of the province of Quebec. There were besides book sales. Money was drawn out of the treasury in many ways, and when all these misdeeds were evidenced before the public, a cry of indignation was heard from one end of the province to the other, and the Administration was changed.

But the party which has been guilty of all this, which profited by it, which then deemed it fine and legal, and which still defends it through its principal organs—although it has not the courage to defend it here—that party should not come here and cast stones at the other party. It is well known that in the management of the public affairs, when a party has long been into power, abuses may creep in ; but are we not bound to confess that Sir John Thompson made his utmost to purify the political atmosphere ? And is there anything with which to reproach the present Prime Minister ? The hon. the Minister of Justice, the hon. leader of this House, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the hon. Secretary of State ? Is it not known that the present Administration, taken as a whole or individually, wishes electoral purity to absolutely prevail, and that we all of us wish it on this side of the House ? But if I am told that it is wrong for some classes of people to subscribe at election times I will reply : Prevent any one from subscribing. Why should a Federal contractor enjoy to a less extent than his neighbour the right to subscribe ? Why should a railway director, who is generally considered in our country as one of the most intelligent, devoted, active and enterprising citizens, be denied the right to contribute as any other citizen to electoral funds ? Go in any parish, town or county, and you will find that the most inteiligent and active citizen there is generally a director of a railway company. And because that man had the courage to devote part of his capital to promoting the growth of his country, he will be told : Sir, you are unworthy to take any part in the public business ! We have penal laws against electoral corruption. For my part, I have urged that the voter be compelled to go to the poll so as to be preserved from one danger of corruption. I was denied this by both sides of the House. I infer from this that in some quarters they are trying to prevent corruption when they suffer by it, but are willing to allow it when they profit by it. This Bill seems to me an unwarranted outrage to a class of respected and respectable citizens, it seems to me to be incomplete and likely to favour one party to the detriment of the other. It seems to me to strike a class of citizens to the exclusion of many others and to the exclusive benefit of one party, without making electoral purity more secure. If the promoter of this Bill should be earnestly willing to cause electoral purity to prevail in this country, I would readily vote for his Bill. Has he stated why he was making the exceptions I have pointed out ! For my part, I am for any measure that might secure the utmost electoral purity. I will go further ; I would be in favour of a legislation that would not allow a candidate to be accompanied by any other person during an electoral contest. I would be in favour of a law that would make it compulsory for a candidate to conduct his contest alone, of a law that would prevent him, for instance, from being accompanied by such a crowd of stump speakers and canvassers as are now carried at a great expense into the counties and are sent travelling from one end of the country to the other. I would be in favour of such a law because it would tend to truly lessen electoral corruption. By such a law we would say to a candidate : You wish to solicit the votes of the electors, very well ; but you will conduct your contest alone, without any help from outside and by only relying on your good name, your abilities and your platform to win votes. You will not have the assistance of all these speakers foreign to the county, imported from outside and often at a very great expense. I repeat I would be in favour of an earnest and thorough legislation, but let no one come and ask me to state that such and such a citizen ought to be disfranchised because they are opposed to a political party.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without protesting against the remarks just made by the hon. member. Whenever the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) rises in this House, he seems to delight in going back to his past course, so much so that one is lead to believe it weighs upon his heart, and that in order to insult and abuse those to whom he owes the position he now occupies in this House. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the Bill moved by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) ; I will merely say I am in favour of this Bill for the reason that I think it might, if properly carried out, prevent scandals such as those of the Curran Bridge, of the Saulte Ste. Marie Canal, and of the Pacific. Those whom this Bill would not reach will have nothing to fear from its being carried out, since it does not concern them. Indeed, those who need no subscriptions to be returned have no reason to fear the passing of a Bill such as this. But I can understand that such men as are in need, in order to get returned, of the public contractors' money, or a share of the railway subsidies, should object to the Bill. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), has referred to the Baie des Chaleurs scandal, but he ought to have kept silent and say nothing about the money, for if any scandal there was, it is by no means sure that he never needed part of this money to get returned in Bellechasse. If there is a man who should never refer to the scandals, or rather the so-called scandals, that took place in 1881, in the province of Quebec, it is the very member for Bellechasse who was implicated in them, if any there were, and got out of them his large share. Here is another member who, from 1885 to 1891, has called the hon. gentlemen opposite robbers

and plunderers, who has charged them with leading the country to dishonour, and who now is licking their feet in order to obtain their favours and the votes of their party ; it is the same gentleman who now has the audacity to rise in this House whenever an opportunity offers and pour abuse on the Liberal party, on the memory of the lamented Mr. Mercier, as well as on the Liberal Administration in whose views he so ardently shared, and whose favours and patronage he likewise so ardently received. Why should not he at least keep silent ? He should have at least the decency to keep silent and not abuse those who got him returned in 1891. It is true the hon. member for Bellechasse easily forgets his past course, and the circumstances under which he was returned at the election in 1891. It is true in 1891 he was returned through the party he now opposes and abuses, by means of the Baie des Chaleurs subscriptions, if there was any, and in spite of the endeavours of the party whose favours he now seeks, a party which had rightly thrown him out of its ranks, and had we known him then as we know him now, the hon. gentleman would have been likewise thrown out of the ranks of the Liberal party. For my part I would have done it. I was surprised to hear from the hon. gentleman the statement that there was no scandal attached to the name of the Ministers he now upholds. I would only need to go through "Hansard" for 1891 to find evidence in support of the statement that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) never ceased denouncing his present friends. What did he not say against this Government ? Is it not the same gentleman who exclaimed in this House that protection was a nice thing, but that this question was worn out, and, moreover, that the principle of free trade and protection were no more in question, that the question was simply to drive from power the robbers and plunderers of the Quebec Harbour Works ? Those whom he now defends, he was then piling abuse upon them. We now see the same gentleman licking the feet of the men he then abused. Why ? In order that he may obtain their favour, and by this means again secure the mandate with which he was entrusted in 1891, owing to the support given him by the Liberal party. As regards the Bill of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), the Liberal party approve of it, I think, for there is nothing in it likely to affect this party. For my part, I am willing to vote for the Bill, because it will be its object to prevent the big contractors from requesting and being granted subsidies for railway schemes, and taking part of these subsidies to give it as subscription to the electoral fund of the Conservative party for the purpose of securing the election of ministerial candidates. I, therefore, thought it my duty not to allow the provoking statements of the member for Bellechasse to pass unchallenged. I did not intend to discuss this evening his political course since 1891. I will do that in due time. I will now repeat what I once said to him—even though it would only cause him to beware—that he should be the last man to pour abuse upon the members of the Liberal party, and take upon himself to sing the praises of the Conservative party. The hon. member for Bellechasse has alternately given his support to the Conservative party and to the Liberal party ; there is hardly a question as to which he did not hold conflicting opinions ; he has flattered both parties to have their favour. It is his own business ; I tell him that we will discuss all such things in due time before his voters. For the moment, I would invite him to cease raising the veil cast over his past and abusing those who always did good to him.

Mr. DAVIN. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I am well pleased to find that the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) has at last made known his inmost thought. This has been weighing upon his heart for a long time and he has intended, no doubt, for years to make before this House the statements we have just heard. He gave utterance to his abuse elsewhere, he wrote it in the newspapers, he repeated it whenever I was away. The hon. gentleman contends that I was returned in 1891 by means of the money raised by the Baie des Chaleurs scandal. It is the first time he makes this statement so as to be well understood. I call on him to show proof of it. Let him give it, if he has any. In 1891 I ran as a National Conservative. That election cost me very little. It was protested and I came victorious out of this as of many other protests previously entered against me by the Liberal party and which were rejected after being investigated. I am not ashamed to talk about what I did in 1891. I went through the consequences of the National movement inaugurated in 1885 ; I acted in good faith and I have nothing to regret of what I did then, since the feelings by which I was actuated were pure and loyal. I had yielded to a patriotic feeling and I was bound by my past. Mr. Speaker, if the thing had to be done anew, I would avail myself of the experience I have gained since then, but that is not now in question. The question is as to what I did. I was a National Conservative and as such I had, to a certain extent, to associate with the Liberal party during the years that elapsed between 1886 and 1891. That is true. The Liberal party supported me in the county of Bellechasse, it is also true. But the hon. gentleman has hinted that I was implicated in the Quebec scandals. If he has any regard for his own reports, he will tell us in what scandalous affair the name of the member for Bellechasse was implicated. Let him say so, now is the time and I am ready to reply to any charge of this kind. He will no

doubt say: As a lawyer, you had some work from the Quebec Government. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had some work from that Government and I was paid for part of that work. I fully and fairly earned that money and what I thus earned and a good deal more went for the support of an organ which was defending the interests of the National Conservative party. That was no boodling. I had a right to earn my living in the capacity of a lawyer and I think that when I represented the Crown in Quebec, the number of verdicts I obtained was so large that if the hon. member for Montmagny should only be willing to consult those of his friends who were pleading in defence of the criminals brought at that time before the court, they would tell him that it was hardly possible to save a criminal from justice. But as to boodling, I challenge him to find out a case, a beginning of a case, a shadow of a case in which he has ever seen the name of the member for Bellechasse, he has never seen the name of the member for Bellechasse in the Baie des Chaleurs affair, nor in that of the forestry, nor in any of the suspicious affairs of the local government. And if I should again appeal to my electors for their support, it will be with as honourable a name, with as spotless a reputation for honesty as when they entrusted me with their mandate. I challenge the hon. member for Montmagny to find out anything whatever likely to tarnish my reputation as an honest man. He may lay general charges, he may pour abuse upon me: he has a voice sufficiently powerful, his heart is filled with enough bitterness and malice for him to do that; but I will tell him this: Specify one case, one circumstance in which I was implicated in a scandalous or illegal transaction. If you find out a single one, you will then have the right to attack me before this House, in the press or upon the hustings. The hon. gentleman thinks others have no right to their convictions, that he alone has such a right. He alone has a right to be now favourable to unrestricted reciprocity, then turn an annexationist and next a free-trader. After these three somersaults, he is now fighting for a tariff for revenue. Although a National Conservative, I always remained true to the principle of protection. If at a time, under special circumstances, I assented to a limited reciprocity with the United States, I soon found out this platform was deserted even by its promoters and that moreover it had become unpracticable. I then realized that I was following a wrong path. Was I bound to remain in it the rest of my life? The gentlemen opposite had deserted their flag; could they force me to remain faithful to it? The hon. gentleman may continue to abuse me in connection with this incident of my career; I leave it to the public and this House to decide between he and me. As to boodling, the people are perfectly informed; they know that I never was guilty of it and that I hold it in execration. I call upon the hon. gentleman to particularize, and I know he is unable to do it. He asserts that I was thrown out of the Liberal party. When? Where art his proofs? I am here before a man whom I respect and esteem, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier). He knows under what circumstances I left the Liberal party. I went and informed him and told him why I could no longer march in the ranks under his leadership. I leave him free to relate the conversation we had about that. There was nothing against his honour nor against him in that interview. I gave him my political reasons about a political question and he understood them. I was told: You were anxious to get the favours of the other party! What favours? Let the hon. gentleman state them. Let him look into the public accounts, let him look around me, let him consult my own people, my relatives, my friends in this House or out of it, and let him state when I received favours, or what favours I wished to receive or could receive. If he cannot do it, it is because he has asserted a groundless fact, because he was wanting to the code of honour, which is no more allowed in this House than elsewhere. When he asserted that I left the Liberal party because I was driven away from it, when he asserted that I left it through an interested motive, he has malignantly made groundless statements. I challenge him to prove his assertions. He is prompt in laying charges; I call upon him to give his proofs: if he does not do it, I call upon both sides of the House to protect the good faith, honesty and sincerity of purpose of a public man who is acting straightforwardly. I do not deny to my opponents their good faith, their convictions and their sincerity. But is there no other way of replying to the political arguments of a man than telling him: Your arguments do not hold good, since they are urged by you? Is there no other way of discussing the merits of a question than to abuse an opponent personally? How often, when I spoke in this House, was I interrupted by the hon. gentleman crying out to me: "Why don't you speak of the North-west?" Well, there again, I defy him. Let him find out in my whole conduct in the North-west, when I was the commanding officer of the Ninth battalion, a single reprehensible act. I had into my hands millions of dollars at my disposal in the North-west, I signed cheques for nearly a million dollars, I had charge of the whole large district of Alberta. I had the direction not only of the 9th battalion, but of other battalions, for, in the meantime, I happened to be by seniority the commanding officer of a whole brigade. Well, I defy any one on earth to find out a single reprehensible act in my whole conduct during that campaign. Let any one mention an order to which I disobeyed, a single act unworthy of a

soldier most devoted to his country, of which I was guilty. I, too, made the sacrifice of my life when I started for the North-west, when I left my family to go and make war against compatriots and cause to be respected the laws of this country and Her Majesty's flag. What was the reward I received for it? Abuse from the gentlemen opposite. They try to tarnish my military career; they would have it believed that that portion of my life was stained with shame. Well, I defy any one to cite a single act, a single fact likely to decrease the merits of that portion of my humble career. As it is with my legal career, so it is with my political and military career. I defy the hon. gentleman to cite a single reprehensible act committed by me as a lawyer or a citizen. And yet he will continue to abuse in these respects. He makes general statements and hopes to lower me in the esteem of my countrymen. Mr. Speaker, I lay before you this short recital of my career; I do not fear the judgment of my equals, and I am all the more confident, as general charges are worth nothing and glass cannot cut diamond.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I appeal to the House and to you, Mr. Speaker, to state that I in no way attacked the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot). I merely advised him, in his own interest, not to bring up the question of the Baie des Chaleurs scandal, if scandal there had been, as the hon. gentleman had been as much, if not more guilty than any of us, of this alleged scandal. I told him not to abuse the party which had made him what he now is. We are not going to wash his dirty linen in this House. That will be done elsewhere. I said he owed his seat to the Liberal party, and notwithstanding that, notwithstanding the feeling of the county of Bellechasse, the political principles of which he does not represent here, he supports the Government now into power, although he was returned under cover of principles opposed to those of the Government. He changed his political allegiance without going before the county of Bellechasse so that the flag confided to his care might be handed back to them; he transferred this flag to another party without the consent of those who put it into his hands. In 1892, when the Hon. Mr. Mercier was into power in Quebec, the hon. member for Bellechasse defended him with all his might. He thus defended him up to the general election, and it was only after this that he turned his back to him when Mr. Mercier could give him no more favours, nor patronage, nor provisions. I made him the offer, in 1892, to go in the county of Bellechasse and discuss all these questions and the hon. member promised me that after the session, he would come and meet me in his county. But he had not the courage to come. Now, I give him again rendezvous, and we will see if he will have the courage to come and try to explain his conduct. Notwithstanding his challenges, this is neither the time nor the place to wash his dirty linen, but this will be done later on, I can assure him. The hon. gentleman defies me to prove that his name was mixed up with any boodling. He must forget what his present friends and Conservative papers said and wrote about him. He has only to refer to the "Courrier du Canada" and to the "Minerve" of that time, and he will see that never a day nor a week past without referring to the member for Bellechasse and the amount of patronage he received through the support given by him to the Liberal party and the Mercier Government. The hon. gentleman also referred to his campaign in the North-west and the attacks to which he was exposed for having defended Her Majesty's flag. He told us that during his campaign his conduct had not been cowardly. I defy the hon. gentleman to point out a single charge laid against him by my party as regards his campaign in the North-west. If he should be willing to know by whom he was accused in this respect, I will refer him to the hon. Postmaster General, for he was the party who laid the strongest charges against the hon. gentleman. The hon. Minister is the man who can give him the certificate he is fishing for. No doubt the hon. Postmaster General will give it to him, for he must have forgotten the past on account of his submissiveness. The hon. member is now licking his feet and is willing to do his business, either small or great, neat or dirty. I once more say what I said a moment ago, that is, that I wish to record my protest against the statements of the hon. gentleman. I think I am voicing the feeling of my hon. friends on this side of the House and those of the voters of the province of Quebec by requesting him in his own interest not to bring up at any time these questions of scandals and boodlings. Before speaking as he does, he ought to surrender the mandate of the county of Bellechasse, as he no longer represents in this House the principles of the voters of this county. They returned him as a Liberal, and since then he has changed party and renounced the policy approved of by the majority of his voters. Let him, therefore, keep silent as to these questions of so-called scandals, for it is within his own knowledge that these charges of boodlings and scandals are groundless. For he knows that when commissions qualified as petit banc were appointed to prosecute the Mercier Government his present friends looked everywhere for evidence in support of charges of boodlings and could not find any. And, Mr. Speaker, who was the lawyer who, before the royal commission and the petit banc, was defending the Mercier Government if not the very hon. member for Bellechasse. Such are the facts, and the conclusion I charge the hon. gentleman, before

this House and before the country, with having left the Liberal party, when it had no more dollars to give him or to cause to be earned by him and having rallied to the Conservative party which have its dispensation of favours, patronage and provisions.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) The debate which is now going on is surely of a great advantage, for it had the effect of making known to the House a great many things which we, voters of the province of Quebec, were perfectly aware of, but which the other members of this House did not know as well as we did. These things were up to now denied by the hon. gentlemen opposite, but this evening the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) has confessed before this House and before the country, that actually the money coming from Baie des Chaleurs scandal was used in securing the return of the Liberal candidates in 1891. He contends that my hon. friend the member for Bellechasse would not have been returned had he not had the help of the money provided by the Liberal party through the Baie des Chaleurs scandal. Therefore, it is duly admitted that such money went into the bribing fund of the Liberal party, and the hon. member for Bellechasse, who then ran with the support of the Mercier Government and of the leader of the Opposition, should have had a portion of this money, since it was to be distributed in the interests of the Liberal candidates in the province of Quebec, such was the reasoning of the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) received his part, I presume, the same as the hon. member for Bellechasse, according to the statement made by the hon. member for Montmagny. I defy the hon. gentleman——

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I never said that the money was given for electoral purposes, and that such money came out of the Baie des Chaleurs affair. I said that if scandal there was, the hon. gentleman must have had his share of it, but I never said——

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) This is what the hon. member said : The hon. member for Bellechasse was returned owing to the money coming from the Baie des Chaleurs affair, and I defy him to assert the contrary in this House. I defy him to state that he never said that the hon. member for Bellechasse was returned owing to the money proceeding from the Baie des Chaleurs scandal. He admitted before this House and before the country, by his own words, that the money coming from the Baie des Chaleurs affair contributed in securing the return of the Liberal members in——

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) ——in 1891. Therefore, the hon. member stated before this House——

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) The hon. member for Chicoutimi puts into my mouth statements which I never made. I said :

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to know if the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) desires to raise a point of order.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I wish to correct the hon. member. I never uttered the words he puts in my mouth. I said that——

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) ——therefore, I have good reason to state, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) As a matter of fact, I never uttered such words. I said that if scandal there was——

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member does not wish to raise a point of order, he has no right to speak.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I said that the hon. member for Bellechasse was well founded in saying that the Bill now before us is not complete ; it is expressly worded so as to prevent any subscriptions from any persons considered as friends of the Conservative party, while it reserves full liberty of action for the friends, the public contractors of the local governments, which, it was well known, are for the three-fourths Liberals. After what has happened in the province of Quebec at the elections of 1891, are we not justified in saying to those who come here and advocate electoral purity, and who profited, without any scruple or remorse, by the robberies and plunders practised by their friends then into power at Quebec, to begin by giving example rather than precept. Are we not justified in saying to them : Right your own wrongs, before trying to right the wrongs of others, and before bringing up in this House measures such as this. Who were the guilty parties in 1891 ? Here is a party which, in 1891, when it was into power at Quebec, robbed the sum of $254,000 during the single day of the 24th of February, 1891, here is a party convicted of an enormous fraud, here is a party which give money to bribe the electorate, and we, members of the Conservative party, would not have the right to defend our friends, to defend our party, and to put under the eyes of our accusers the frauds and robberies of which they were guilty ! They ought to remember that they have no right to make painful allusions. This Bill is not complete, it was drawn up and submitted to this House for the sole purpose of trying to tyrannize over and ill-treat a certain number of citizens, while reserving full protection for the Liberal governments in the various provinces of the Dominion. Mr. Speaker, I have no mission to defend the hon. member for Bellechasse. If there is any man able to do it in this House, it is the very member himself ; but I cannot but protest

against the mean charges laid by the hon. member for Montmagny, against the odious generalities which he uttered here and which he is quite unable to prove. We know who the parties were who boodled in the province of Quebec. Their names are present in our memory and if we were allowed to speak in this House as we speak before the people, I could name some who are here and who very likely would blush with shame. I will not do it, but it does not preclude of knowing their names, and the hon. member for Bellechasse is not amongst them. The Conservative papers never contended that the hon. member for Bellechase had received money on false pretenses. He had some patronage from the province of Quebec. He had even a good deal. But it was obtained quite correctly. But is it to be inferred from the fact that he received such patronage, that he obtained money under false pretenses, or the proceeds of illegitimate doings ? There is a great difference in that. I say once more that the hon. member for Bellechasse was charged neither by the Liberal party nor by any member of the Conservative party with having obtained money under false pretenses from the Quebec Government. If we swept the province of Quebec, in 1892, it was because we knew such things. We will refer to them at the next election ; they will be once more one of the strongest weapons we will have in use. For my part I will have no scruple in referring to the Baie des Chaleurs scandal or to the Langlais scandal. They are ashamed for the province of Quebec, but these things are too recent to be forgotten yet, and the people remembers them. They also know that the Dominion Liberal party is the same party which drained the treasury of the provinces of Quebec in 1891. If they are not the same men by name, it is the same party which profited by the boodling in 1891. And the hon. member for Montmagny in particular believes that we will no more refer to this. We will refer to it not only in the province of Quebec, but also, I hope, in the province of Ontario. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) who gives us such a help in that Baie des Chaleurs affair will know how to speak of it, in order to support his party against the Liberal party. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and seeing the object sought by this Bill, I think the whole House, or at least the whole Conservative party ought to agree in rejecting it ; for I consider, as such as it is, it is immoral and cannot receive the support of the members of this House.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I regret that I did not happen to be in the House when the hon. gentleman who has the Bill in charge, discussed it, and so I missed the first part of his remarks. But in looking over the Bill I find that the hon. gentleman has acted to a great extent upon the objections that were made to a proposal of a similar character submitted last year by the leader of the Opposition, when the subsidies to railways were under consideration towards the end of the last session. When the Bill dealing with these subsidies was before the House, the leader of the Opposition moved that the resolution should not be read, but be referred back to the committee to consider several clauses. In that amendment, I find the following :—

> That every officer and director of said companies, and every person having a contract with any of the companies for the performance of any work, or the doing of anything, or the furnishing of any goods, effects, or materials, and having, or expecting to have, any claim or demand against the company by reason of such contract, who either directly or indirectly, by himself or any person on his behalf, subscribes, furnishes or gives, or promises to subscribe, furnish, or give, any money or other special consideration for the purpose of promoting the election of any candidate to a legislature or to Parliament, or with the intent in any way of causing or effecting the result of a provincial or Dominion election, is guilty of a misdemeanour.

The leader of the Government, on that occasion, resisted this proposition. He dwelt it is true, largely on the impropriety of constituting such act a misdemeanour, after the action that had been taken in connection with the criminal code ; and he also found fault with a suggestion of this kind being made as an addition to a railway Bill, and pointed out that if the proposition were to be entertained by the House, it would find a proper place in connection with the code. So I observe that the hon. gentleman, acting on that suggestion, has brought this subject before us, as an amendment proposed to be made to the criminal code. I fear, however, that the hon. gentleman is not dealing as completely with the subject as the House dealt with really the same principle in 1891 ; and I think the hon. gentleman referred to that legislation, where, instead of railway companies, directors, or officers, being aimed at, Government contractors were aimed at, and the House, therefore, as he argued tonight, I think, had adopted, in large part, the general principle that is involved in the amendment under consideration. But the hon. gentleman will remember that on that occasion the House did not confine its attention to contractors dealing with the Federal Government, but took care to make that provision broad and comprehensive, and to embrace all contractors with any government, federal or local ; therefore, the proposition removed any suspicion that a special effort was being made in connection simply with federal contracts. Now, the hon. gentleman will see from the resolution of the leader of the Opposition, which I have just read to the House, that there was an attempt to keep to the old legislation, and a reference was made to the elec-

tion to Parliament, or to a legislature; whereas, I find in this Bill that the hon. gentleman has eliminated entirely the class of contracts having relation to a local government; because he recites in the first part of the clause:

> Any one, being a director, officer or contractor of any railway company to which any subsidy, advance, loan or bonus of public money has been granted or made by the Governor in Council or by Parliament—.

Dropping the word "government," which is in the code, he proceeds to amend, and in the particular section to which it refers, the word "government" being defined in the code as including "the Government of Canada, the government of any province of Canada, as well as Her Majesty in the right of Canada, or any province thereof."

Mr. EDGAR. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow me to state that if the clause is not strictly drawn, according to that resolution, it was through inadvertance. The latter part of the clause applies to provinces, and I would be only too glad to use the word "government," or any other word, in committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is quite satisfactory to me, so far as that point is concerned. Now, I find that a further objection was made by the leader of the Government last session to the legislation then drafted, and the draft has been carefully reconsidered, no doubt, and put into a proper form with the exception of that feature to which I have just alluded. But the leader of the Government, I find, pointed out a rather extraordinary feature in connection with this legislation, not, I take it, as an objection to the principle involved in this amendment, but in reference to the length to which the proposed legislation would go. His reference is short and concise, and perhaps I could not do better than to state what he said:

> There is on the statute-book a law with reference to subscriptions by contractors with the Government. The Act would then contain this extraordinary feature, that, while the president, secretary, manager, members and contractors of all those railway companies are eligible to sit in Parliament——

And so they would be, notwithstanding the Bill now under consideration.

> —they would be prevented from subscribing to their own elections, or to that of a co-director who might be a personal friend, and who might be able to furnish him even with the necessary money to put up a deposit, or any other legitimate expense, to an election either to the Dominion Parliament or a local legislature.

Now, no matter how the House may ultimately decide that subject, it is a matter that ought to be very carefully and thoroughly discussed, and I desire to say frankly to this House that I have not had an opportunity of bringing this under the notice of the Government, as it was perhaps my duty to do. But I rise for the purpose of saying that at the earliest possible moment I shall advise with my colleagues as to the action that will be proposed, and, in the event of this subject being considered, I feel certain that the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill will go still further in the line of the suggestion of the late leader of the Government, and not only reserve this clause in the form it is, with the suggested addition, but will consent that if the Government is favourable to it, or if the House should be favourable to the adoption of the principle, to add it to the consolidated amendments which have been referred to the subcommittee, and I rise, therefore, at the present moment, merely to move the adjournment of the present debate for the express purpose of advising with the Government as to whether the Bill, as it stands, with the addition I have suggested, shall be accepted by the Government, or whether some other and further proposition shall be made. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. EDGAR. There seems to be undoubtedly an amount of fairness in the suggestion made by the Minister of Justice. If the principle of the amendment were agreed to by the House it would be referred to the special committee. I think the suggestion is a proper one; but I should like some assurance from the hon. gentleman that an opportunity will be given to the House for the consideration of this measure after the Government have taken it into consideration.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no hesitation, after speaking with the leader of the House in stating that there is no desire to prevent its consideration.

Mr. INGRAM. Before the motion to adjourn the debate is adopted, I desire to offer a few remarks on the motion moved by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). In doing so, I desire to make a statement in order to put a little matter right. The hon. gentleman in his remarks charged the Government with granting subsidies for the purpose of influencing the electors to support Government candidates for parliamentary honours. As I may not have another opportunity to set this matter right, I ask the indulgence of the House while I refer to it in order that some hon. gentlemen opposite may have an opportunity to contradict the statements they have made elsewhere with respect to certain subsidies granted in the riding I have the honour to represent. In March last hon. gentlemen opposite, I believe, rather feared there was about to be a general election. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) addressed the constituents of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and during the course of his remarks he made certain statements charging the

Government with granting subsidies in certain constituencies with the sole view of securing the election of certain candidates. Among the candidates mentioned I was one. The hon. gentleman found fault with the granting of a subsidy of $3,200 per mile for sixteen miles of railway to run from Tilsonburgh to Port Burwell in the east riding of Elgin. The hon. gentleman's remarks were somewhat in this line. I read from a letter sent to me by a gentleman who listened to the speech. He said :

Arthur, 25th March, 1895.

Mr. Ingram, M.P.

Dear Sir,—We had the Hon. Mr. Mills speaking here in the interest of J. McMullen, M.P., of North Wellington, in our town hall, Monday evening, and in the course of his remarks he referred to a line of railway that was built from Tilsonburg through your riding to the lake, that received $3,200 per mile from the Government, to secure your election against Mr. Wilson, and that a man not over thirty years of age could carry all the freight on his back that went over the road, without any trouble ; that it ran through a country that was nothing but sand, which would not grow anything ; that the road did not pay the running expenses. I did not believe there was such a road in Canada, therefore, I thought I would write you for information on the matter. If you can find out the facts of the case, let me know and greatly oblige.

Yours truly,
R. MARTIN.

Assuming that the hon. gentleman did make that statement, I knowing that statement to be incorrect in every particular wrote—wishing to be very careful that the hon. gentleman should not be misrepresented—and asked that gentleman to get one or more responsible parties in the village of Arthur to corroborate the statement. I received this reply on March 4th, 1895 :

Arthur, Ont., 4th April, 1895.

A. B. Ingram, Esq.

Dear Sir,—We, the undersigned electors, certify, that we were present at the meeting held in the town hall on Monday evening 25th March, and we heard the Hon. Mr. Mills speak, and that the words in the letter written by R. Martin to you, are as near the words used by Mr. Mills as it is possible to quote them from memory.

(Signed) WILLIAM EDEN,
Ex-Reeve Arthur Tp.
J. D. CALLAGHAN,
Contractor.
GEORGE SMITH,
Farmer.
M. M. McMARTIN,
Solicitor.
FLORENCE SMITH,
Agent.
WILLIAM TERNAN,
Farmer.

Those gentlemen certified to the statement made by the hon. gentleman on that occasion. Let us see whether the facts bear out the statement or not. I was elected on 5th March, 1891 ; I was unseated in December, 1891 ; I was re-elected on February 12th, 1892. The first subsidy voted and assented to was on 9th July, 1892. It is unfair, therefore, to say that this was a subsidy which in any way affected my election, because it was not granted by the Government until several months after my election. The subsidy was revoted and assented to on 23rd July, 1894. In rising to make this explanation, I regret very much that the hon. gentleman is not in his place, because if hon. gentlemen make statements of this character, and make such statements as are not borne out by the facts, then it is the duty of hon. members to challenge them and have those hon. gentlemen place themselves on record in this House, which is the proper place, so that the people will not be misled in condemning the Government for granting subsidies in various constituencies. It has been frequently said that hon. gentlemen opposite run down this country. This is correct if the hon. gentleman's statement be true, that this road runs through a section of country where there is nothing but sand. I want the hon. gentleman to come down to East Elgin and make that statement to the electors, and he will soon find out that it will have greater effect than finding fault with the granting of subsidies. In order to show that the Government was justified in granting the subsidy I may say that the Ontario Government at the last session of the legislature voted a subsidy of $2,000 per mile to the Tilsonburg and Port Burwell Railway Company. What induced the Government to do this ? It was because they felt it was a section of country which required a railway. Their policy, as everybody who understands anything regarding the Government in Ontario, knows, has been to make no grants in old settled counties for railways, but recognizing the importance of building a railway through that section they reversed their usual policy and granted to the road a subsidy of $2,000 per mile. I am glad the hon. member for Bothwell is now in his place. If this statement was not made by the hon. gentleman, let him deny it. He can take which horn of the dilemma he chooses. If the hon. gentleman denies that he made the statement, then he and the hon. member for North Wellington must settle the matter between themselves : but as regards the county of Elgin, the statement made by the hon. gentleman is incorrect. The road is not built yet, and the statement cannot therefore be true that any man under thirty years of age could carry on his back all the traffic that would pass over the road.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to say, Mr. Speaker, that I never said there was a road in existence from Tilsonburg to Port Burwell.

Mr. INGRAM. What did you say ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am answering what the hon. gentleman has read. I know there is no railway in existence there, and

I never said there was a road in existence, nor did I discuss the amount of freight or traffic over the road. I said this: That there was a line proposed to be subsidized by the Government there that never would be built, that there was no traffic to sustain a road in that quarter, and what is more, that it was proposed to subsidize the line to aid the hon. gentleman in an election. I say that now.

Mr. INGRAM. And I deny that statement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say, the hon. gentleman knows that no road could be built there with any hope or expectation that it would pay running expenses, and that being so, the hon. gentleman knows right well that if a road were proposed there, it was not proposed with any hope or expectation that the road would be constructed, but that a few electors living along the line between Tilsonburg and Port Burwell might be influenced in the hon. gentleman's favour.

Mr. INGRAM. Permit me to state——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. INGRAM. I am in order. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills). My election took place on the 5th February, 1892, and the subsidy was not granted until the 8th July, 1892, and how could that have affected my election?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) has got out of this in a very philosophical way. There was not a definiteness about it nor a reference to the locality——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has no right to question the statement I have made. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) has read a letter here and asked me to repeat what I did say. I have told the hon. gentleman what I said. He was not present, and he is not in a position to question any report of what I have said.

Mr. SPROULE. Evidently this gentleman whoever he was, must have written immediately after the language was used by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), and he therefore was likely to remember, and to refer to a specific instance that must have been mentioned——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite in order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, you are not.

Mr. SPROULE. This gentleman must have referred to some specific incident that took place at the time, and I assume that he was referring to what took place, and was more likely, or as likely, to be as near correct as the hon. member (Mr. Mills) must be now, after the lapse of several months; and who, on the spur of the moment, is endeavouring to call on his memory as to what took place a long time ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have stated explicitly what I did say, or to the effect of what I said, and having made that statement the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has no right to get up in this House and question it. He is not in order to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman does not say he said it, but he says he meant to say it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I said what I did say.

Mr. SPROULE. He should have said it if he meant to say it, but he did not say it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. If he withdraws the statement now, and goes back on his record, I am quite satisfied.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) wish to deny the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not denying it at all. I say, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) wishes to deny it now, I am satisfied. I am not questioning it, but on the contrary I am perfectly satisfied with his explanation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then sit down.

Mr. SPROULE. I have a perfect right to speak, and I shall.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has no right to call in question what I have said.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has a perfect right to criticise what the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said. He is doing that and he is perfectly in order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He is not in order. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) was doing, was to dispute the correctness of my hon. friend's (Mr. Mills) statement, which he has no right to do.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) was criticising the statement of the hon. gentleman, and in that he was in order.

Mr. LAURIER. He was not in order. He was contradicting the statement of the hon. gentleman from Bothwell.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) said that he accepted the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell, and then he was called to order when he was proceeding with his speech. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has a right to the floor.

Mr. SPROULE. I said he was doing it in a philosophical manner. I said that I was

satisfied with the hon. gentleman's explanation and denial, and what more does he want? If he was wrong before and correct now I am satisfied, and if he was correct before and wrong now, I am satisfied. It does not matter which way.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) proceeded a moment ago to quote the opinion of witnesses, who, he said, were present, against the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Mills). He had no right to do that.

Mr. SPROULE. I said if such and such a thing had taken place, under the circumstances it was reasonable to suppose that the statement of this gentleman was likely to be as correct as the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) who calls up the subject to his memory now after a lapse of several months, and, I think, there is nothing wrong in that. With reference to the Bill before the House, Sir, I think it is a very important and at the same time a very drastic measure. Let us consider for a moment that there are practically only two great railway corporations in Canada to-day, and that these two railway companies have largely absorbed all the shorter railways of the country, whether they are branch lines or important trunk lines. Now, in connection with these two great railways, there are many subsidies given both by provincial and Dominion Governments, and this Bill, if passed, would apply directly and indirectly to every person who was connected with these two great railways, or any subordinate railways. The Bill says:

> Or (j.) being a director, officer or contractor of any railway company to which any subsidy, advance, loan or bonus of public money has been granted or made by the Governor in Council or by Parliament, and while any part of such subsidy, advance, loan, or bonus is a subsisting claim against the Government, either directly or indirectly, by himself or by any person on his behalf, subscribes, furnishes or gives, or promises to subscribe, furnish or give, any money or other valuable consideration, for the purpose of promoting the election of any candidate, or of any number, class, or party of candidates, to a legislature or to Parliament, or with the intent in any way of influencing or affecting the result of a provincial or Dominion election.

Now, let me give an example for the purpose of making myself plain, and I wish the hon. gentleman to excuse me if I refer to him personally. I think the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), is a director of a short line of railway that is to-day run by the Grand Trunk Railway. Suppose that railway were being extended to the lake, and suppose that either the provincial or Dominion Government was to give a subsidy for the continuation of that railway, which would be very natural as they have given it for the line at present built; then my hon. friend would be unable, directly or indirectly, and as the Bill provides, to subscribe any money for any election, provincial or federal, even though the money might be legitimately used. It does not matter whether the candidate should be for a Dominion or provincial election, or whether he belong to one party or the other. I assume that he would give the money for legitimate purposes in an election contest, but if this Bill were passed the hon. gentleman would be deliberately violating the law, and could be called to account for it before the courts of the country. I think the measure entirely too drastic, because if you remember the number of subordinate lines that are owned by these two great corporations, and that are being extended in different directions in Manitoba, the North-west Territories, British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and in Prince Edward Island; one can readily understand how it would be possible to connect almost every public man in the Dominion, directly or indirectly, with these two railway corporations. If they gave to the extent of one dollar for the promotion of an election, it would make them amenable to an infraction of the law under this Bill. It seems to me that that would be going much further than it was ever contemplated to go by any law which provided for punishing corruption at elections. Now, I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edgar), when he drafted this Bill, never thought of this, or at least, that he never looked carefully into this Bill; or else that he did not hope the Bill should pass, for if he did he would not have put it on the Order paper; because I believe the hon. gentleman himself would be one of the first to suffer under the operation of this Bill. I do not know whether he is now interested in any railway; but if not now, he was only a few years ago interested in a railway, for which, I understand, he hoped to receive some Government aid. I do not know whether he did or did not receive it. It might be fair enough that he should receive it in the interests of the ratepayers who would be benefited by that railway; but if he did receive it, and his own Bill became law, and he attempted to support a candidate, by giving or promising to give any money or other valuable consideration to secure his election, he would be violating his own law, and be liable to punishment. I do not think he contemplated that. If I know anything of the hon. gentleman, he would not go through any such contest without violating this law. I think the Bill is going too far. Again, it provides that if this is done "for the purpose of promoting the election of any candidate, or of any number, class or party of candidates," the law will be violated. It does not matter whether it is an individual candidate, a number of candidates, a party or class of candidates, or whether the election be for a Dominion or provincial legislature; if he gave money or other valuable consideration for the promotion of the election, he would

be violating this law. If this Bill were on the statute-book to-day, I think we could scarcely run an election without having parties brought before the courts for violation of the law. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman, being a lawyer, would suffer indirectly from that; because if litigation was the outcome of his Bill, the profession would be benefited. But I am very far from supposing that the hon. gentleman is so mercenary in his nature as to propose it for that purpose. I think he has done it inadvertently, with the object of intimidating parties who might be interested in railways, either directly or indirectly, such as parties belonging to a municipality or a county, or directors or officers or contractors. They would be held accountable for their conduct if they took part in a provincial or Dominion election. Therefore, I say this Bill goes too far, and I do not think the judgment of the House is that it ought to become law; I do not think the good sense of the House will allow it to become law; and I do not think the hon. gentleman will gain much from the cheap popularity that will come to him from the introduction of a Bill of this character, which he cannot reasonably hope will become law or ever be put into practice.

Mr. TISDALE. I regret that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has left the Chamber, because I wished to correct some things that he said while he was here; but I will make the correction in his absence, as it may not be possible to do so at another time. I wish to explain how impossible it was that the subsidy granted could affect the election of my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), because, as he explained, and I will take the liberty of repeating, so that the facts will be known to every member of the House, the hon. member for East Elgin was elected in 1891; he was unseated and was re-elected in February, 1892; and the subsidy was granted in July, 1892; so that it was impossible that it could in any way affect the election. Another statement of the hon. gentleman I wish to correct, because I know that part of the country. This railway runs along the western border of the riding I have the honour to represent, and one of the municipalities in my riding voted a subsidy for it. The hon. gentleman said that the municipalities through which it runs are all sand, and that a man could carry on his shoulders all the freight that it would have, and therefore, he said, the railway could not be built, and it would be useless if built. The hon. gentleman made a very sweeping condemnation of the railway. Yet this House voted $3,200 a mile for that railway, and from the information submitted to it; and as the hon. member for East Elgin said, the Ontario Government were so impressed with its importance that they reversed the policy they had followed for years of not granting any more aid to railways in the old settled parts of Ontario, and last session granted it $2,000 a mile. In addition to these subsidies, the municipalities through which it runs for the sixteen miles voted for it $52,000 or $53,000 of bonuses; and I want to tell the hon. gentleman that these municipalities know a great deal more about that country than he does. The hon. gentleman ought not to make such statements without some personal knowledge on the subject. If he would visit that part of the country and see the sort of country it is, I am sure he would be fair enough to take back the words he has uttered here to-night to its discredit. I have no hesitation in saying that while it would not pay a company to build that road without assistance, yet, with the subsidies which have been granted, it would pay the interest on the small amount of money that would be required in addition, besides paying operating expenses. There is a large tract of country to the east of this road. The nearest point where there is a railway on the lake to the east is Port Rowan, about thirty miles distant; and on the west is Port Stanley, I presume, about 50 miles distant. There is a wide tract of country between these two points that the railway would serve, and it would obtain a fair amount of traffic in that part of the country from the lake to Tilsonburg, where it would connect with the Grand Trunk and with the Canada Southern Division of the Michigan Central. So that it would be a most important factor in the development of that district, and in providing proper railway communication to one of the oldest parts of Ontario, which heretofore has been without it. I am surprised at the statements of the hon. member for Bothwell, because, as a rule, he is careful in his utterances upon subjects of this sort, and I believe he always intends to be fair. He should not make statements so utterly unsupported in regard to the motives that induced this Government to grant the aid, because, as the facts show, he is entirely mistaken, the aid having been granted long subsequent to the election. In the by-election of 1892 I had the pleasure of being in the township of Bayham, which is one of the largest townships in the county of Elgin, advocating the election of my hon. friend who so ably represents the east riding in this House. I never heard the question of the subsidy in connection with that road discussed during that election, and it was not voted for months afterwards. I deprecate strongly, gentlemen, no matter from what side of the House, coming into a constituency and making statements with reference to public undertakings without having previously prepared themselves with a correct knowledge of the facts, and I am surprised that the hon. member for Bothwell should have so forgotten himself and allowed himself to

be led so wide of the facts as regards this subsidy. It has the endorsement of this House, which voted the subsidy, and of the municipalities which gave other generous subsidies, and it has, besides, the endorsement of the Ontario Government, which went out of its way to make an exception in favour of this road, so strongly did that Government believe in the necessity and the importance of this enterprise which my hon. friend attacked.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Twenty-seventh annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, 1894—Fisheries.—(Mr. Costigan)

ADJOURNMENT—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. What does the hon. gentleman propose to take up to-morrow?

Mr. FOSTER. I am very anxious to get the Supplementary Estimates through, because the session is going on to a great length, and we shall have to get these Estimates into the shape of a Bill in order to get money for certain services which are urgent. To-morrow I shall try to finish the supplementaries, and then shall try to take up the other Estimates, and I hope my hon. friend will be in a good mood and humour to expedite business.

Mr. LAURIER. I would be in a far better mood if the hon. gentleman would state what he intends to do with regard to the policy of the country—whether we are to have those measures of which we have heard a great deal, but as to which he will not express his intentions. If he would, that, perhaps, would be a very effective way of expediting business. I may say that my hon. friend beside me has an amendment to make to-morrow on the subject of the Curran Bridge on going into Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. Minister of Railways bring down the accounts promised with reference to the expenditure on Sir John Thompson's funeral?

Mr. HAGGART. I will bring them down at the opening of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that my hon. friend appears to be very insistent.

Mr. LAURIER. I am.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask him whether in the history of the Canadian Parliament, the House has ever been, at so early a stage of the session, in possession of so much information with respect to the exact amount of legislation, estimates, subsidies, &c., that would be brought down by the Government? More than a month ago, almost, every important piece of legislation that the Government intended to bring down was outlined. The statement was made that no further supplementary Estimates this year may be looked for, and that no railway subsidies would be placed before the House. I just bring that fact to the attention of my hon. friend. A clean bill, with one single exception, was given to the House, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite have shown, I think, an undue amount of dissatisfaction because of that one little item.

Mr. LAURIER. A little item of $2,500,000, as to which the Government came to a conclusion two months or more ago, and as to which they are not able to say whether or not they will abide by their judgment. If the hon. gentleman were able to say now "We have passed the order and intend to follow it up, or we have changed our minds," we would have something definite.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not keep the hon. gentleman much longer in doubt.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 13th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 110) for the relief of Mary Bradshaw Falding (from the Senate).—(Mr. Taylor.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

REPORT.

Report of the Board of Civil Service Examiners, for the year ended 31st December, 1894.—(Mr. Montague.)

STATE FUNERALS.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked, What are the names of the Canadians who have had a public funeral at the expense of the State, since the year 1867? What was the total outlay for the funeral in each case?

Mr. OUIMET. 1. Sir Geo. Et. Cartier, Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir John Thompson. 2. For the funeral of Sir Geo. Cartier the

amount in the Public Accounts is given as $10,000. For Sir John A. Macdonald the expenditure was $6,938.02. For the funeral of Sir John Thompson the accounts are not yet adjusted but will amount, it is expected, to about the sum voted, viz., $25,000. I find in the Public Accounts that the Government paid $295 on account of the funeral of T. D'Arcy McGee.

I. C. R. TIME-TABLE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked. Is the new time-table of the Intercolonial Railway now decided upon? If so, at what hour will the passenger train and express be due at Lévis?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, the time-table is now decided upon. The through express will arrive at Lévis at 16.00 o'clock. The local express will arrive at Lévis at 13.30 o'clock.

CAP ST. IGNACE STATION—I. C. R.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, When is the Railway Department going to begin the construction of the new siding on the Intercolonial at Cap St. Ignace station, as recommended by Mr. James Yeo, roadmaster, and as promised by the officials at Moncton?

Mr. HAGGART. There is no information as regards a new siding at Cap St. Ignace, but the General Manager has been asked for the facts in relation thereto, and his reply has not yet reached Ottawa.

FREE GOODS IMPORTED BY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. CASEY asked, What are the details as to description, classification and value of the goods imported, free of duty, by the Government during the last fiscal year?

Mr. WALLACE. The information asked for by the hon. member as to "what are the details as to description, classification and value of the goods imported, free of duty, by the Government during the last fiscal year," cannot be furnished except by getting a special return from the ports, as the department has no record of the details required. Therefore, the hon. member will require to move for an Order of the House.

Mr. CASEY. Let it stand until the information comes in.

Mr. WALLACE. That might take some weeks, and the information would be too voluminous to read.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The greater portion of the information the hon. gentleman requires was given in a return that was brought down some few days ago.

Mr. OUIMET.

MANITOBA SCHOOLS—COMMUNICATIONS WITH HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, 1. Whether it is the fact that negotiations have recently taken place between His Excellency the Governor General and the Honourable Messrs. Greenway and Sifton, Premier and Attorney General of Manitoba, on the subject of or in relation to the action of the legislature of that province on the remedial order passed by the Governor General in Council on the subject of the Public Schools Act of the province, or in connection therewith? 2. Was the Governor General in these negotiations acting on the advice of the Privy Council, or in what capacity? 3. Have the negotiations been concluded? 4. Is it the intention of the Government to bring down to the House the history and result of the negotiations, and if not, why not?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy), I may say, that nothing which could be called "negotiations," in the proper acceptation of that word, have taken place recently between His Excellency the Governor General and the Hon. Messrs. Greenway and Sifton; &c., &c. But, the Governor General has had some communication with these gentlemen at Ottawa. In these negotiations—if the question is a question of fact—the answer to it is: That the Governor General was not acting on the advice of the Privy Council. The negotiations,—as I have said, in the former reply there was nothing that could be called negotiations—I believe the communications have been concluded. There is nothing to bring down to the House as to the history.

WHARF AT MAGOG, P.Q.

Mr. RIDER asked, Has the Government purchased any property in the town of Magog, province of Quebec, for a public wharf? Where is it located, and does the purchase include necessary land for wharf and approaches thereto? Who were the owners, and through what party is the purchase being negotiated? What will be the gross cost of the purchase, and what sum will be required to put the property in suitable condition for public use?

Mr. OUIMET. Steps are now being taken through the Department of Justice to purchase the wharf now existing at Magog. The wharf is situated at the foot of the street immediately west of the Canadian Pacific Railway station, distant from said station about 125 feet. The purchase will include the land and approaches. Messrs C. C. Smith & Co. are the present owners of the wharf. The purchase is being made through the Department of Justice. The gross cost of the purchase will be $2,500, and the Chief Engineer reports that $200 will be required

to put the property in suitable condition for public use.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES--GENERAL REVENUE FUND.

Mr. DALY moved that, to-morrow, the House do resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that any payment heretofore made to the General Revenue Fund of the North-west Territories of any fine, penalty or forfeiture which belonged to Her Majesty for the public uses of Canada, or of any portion of any such fine, penalty or forfeiture, be ratified, and that the amount of such fine, penalty or forfeiture, or portion thereof, need not be paid over to Her Majesty to be applied to such public uses.

Motion agreed to.

LOBSTER FISHING SEASON.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with respect to a telegram which I have just received, whether or not he has granted an extension of twenty days, or any other time, in the lobster fishing season to the lobster fisheries on the coast of Prince Edward Island from West Point to St. Peters ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. An extension has been granted, and I think, within the district named by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FORBES. Does that extension extend as far north as the coast of Labrador ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No ; it is confined to the district named by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I.

PROTECTION OF OTTAWA PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. CASEY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct the attention of the House, and especially of the hon. Minister of Public Works, to the injury done this morning by lightning to one of the buildings on these grounds. The fact, as reported to me, is that the lightning also struck this block in which the Houses of Parliament are situated ; it appears that the current was felt and played pranks in several of the rooms. I may say, in parantheses, that I believe some of the committees were slightly electrified this forenoon by lightning or otherwise. But, speaking seriously, the fact has been demonstrated that these buildings, in spite of their national character and public usefulness, are liable to be struck by lightning as well as other buildings. The startling fact appears also to be demonstrated that these buildings are not protected by lightning rods ; and I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the advisability and necessity of having lightning rods placed upon them for the protection of the lives of the people who are obliged to remain within them, as well as of the public property. I hope it is too late in the day to argue that lightning rods are a necessity. When the buildings are struck, the large amount of iron in the floor joists and in the walls appears to become saturated with electricity, which escapes by way of the electric light, telegraph and telephone wires. I believe that the iron in the buildings has been relied on too much to carry off the lightning. It appears that it is not sufficient, and something ought to be done to increase the protection of these buildings.

THE FISHERIES ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 67) further to amend the Fisheries Act. He said : I gave a short explanation of this Bill when it was introduced : but perhaps it would be well now to state more fully the reasons which seem to call for this measure at present. Before last year there were two Acts of Parliament dealing with the throwing into rivers of sawdust and other matters injurious to fish. One was a clause of the Fisheries Act preventing the throwing of all such objectionable matters into rivers frequented by certain kinds of fish. But it contained a proviso giving power to the Governor in Council to exempt certain rivers and certain portions of rivers where the exemption might be given with safety to the fish. The other Act was that for the Protection of Navigable Waters, which contained and still contains a clause prohibiting those objectionable matters being thrown into rivers, and containing also a proviso giving power to the Governor General in Council to exempt rivers or portions of rivers where that might be done with safety to navigation. Last year a short amendment was made in the Fisheries Act, which in effect terminated all exemptions heretofore granted, on the 1st day of May last ; but no change was made in the Act for the Protection of Navigable Rivers. Under that Act the Governor in Council has still power to exempt navigable rivers, but not such rivers as are inhabited by the fish named in the Fisheries Act.

Mr. LAURIER. What kind of fish are they ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the names of the fish. It was considered a great hardship, especially to the mill-owners, who had been exempt for many years, that this exemption should be swept away so suddenly. The House will remember that several inquiries and investigations have been made into this subject. We have representations made by scientific men, by engineers and millwrights, practical men who examined a great number of the mills on the Ottawa

River; and it is their undoubted opinion that in the case of most of the mills—those of older construction—their structure could not be changed so as to comply with the law without almost entirely rebuilding them. I propose by this Bill to deal with the matter in a temporary way. I propose that the Bill should only have effect for two years, for these reasons. It would restore during that period exemptions already given in good faith to the mills on the rivers named in the Orders in Council, and would restore the power of giving such other exemptions, within that term of two years, as it may be found necessary and just to give. I propose a limit of two years because I think that within that time the whole question may be dealt with in a more practical way than it possibly can be at present. I mentioned the River St. John, the other day, and I am afraid that some hon. members misunderstood my object in mentioning that river alone. I simply spoke of it as one of the international rivers where it would be a hardship to enforce a regulation on the one side while the mill-owners on the other were left free to do as they pleased. I simply meant that the object of the law would not be accomplished unless the same legislation applied to both sides of the river, and that remark, of course, applies equally to the St. Croix and other international rivers. I simply mentioned the St. John as an illustration, because it is the largest in volume and longest in length, as regards the boundaries between the two countries. Another reason why this delay should be given is to enable us to prepare a more perfect measure. That whole question is now under consideration. Our commissioner, who is in communication with the commissioner of the United States on other subjects, has brought this matter to the attention of the United States authorities, and we have the assurance that it will receive their attention with a view of co-operating in some joint regulations. It is only reasonable therefore that we should await that action on their part. Another reason is that the Act does not define to what rivers it applies; and after full inquiries, a measure may be introduced by which a large number of small streams and brooks in inland sections of the country might be exempted entirely, because the House may decide that they are not, in a practical sense, navigable rivers. With regard to the Fisheries Act, there is certainly, quite a number of rivers of different sizes that might certainly be exempted from its operation, because the construction of mills and the putting of sawdust into those rivers could not possibly injuriously affect the fish. These are the reasons which induce me to ask the House to pass this measure for a term of two years. Hon. gentlemen may ask if we have made an inquiry, because an inquiry was promised. My predecessor appointed a commissioner to visit as many of these places as possible so as to report the facts, and he has visited the majority perhaps of the mills east of Ottawa. His inquiry is not yet complete. We require a full report, not only with regard to the mills, but the rivers as well.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not intend to discuss this Bill at length. The proviso which the Minister asked the House to adopt is one which vests in himself the absolute discretion of determining what rivers shall be exempt or whether the mill-owners on such rivers shall wholly or partially be exempt from the operation of the Act. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that such discretion does not exist at present.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was taken away by the Act of last year and expired the 1st of May.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to re-establish it in the law,——

Mr. COSTIGAN. For a limited time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—which will necessarily cover the coming elections; and although it would be unfair to assume that any Minister would use an important discretion for political purposes, still it is fair to ask whether Parliament should, in legislating upon this subject, divest itself of a power which it ought itself to exercise and hand it over to the Minister to exercise or not at his mere discretion. I think the principle is bad. If the Government determine that any exemptions ought in the public interest to be made, the Minister of Marine should be prepared to submit those exemptions to the judgment of Parliament, and ask Parliament to put them in the form of a statute.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is not new.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The discretion existed before, but it was taken away by statute, and now the hon. gentleman proposes to re-enact it. I say that is an unfair way of legislating.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has forgotton that this was the law for years. The right to exercise that discretion obtained ever since the Fishery Act was adopted. It certainly existed between 1874 and 1878 and was acted upon. The hon. gentleman could not, I think, have caught exactly the explanation of the Minister of Marine, because this is not a case of resorting to power by the Minister at all. Those conversant with the lumber industry will know that the people interested in that business, regardless of politics, made out a case to the satisfaction, at any rate, of the Minister of Marine, which he now practically presents to the House. They represented that a sudden change of the law from what it was last year——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not express any disapproval of any judgment the Minister of Marine might arrive at, but I submit that his judgment should be submitted to the House. It may be perfectly right, and the majority of the House may vote for it, but my objection was, not to the judgment he may have reached, but to his reserving full discretion to himself.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has raised an important question on which, as I am informed, there is no difference of opinion, and that is the policy, in a case of this kind, of leaving Parliament to say what special privileges in these waters mill-owners should possess I never knew a more difficult responsibility to discharge than the exercise of that discretion. The hon. gentleman has suggested a suspicion in connection with the elections. Well, all sort of suspicions must and did arise every time that power was exercised by the Governor in Council. But the present Minister of Marine, because he does not ask to have that power restored to the Governor in Council, or vested in the Minister, or to have it taken out of the hands of Parliament. But he says, owing to these inconveniences, and owing to the effect of the sudden cessation of these exemptions upon the trade of this country, it is asked that the power that was in the Government permanently should be restored temporarily, that is until 1897, so that preparations may be made in the case of the vast number of waters where the exemption obtained, where the business was altogether arranged in view of that exemption, and where, in some cases, it was found after the notice of the law was received, to be absolutely impossible, without very heavy loss and, in some cases, stoppage of business altogether, to comply with the law. So the hon. gentleman will observe that there is no attempt to obtain a restoration of the responsibility, which is so difficult to discharge on the part of any executive, but simply a proposal to adopt the best means by which a sudden loss and sudden interruption of business to parties who may be considered, to some extent, to have acquired vested rights in this regard, may be averted. And I know enough of the representations that have been made to know that they come from all parts of the country, and were wholly separate and apart from political considerations.

Mr. EDWARDS. I desire to say a few words with regard to the Bill now under consideration; and, being a lumberman largely engaged in the business, and one who does not put either sawdust or mill refuse in the river, my evidence, I think, should be received as that of an unbiassed witness. For many years, under the statute it was illegal to put sawdust in the river, but with the proviso that the Governor General in Council had the power to exempt from the operation of the law such streams as, in the discretion of the Government, it was deemed proper to exempt. At the last session of Parliament an amendment to the Fisheries Act was introduced in the Senate and came over to this House and was passed in the dying days of the session. It was passed through this House, I think, in one day, at a time when the House was holding two or three sittings in the same day. I happened to be absent at the time, or I would have opposed the passage of the Bill. I would have opposed it, not because it would affect me individually in any sense, but because I believe, in the public interest, the Bill should not have become law. Now, there are a great many who believe that the putting of sawdust in the river—I will deal with the Ottawa only, because it is the one with which I am most conversant—is an injury to navigation. Let me say at once that if I had my choice, I would prefer that the sawdust should not be put in the river, but I think the question ought to be decided upon considerations of whether the putting of sawdust in the river would be a greater injury to the country than would be involved in the effort to prevent the practice. I am engaged not only in sawing but in navigation upon the river, and I make this statement: That in no place whatever in the Ottawa River, except at the foot of the locks, is any injury done to navigation by the presence of the sawdust. There is no point, even in the shallow places, where there is a less depth of water than there was twenty or thirty or forty years ago. It is true that some of the bays may fill up to some extent, but, so far as the navigation of the river in concerned, the putting of the sawdust in the river is no injury at all. Boatmen, pleasure seekers, may perhaps meet with trifling difficulties; but, so far as navigation is concerned, no injury is done. I think that the great question, so far as the Ottawa River is concerned, is whether a great and important industry is to be very seriously interfered with, or whether a few pleasure-seekers are to suffer some little inconvenience upon some occasions. Now as to the question of the two years being given, to my own knowledge, those who came to urge this point upon the Government came perfectly independent of political considerations. And not only so, Mr. Speaker, but shortly after the opening of Parliament, I presented a petition in this House signed by nearly every owner of property between this city and Grenville on both sides of the river, asking that the clause passed last session be rescinded. Now, who are the people who should be considered—the property owners along the banks of the river who use the river constantly, or a number of gentlemen living in the city of Ottawa who have very little use for the river at all? I think by all means the owners of property and those who navigate the river are those who ought first to be considered. Now, it may seem very strange to hon. gentlemen, that I should advocate

this proposal as I do. At Rockland we own steam mills where we can burn the sawdust with very great facility: in fact it is the easiest way for us to dispose of it. There we have always burned our sawdust and mill refuse. At our mills at New Edinburgh, the conditions are entirely different from those affecting other water mills on the Ottawa River. There we take our power from the Rideau River as it falls into the Ottawa, and have a very high head. Our mill is built on the bank of the river on a very high cliff, and we are practically in the same position as if our mill were a steam mill. We have facilities for accumulating the sawdust and taking it out. Our reason for putting up a burner is that we have a very small discharge from our mill into the Ottawa, and sawdust there put in would be an injury to ourselves. That is the reason why, in the construction of the mill, we provided for burning the refuse. I may say I have had a very long—well, no, I will not say a very long but a very considerable—experience in saw-milling; and I think I understand this question pretty fairly well. Now the position of the other water mills on the river is simply this: They are constructed, just as water mills usually are, in the bed of the stream, in order to get the greatest head of water possible. That being the case, the machinery is all down in the lower part of the mill, and during high water in the spring of the year, the water actually comes up to the level of the sawing floor, and is only kept out of the machinery by the dam. Now, a great many think that it is possible for gentlemen owning mills so constructed to dispose of the sawdust just as we are doing. From my experience, I say that it is impossible. In most cases, a very large expenditure, indeed, would be required in order to accumulate the sawdust and elevate it into the burners to be consumed; and, in most cases, in fact in almost every case, I think that reconstruction would have to take place. Now, as the law stands to-day, every one of these mills is liable at any time to be fined. Let me ask: What would be the condition if these mills were prosecuted under the Act, and should cease to run? The effect would simply be this, that plentiful as labour is, large as are the number of men unemployed, thousands of men on the Ottawa River would be thrown out of employment. Under these circumstances, I think that the Government, at least, should make a temporary arrangement whereby the mills may be able to proceed with the work, and the labourers of the country continue to be employed. There are those who think that if this large expenditure for reconstruction were forced upon the lumbermen, the cost of such reconstruction would come out of the lumbermen themselves. I deny that in toto. It would come out of the country, and out of the labour of the country; because all constructions of the kind, in fact, all constructions of every kind may temporarily come out of the proprietor but ultimately it comes out of the labour of the country. To enforce the law as it now stands would be a very serious infliction to the Ottawa Valley; in fact, it would imperil the whole business of the Ottawa River; and I think every hon. gentleman will agree with me that the lumber business on that river is our greatest business. Now, I sincerely hope, in the interests of the Ottawa River, and in the interests of the country, that the law now proposed by the Minister of Marine will go into effect, and that, within a period of two years, an arrangement may be made whereby this matter will be finally settled. There is, I think, a question of vested rights to be considered. When this business was begun on the Ottawa River, and on all the other rivers where it exists, it was very small, but it gradually grew and attained the great proportion it has to-day. A very large expenditure has been incurred in mill construction, and a large amount of money has been invested in other ways connected with this industry. If this change has to be made all over Canada, it will be a very serious loss, indeed, to the country. Now, what I would suggest is this: Looking forward two years to the time when it is hoped some arrangement may be made, I would suggest that all mills at present in operation on such rivers as the Ottawa, where no great injury to navigation is done, should be allowed to continue their operations as at present, but the law should provide that any new mills that may be constructed shall be obliged to dispose of their sawdust and other refuse otherwise than putting it in the river.

Mr. AMYOT. Speak about fish.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, so far as fish is concerned, it is true that some maintain that fishing has been seriously injured by throwing mill refuse into the Ottawa River: but I have lived all my life on the river, and am unable to say whether that is the case or not. My own opinion is that it is not the case. It is true that years ago there were more fish in the river than there are to-day, but it is also true that there are far more fishermen on the river to-day than there were years ago. Fishing is now carried on for commercial purposes, and, consequently, the fish are being more rapidly taken out. There is another thing. The Carillon dam down at the foot of Long Sault, prevents certain fish coming up the river, and that is, I think, another reason why the quantity of fish may have been lessened. But if the sawdust were injurious to the fish, I think they would have ceased altogether to exist in that river. Many kinds of fish that existed years ago are still found here, but perhaps in less numbers than formerly. But let me remind the House that the petition presented to this Parliament by myself, bore the names of

nearly every fisherman on the river ; in fact, I think every fisherman signed the petition. As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, I am not at all personally interested in this question. I am not interesting myself in favour of the lumbermen ; I have not been solicited by the lumbermen to interest myself in this matter ; but knowing all the conditions, and having regard to the great importance of the lumber industry in the Ottawa Valley, and knowing that no very serious injury is done by putting the sawdust in the river, I take the position on this question that I have stated.

Mr. DEVLIN. I merely rise to endorse what has been so well said by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). I would like to take up a point that was made a moment ago by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) in regard to political considerations that may be connected with this question. I can assure him that whatever power may be vested in the hands of the Minister in that respect, one party cannot suffer from its exercise much more than the other, inasmuch as those who are interested in the lumber business, so far at least as the Ottawa River is concerned, belong to both parties, and if punishment is meted out to one, it is sure to be meted out to the other. A short time ago considerable alarm was felt by the lumber interests of the Ottawa Valley in regard to the law as it stands. They felt that if the law were enforced, their interests, their vested rights, as the hon. member for Russell has put it, would suffer. Now, if the representations made by the lumber merchants of the Ottawa Valley are true, and I believe they are true, namely, that if the law were carried out they would be obliged to remove their mills, what would the consequences be ? Why, Sir, the removal of the mills from Ottawa—I speak solely of the Ottawa Valley, and not in regard to any other river—would be a serious blow to the trade of the city of Ottawa, and a serious blow to the trade of the city of Hull. We know, as a matter of fact, that the population of the city of Hull, and a large part of the population of the city of Ottawa, depend upon the maintenance of those mills for their subsistence. Any one who visits the Chaudière at almost any time of the day during the summer months, will perceive the hundreds, nay, the thousands, of men who are there employed, who are earning their living in those mills. The hon. member for Russell has pointed out, and has established, that the erection of those burners, and the means of conveying the refuse into those burners, would entail an immense cost upon the lumbermen of the Chaudière, owing to the peculiar situation of their mills. There is a question whether the throwing of sawdust into the Ottawa is a greater nuisance than would be the smoke from burners. It is a very serious question. From burners erected in all the lumber mills on the Ottawa in the immediate vicinity of Hull, a cloud of smoke would arise that would prove more disagreeable and a greater nuisance to the city of Ottawa than is the throwing of sawdust into the river as a nuisance to pleasure-seekers. If any persons have the right to complain in regard to the sawdust in the Ottawa, they are the landowners in the Ottawa Valley, especially those whose properties border on the river, and the member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) has represented that petitions have recently been signed by almost every landowner, showing that they offer no objection to the Bill introduced by the Minister of Marine. I merely rose for the purpose of seconding what was said so well by the hon. member for Russell, and giving my word, also, in favour of affording that protection to the lumber merchants of the Chaudière to which they were entitled.

Sir JAMES GRANT. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the observations that have fallen from two very practical men in regard to this matter of sawdust in the rivers of Canada ; one, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), and the other the hon. member for the county of Ottawa (Mr. Devlin). Both those gentlemen live in this section of the country, and one is practically and largely concerned in the manufacture of lumber. His observations were of a technical character, and he, being a thoroughly practical lumberman, and knowing the effect of sawdust in the streams, his opinion is one on which great reliance should be placed. During the time I have lived in the valley of the Ottawa, I have had the subject of sawdust before me. Many persons live under the idea that it is a deleterious substance. As a medical man, I will no doubt be asked to pronounce a medical opinion. As regards sawdust, what has been the practical results on the health of the community ? We know that throughout the length of the Ottawa Valley, where sawdust is passing down all the time, there is a large population. If we inquire into the life history of the people of this section, we find that in each family there are ten or twelve children at least. So that sawdust passing in the waters through the valley of the Ottawa cannot be injurious to health. In the second place, people speak of the destruction of fish in the Ottawa River. Let me tell this House that any individual who has lived here twenty-five years, and will compare the fish products then with what they are to-day, as seen in the market every Friday morning—for we know Friday is a good day for taking fish there—will find an exhibition of the finest fish produced in any of the tributaries of the rivers of the Dominion of Canada. Where do they come from ? Largely from the Ottawa, and from the very sections where, it is alleged, that sawdust is killing off the fish. In the third

place, I have a report by one of the first engineers of Canada, Mr. Sandford Fleming. He went into the whole subject most carefully, and prepared an elaborate report, and the statements in that report can be accepted with a considerable degree of credence. Riparian owners claim that they suffer damage from the operations of the lumber manufacturers. But what is this damage? It consists of a considerable amount of mill refuse being piled on the shore, which is sold annually for a considerable sum, besides supplying all the wood they require themselves for their purposes. That, however, is a point out of which some persons try to make a great deal. Mr. Sandford Fleming, in the concluding remarks of his report, said:

> With respect to the future, it is conclusively established that there is no probability of the navigation between Ottawa and Grenville being irredeemably destroyed, or seriously obstructed, from the cause assigned, for centuries to come.

I thoroughly believe in that opinion, for those who now sail up and down the Ottawa in ordinary steamers find the main channel is not obstructed. There are some places, side bays, where the sawdust has accumulated, but there is no material damage done. If we inquire into the character of the lumber trade, do we not find that the lumbermen of the Chaudière have contributed not only to the wealth and prosperity of the capital, but also to the progress of the whole Dominion as well. I do not think, when those men erected their mills they were impressed with the idea that sawdust was of such deleterious a nature as is now supposed by some people. It is true that the hon. member for Russell has recently put up a consuming appliance for sawdust; but let me tell the House that some of the large mills in this section are so constructed that it would be utterly impossible to put in such an appliance without entirely rebuilding the mills. Again, at Hawkesbury there is one of the largest mills in the Ottawa Valley, owned by the Ottawa Lumber Company. We know that mill is also built so that machinery of this description could not be applied. If we inqiure into the circumstances of the case, what are they? The mills which are pouring sawdust into the river at that point, where the rapids are, do not appear to be causing any material disadvantage whatever. They are not injuring navigation—for there is no navigation there. They are not injuring trade or commerce. They are not producing any deleterious influence on the wealth or health of the community. But some persons look upon this question as a big wall—they have sawdust in their eye constantly. They are getting up an agitation, for what purpose? Some consider it a matter of a local character, and they think that in it they have a great subject to discuss, and a great nuisance to put down. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that, looking at this question in the widest and most comprehensive sense, the observations of the hon. member for Russell are of such a character it is impossible to controvert them. I will take any man on the sawdust question and look into it with him, either as regards its physical effect, or its healthy character, or so far as trade and commerce are concerned. It is a subject that is constantly overdrawn. I support the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in introducing his Bill because he has put in it a clause which is based on common sense, that two years shall be allowed to elapse in order that the question may be entered into more fully than it is possible to do, even to-day, and at the end of those two years a practical solution of the difficulty may be reached whereby those mills which are known to be of such a character that it is impossible to make satisfactory arrangements for introducing the necessary apparatus, may reach some satisfactory conclusion as between the Government and the mill-owners, which will be advantageous, not only to our own people, but to the country at large.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are we to understand that the hon. gentleman lends the weight of his professional opinion to the proposition that the dissemination of sawdust is beneficial, not only to the fish in the river, but to the people on the banks?

Sir JAMES GRANT. I say it does not harm either the fish or the people.

Mr. FORBES. With respect to this Bill, let me say that a few days ago I moved for copies of the report of the expert sent by the Government to visit the rivers and streams with a view to ascertain what rivers should be permanently exempted from the Act of last session. I am glad that this Bill has been brought down by the Government. Of course, it is only a temporary measure; I trust, however, it will be made a permanent one after the arguments we have heard to-day. What I desire, however, particularly to ascertain, after the remarks made by the Minister and hon. members specially concerned in the great lumber interest, is this: Are the lumbermen to consider this Bill as notifying them that when the two years are elapsed they will have the whole force of the Government called into requisition to prevent sawdust being emptied into the rivers of the country? Are they to rest upon the assurance of the Government, and the statement of the Minister that this exemption will last for two years, and two years only, and, come what may, or cost what it will to the mill-owners of the country, whose interests are affected, they shall then be required to have their mills in such condition that there shall be no exemptions required; that all the sawdust will have to be destroyed, and that, by that time, their mills will have

to be so constructed as to utterly destroy the sawdust, or else that they will be obliged to shut down their mills?

Mr. DEVLIN. We will be in power then.

Mr. FORBES. I dare say the Liberal Government will be in power then, but we would like to have the benefit of the advice now of our friends in Opposition at that time.

Mr. FOSTER. You are two young optimists.

Mr. FORBES. I judge from the statement of the Minister of Agriculture in the Senate, that the Government are looking forward to the permanent exemption of merely the Ottawa River and the St. John River.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Bill covers all the rivers that were exempted.

Mr. FORBES. There is nothing in the Bill which leads one to come to the Minister's conclusion, but I have the statement of one of his confrères that that is the intention of the law, and members everywhere are discussing the exemption of the Ottawa River only.

Mr. DEVLIN. And the Gatineau.

Mr. FORBES. I ask the Government if they do not consider that other rivers are equally entitled to the same rights? The persons engaged in the lumber industry on other rivers than the Ottawa and St. John, have certain rights which must be recognized by whatever Government is in power. The rights of navigation only should be paramount to the rights of the lumberman, and the rights of the river fisheries should only come in the third place. Sawdust has no injurious effect upon the fisheries which are off the coast. We have had the opinion of an experimental medical man.

Mr. FOSTER. That is rough on him.

Mr. FORBES. I mean an expert medical man. We have had his opinion that sawdust is not against good health, but that on the contrary it tends to increase the population, even to a greater extent than the vigorous immigration policy of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. Why, then, should not this exemption apply to other rivers of the Dominion? In Nova Scotia we have rivers which are shorter than the Ottawa, but the waters of which run more rapidly and on which the protection of the fisheries is safeguarded better than on the Ottawa, and, therefore, I say that if there is any reason for exempting the Ottawa, these reasons apply with double force to the rivers of the maritime provinces, and especially the rivers on the south-western coast of Nova Scotia on which lumbermen have invested vast sums of money in the erection of mills. I ask the Government to tell the citizens of the south shore now, whether or not we are to interpret this Act as a notice to the mill-owners that they will be required to reconstruct their mills in order to comply with this law two years hence. Let them state now that there shall be no exemption of any rivers in the Dominion of Canada, if that is their intention. By this Act, the Government are notifying the mill-owners that they must reconstruct their mills so that they can destroy all deleterious matter which goes into the water, or otherwise that they will be obliged by this law to abandon their mills. That is the natural conclusion from the statement of the Minister of Marine, or else, on the other hand, we must assume that the Government are going to exempt all rivers which are now exempt. In the words of section 2 of the Bill:

> 2. Any exemptions granted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries under subsection two of section fifteen of The Fisheries Act, and in force on the thirtieth day of April, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, shall remain in force until the said thirtieth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, unless sooner revoked by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

—as political exigencies would require. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that all rivers now exempt, together with any rivers properly entitled to exemption, should be exempted at the end of two years from now, and if that is the real intention of the Government, why do they not state it now. The hon. Minister will see that for the two years there will be great perturbation as to whether mill-owners are going to be affected by this Bill or not. I trust that the Government will not act in such a way as would be calculated to cause the mill-owners to have frequent interviews and negotiations with them on this matter. The present Minister (Mr. Costigan) may not be aware, but his predecessor (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is aware, of the negotiations with the mill-owners which were carried on in New Brunswick last fall. There were then certain representations placed before the Government and certain promises made. These mill-owners rely upon the fact, as intimated to them by the Government officials, that there would be a permanent exemption made of certain rivers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was no such arrangement.

Mr. FORBES. Then there will be no permanent exemptions made in favour of the Ottawa River and the St. John River?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This Bill does not contemplate it.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. Minister begs the question. He says that there may be permanent exemption as regards Ottawa and St. John rivers, but he will not say that in regard to the maritime province rivers. Are the Ottawa and St. John rivers to be selected for special favour by the Government, and are the other rivers of the maritime pro-

vinces to have the law vigorously enforced in their regard ? Is this act only a temporary makeshift of the Government to curry favour with the mill-owners, and is it the intention of the Government later on to enforce the law vigorously ? If such is the case the mill-owners should understand it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The mill-owners understand it all right.

Mr. FORBES. I shall only be too glad to know that, if such be the case. Mr. Speaker, I add the plea that if the Minister of Marine is going to make anything like a law which will give permanent exemption, I demand with all the force possible, that the rivers of the maritime provinces, and especially those on the south coast of Nova Scotia, shall have equal privileges with any other rivers in the Dominion of Canada.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This Bill applies all over Canada.

Mr. FORBES. If any river in Canada is to get permanent exemption from the operation of last year's Act, then those rivers on the south shore of Nova Scotia should have it, and must have it. The lumbermen have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars there, and, as the member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) has well said : Every dollar they are compelled to spend to reconstruct their mills will be a direct tax on the labour of these several sections of the country. The mill-owners are therefore entitled to a square and honest declaration on the part of the Government with regard to these points I have mentioned.

Mr. BRYSON. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to say a word or two in reference to the very important question which is now before the House. At the outset, I wish to congratulate the Minister of Marine for the very prompt manner in which he has brought forward this Bill at the opening of the session. As was said by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), the Bill which passed this House last session was amended in the Senate during the dying days of the session. When the amendment came back to the House of Commons I did not notice that such an amendment was introduced, and had I been aware of it, I certainly would have directed the attention of the House to it at the time. For many years there has been very great discussion as to the results of the deposit of sawdust and mill refuse in the Ottawa River. Seventeen or eighteen years ago a petition was presented to this House in respect to that, and subsequently a Royal Commission took the evidence of experts who had examined the navigation of the river at the different points between Grenville and the city of Ottawa. The conclusion then arrived at was that the channel of the river was not materially disturbed by the deposit of sawdust. I understand that the survey of the Ottawa River made last year by Mr. Fleming, who took soundings and made examinations at almost every mile between here and Grenville, goes to prove that the channel of the Ottawa River has been not at all seriously affected by the deposit of sawdust ; but, on the contrary, it was found at many points to be deeper than it was five years ago. Now, while it may be argued that the sawdust is deposited in the bays of the river, to the detriment of the farmers living along its banks, that idea is dispelled from my mind by the fact that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), and the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), a few days ago presented petitions to this House signed by seven-eighths or more of the ratepayers living along the banks of the Ottawa River, appealing to this House to rescind the Act of last session, and to continue to the mill-owners of the Ottawa and Gatineau rivers the privilege that has heretofore been extended to them. If any one could know whether or not any injury is done to the river, surely the men living along its banks are in the best position to judge. While I do not deny that at the foot of the hill where we now stand, at the mouth of the Rideau Canal, there is a very large deposit of sawdust which in a few years may have to be removed, yet, considering the magnitude of the lumber trade of this country, it is for this House seriously to consider whether we should not unanimously, irrespective of party, support what is for the greatest good of the greatest number of people in this country. We should remember that 300,000,000 feet of lumber is manufactured annually at this point, that during the last forty years the mill-owners have been dumping sawdust into the Ottawa River without serious detriment to the interests of the country, and that to prevent them doing that would be practically to close the water mills at the Chaudière and on the Gatineau. The owners of these mills cannot, I understand, without great expense, if at all, raise the floors of their mills so as to allow the sawdust to be carried beneath the floors. If you take two or three feet from the head of water used for running the mills, you practically put these men in the position of being obliged to abandon the process of manufacturing by water power. You practically say to the mill-owners : You have to put in steam appliances, because the water-powers of this country are of little or no use for the manufacture of lumber under such restrictions. That would be a very serious thing to the labouring men whom they employ. If the Government insisted that the Ottawa River mill-owners should stop putting sawdust in the river, not only would they have to close down their mills, but two-thirds of the cut in the woods next year would have to be abandoned, because the cut of logs this year would have to remain in the river

and be sawn next year. I think this matter should be viewed from a business standpoint. Fishermen from the counties of Carleton and Russell have gone to Ottawa county and fished in streams where no sawdust is deposited; and they have frequently expressed to me in conversation on the trains, the opinion that the fishing is as good below the city of Ottawa as it is above. So far as the health of the children is concerned, we have the opinion of a medical man, and it would be most unfair for a layman to offer an opinion on that subject. I think the argument of the hon. member for Queen's, who said that this was a temporary measure of relief, was very fair. I think the hon. Minister of Marine might possibly go further, but for the other House. The hon. the Senate may view this matter as they did last session, but my strong opinion is that the mills now operated by water power on the Ottawa and the Gatineau should be exempt for all time to come—that the Order in Council should be permanent so far as the mills at present constructed are concerned. I think it would be only fair to the owners of those mills, to give them an opportunity to offer evidence to show that it would be impossible for them to continue to carry on their business if the Act should be put into force at the end of two years. I hope that before the end of those two years the Government, whether Liberal or Conservative I care not, will consider frankly and fairly, in the interest of the lumber industry, and in the interest of the labouring classes who are supported by that industry, whether these mill-owners should not be allowed to put in evidence to show that it is impossible for them to put sawdust carriers into the mills so constructed, and that they should be permanently relieved from the operation of any such measure as is now contemplated. Therefore, while I am quite willing to admit that the dumping of sawdust into the rivers is to some extent a nuisance to the people who use those rivers for pleasure-seeking and for navigation, yet when we consider that fully two-thirds of the cut of the Ottawa River has been exhausted, and that the mills are sawing lumber on an improved system by which not more than two-thirds as much sawdust as formerly is deposited in the river, and no serious difficulty is found in navigating it, I think the Government and the House should hesitate to put a damper upon those gentlemen who have so much capital invested in lumber properties and mill industries. I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill so promptly introduced by the hon. Minister of Marine.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I wish to say a word or two in support of what my hon. friend has stated. I believe this Act should exempt sawdust at once as not being a deleterious substance. In fact, as the hon. gentleman has said, instead of obliging the owners of mills to burn their sawdust, we might as well at once order them to close their mills. They have suffered in our section of the country from prosecutions, which I may call malicious prosecutions, with regard to rivers in which there is no fish worth mentioning. As to the owners of land who might be affected by this sawdust, they have an action of damages in our civil law to protect themselves; but this fishery interest is a minor consideration altogether to the lumber interest. We have in Megantic and Arthabaska rivers like the Bécancour, the Nicolet and their tributaries, on which the mill-owners have been occasionally troubled by these malicious prosecutions for the protection of fish which have no existence. As soon as you can find a few small fish in any of those rivers, you may put the law in operation and stop a very important business. In the townships which are comparatively new, there is a good deal of lumber being made, and a very large number of small water mills; and if you oblige these mill-owners to carry on that expensive process of burning sawdust, they will have to close their establishments, to the great damage not only of themselves but of the surrounding country.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have listened with much attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), the hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant), and others, and as I represent a county which is largely interested in the milling industry, I cannot allow this Bill to pass without expressing my views with regard to it. The lumbering industry is one which, from its importance, ought to be very carefully considered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has charge of this Bill. He should consider, first of all, whether in restricting the milling industry he is not inflicting a large amount of injury upon other industries and upon the people inhabiting those sections of the country where the milling industry flourishes. I know that in the district I have the honour to represent, that industry has been carried on very successfully, and will continue to prosper if not restricted, as it has been in recent years. It cannot, with any show of reason, be contended that the emptying of the sawdust into the rivers has at all affected the industry of fishing, because in most of the rivers where the milling industry is carried on, the fish appear to be quite as plentiful now as they were in the past, making proper allowances for the many more hands employed in the capture of them. I approve of this Bill as a measure of present relief, and hope it will result in a measure affording permanent relief. It gives the Minister of Marine two years to consider the matter, and allows him the discretion during that period of exempting other rivers than those which were formerly exempted, on a good case being made out for exemption; and

that being a step in the right direction, I can support the Bill. I do not see why the two rivers, the Ottawa and the St. John, should be exempted while others are required to come under the operation of the law. If the argument is good that the mills on the Ottawa and St. John rivers are so constructed that it is impossible to construct furnaces for the destruction of their sawdust, is not the argument doubly strong in favour of the small mills on the rivers in Lunenburg county? The hon. member for Pontiac has urged very strongly that the Ottawa should be exempted, but sufficiently cogent reasons can be advanced for exempting the rivers in the province of Nove Scotia. I concur in the principle of the Bill, and I hope that in the two years which it has to run the Government will send an official to inspect the La Have and other rivers in the county I have the honour to represent, and obtain a report of such a character as will warrant the Minister of Marine in bringing down a measure which will afford permanent relief to all those parties who now feel that they are hardly dealt with under the operation of the present Act.

Mr. FRASER. I am very glad to hear the remarks of my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), for I know of no part of the Dominion which has suffered more from vexatious proceedings than the hon. gentleman's own county.

Mr. KAULBACH. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. I only regret he did not speak in the same way some time ago and insist that the Government should act in that county as he now proposes they should.

Mr. KAULBACH. "Hansard" will show that I have done so.

Mr. FRASER. This debate has proved one thing, and that is, that the only reason why sawdust should be kept out of the rivers is because it interferes with navigation. There is no question about fish at all, which was the great question heretofore. After the lucid explanation given by the hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant), I am sure that all controversy hereafter will cease. I regret that the hon. Minister of Marine had not that information before him when he did prosecute so very vigorously certain parties in the interests of the fish, and I would throw out the hint that a further suggestion made by my genial friend should be seriously considered by the Government. Here is an opportunity by which the Government may, in the future, avoid having to face such a state of things as the census discloses. Here is an industry which the Government may profit by—the sawdust industry. In that the Government have an industry by which they may increase our population. They have now in their hands a means by which the next census shall show a different state of things from the last. In place of allowing the sawdust to lie in the rivers into which it is thrown, let it be collected and distributed throughout the various streams, and you shall have such a triumph that this Dominion, so far as population is concerned, shall bloom and flourish like the rose. It strikes me that the Government should not hesitate in taking this method of covering up deficits in their system, which so far they have been unable to hide; and if they do that, the good results will more than counterbalance the loss of a few fish. I am glad the only question now raised is one of navigation, and I can safely say there is not a river—I speak of Nova Scotia particularly—with the navigation of which the sawdust thrown into the stream interferes. And, as the fish question is out of it, I ask that the Minister will at once see that an Act is passed exempting every river in Nova Scotia.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) referred to an abuse which exists in his county and which also exists in mine, and, I daresay, in many others. In those counties we have comparatively small streams, upon which there are small mills, and in which streams there are no edible fish of any consequence. I called the attention of the hon. Minister's predecessor to these facts and to the further fact that the officials of the department in these parts of the country were in the habit, for some reason or other—and I am afraid not always influenced by the best of motives—of making occasional raids upon these poor, weak mill-owners and imposing arbitrary fines upon them. Now, as a rule, these mills are not operated to the extent of more than three months in the year, and the sawdust which results from their operation is a very small matter indeed. And yet the owners have been required by these officials to take baskets—for they cannot afford machinery to carry the sawdust away—and remove this sawdust from the mills. And this after imposing these arbitrary fines upon them. Though I made as earnest representations as I could, I did not succeed in getting the relief I thought our citizens were entitled to. The conduct on the part of the officials of which I complain is not carried on with any degree of consistency or regularity. These visitations of theirs are made at intervals of perhaps two years. Without warning they pounce down upon the mill-owners and say: You must pay $40 or $50 or worse will befall you. I say, from my own personal knowledge, that this practice exists on these small rivers—small affluents of the Chateauguay and other streams which empty into the St. Lawrence, and which, to-day, have not in them edible fish in sufficient quantity to make it worth while to send officials to them at all.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. COSTIGAN. I find that the Act applying to these rivers gives the power under the proviso to the Governor in Council and not to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I would like to have this Bill uniform with the former Act, and I would move that the words "Governor in Council" be substituted for the words "Minister of Marine and Fisheries."

Mr. LAVERGNE. I think it has been pretty well agreed, particularly since we have heard the expert opinion of the hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant), that the saw-dust is not a deleterious substance so far as the fish are concerned. I think, therefore, that we might as well strike out the words "or saw-dust." At least we might as well exempt at once the tributaries of large rivers, for instance, as my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) said a few moments ago, those that flow into the Chateauguay, the Nicolet, the Becancour and others upon which are small water-mills whose owners are sometimes troubled with malicious prosecutions. I would not charge these prosecutions as the outcome of the ill-will of the fishery inspector himself, but people make complaints to him. I would like the opinion of the committee on this proposal. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Ottawa county (Mr. Devlin), that the words "or saw-dust" in the fourth line of paragraph 2, section 1, be struck out.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I hope the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment will reflect upon the position. I think he could not have heard the statement I made as to the object of the Bill. As the law at present stands, every mill-owner on large stream or small who puts saw-dust in the river is liable to prosecution and heavy penalties. The hon. gentleman thinks we ought to exempt certain streams. But what progress should we make if we undertook to discuss the question on that basis now. The hon. gentleman knows those streams in his own locality that ought to be exempted. But after we have dealt with these streams we should be obliged to consider similar representations from gentlemen from Nova Scotia, gentlemen from the North-west and other localities. We are asking for delay in the enforcement of this law that we may make inquiries and find out what rivers ought to be exempted from the operation of the law. The law, as it stands at present, prohibits the putting of saw-dust into any river frequented by fish, under serious penalties. In order to minimize the effect of the law, I propose, in the first place, to restore the exemptions that were made, and that have been practically dealt with. These exemptions have gone on for years, and I propose to ask the House to give power during the existence of this Act, to make such further exemptions as may be deemed wise in the public interest. I think that covers the whole ground.

Mr. GILLMOR. Will the hon. Minister name the rivers that he proposes to exempt?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I stated as clearly as possible that I could not now undertake to name them; and one reason why I submit this Bill with this two years clause, is to get information. I can name one river, the St. John River; and I can name another river, from my own knowledge of the position, namely, the St. Croix, because it is an international river. I suppose that will satisfy the hon. gentleman. Any one can see that the same reason that applies to the St. John as an international river, will apply to the St. Croix, or any other international river. But the House would not expect any person to be in a position at once to state what rivers throughout the Dominion should be exempt, and what should not.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that the statement just made by the hon. gentleman is hardly borne out by the Bill. As I understand the Bill, during the next two years, he shall have power to exempt certain rivers from the operation of this Act; after two years he shall not have that power, and, therefore, there will be no more exemption after that period.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Unless there is other legislation in the meanwhile.

Mr. LAURIER. That is quite a different thing. That would be contemplated legislation, of which we know nothing, whereas we are now dealing with the measure before the House. If the Government have secrets, they had better lay them before the House at once. But, according to this Bill, it seems to me that for two years to come the Minister can grant exemption to certain parties from the operation of this Bill, that is to say, he can prevent saw-dust from being thrown into certain rivers, and allow it to be thrown into others; but, after two years, all rivers in Canada will be put on the same footing, and none will be allowed to throw saw-dust into them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not say that at all.

Mr. LAURIER. The Bill says so.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; the Bill does not say so. The Bill says that it shall only have operation or effect for two years, and it could not possibly give power to the Governer in Council, or to anybody else, to exempt after the Bill had expired. The power to exempt cannot exist any longer than the Bill exists.

Mr. LAURIER. The section provides that it shall be an offence to throw saw-dust, refuse, or other deleterious matter into the river, and then it goes on to say :

Provided always, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may exempt from the operation of this subsection, wholly or partially, any stream or streams with respect to which he considers that its enforcement is not requisite in the public interest.

That is to say, the Governor in Council henceforth will have power to exempt certain rivers from the operation of this section. He may allow saw-dust to be thrown into certain rivers, but no such exemption shall have force or effect after 30th June, 1897. At present, this power of exemption is vested in the Governor in Council, who may exempt certain rivers from the operation of this law, but, after the two years are expired, neither the Minister or the Governor in Council will have power to make any such exemption.

Mr. DEVLIN. This is a very serious matter. The trouble which exists to-day, and which it is being sought to remove, will all begin over again in two years. I am speaking now as representing the lumber interests of Ottawa County, and we hope that the mills there will be exempted from the operation of this Bill during the next two years. We hope more than that. There is no man in this House who supposes that any lumberman who has large mills on the Ottawa, intends to change them at the expiration of two years. Why, the capital invested, the structures erected, everything shows that it is almost impossible to do such a thing ; consequently, there will be the same state of alarm at the expiration of two years as there has been for the past years. I think the fact pointed out by the leader of the Opposition is a serious one, and for that reason I hold that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne), and which I had the honour of seconding, is a good one, namely, that the word saw-dust be struck out. What is the use of the word saw-dust there, anyway ? Are you going to give exemption in one case and refuse it in another ? I do not ask any more rights for the lumbermen of the Ottawa Valley than I would see extended to the lumbermen of Nova Scotia, or any other portion of the Dominion. Their rights, no doubt, are just as good and as sacred as ours ; and ours are just as good and as sacred as theirs. There should be no possibility of the Government showing favour in one instance and refusing it in another, or doing justice in one case and perhaps doing an injustice in another. I hold that the Bill is unfortunate in this sense, that this state of alarm will exist again for two years, and that after that period the lumbermen will again be in a disturbed state. Does the hon. gentleman understand what the consequences will be ? Perhaps the effect will be to destroy a large portion of the trade that might be done under other circumstances, if the lumbermen were not under the apprehension that two years hence they would be obliged to build burners. I say, then, with the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska, that it would be a wise thing to remove the word saw-dust, at all events, from the section.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman will find, on reflection, that the line of action he proposes is directed against the interests of the gentlemen for whom he professes to speak. He must recollect that the law, as it now exists, was passed without dissent in this House, and by a large majority in the other House. Under this law, the lumbermen are subject to very heavy penalties, indeed, and, in order that they shall not be taken suddenly, this measure, at any rate, gives them a respite of two years. I venture to say that while opinions differ in this House, a large majority of the people of Canada who are interested in the rivers, and in the fisheries, hold the very opposite views to those that were expressed to the effect that it is doubtful whether saw-dust has a deleterious effect upon fish. All the fishery authorities of this country, of England, and of the United States, agree that saw-dust is most deleterious to fish life. When this subject was threshed out in the House of Commons, when I was at the head of the Marine and Fisheries Department, the great preponderance of opinion in the House at that time, though we were not then considering a section of this kind, was against the dumping of saw-dust into rivers. Now, the lumbermen are approaching this question as reasonable men. They find out how the law stands, they have come to the Government and have asked for some relief, or, at any rate, an opportunity to prepare themselves. In my experience many a lumberman who has sent in reams of papers to convince me that it was absolutely impossible to consume the saw-dust of his mill, nevertheless, finding that the law was to be enforced, has gone and fitted up his mill. Take, for instance, the case of the La Have River, to which the hon. member for St. John incidentally referred. The gentlemen on that river are very important lumbermen ; they insisted in the press, and in long arguments addressed to the department, that they could not adapt their mills to consume the saw-dust Having been prosecuted, and having found a law in force with which they were compelled to comply, they provided apparatus for their mills. So it was on Rice Lake and on Otonabee River, where the mill-owners for some time disregarded the law, but in due course they put in apparatus at their mills, and benefit followed in connection with the

fisheries there. I say the prevailing sentiment is in favour of very rigid legislation on this subject, and recognizing this fact, the Government have concluded to go this far, and have asked for a probationary period of two years. They have not assumed a dictatorial position. That is as far as the Government have ventured to go on the information they now possess. What they will do afterwards will depend on what new light will be thrown on the question, and whether the views expressed by some hon. gentlemen opposite are found to be generally shared by it; but the information in the hands of the Government, as the Minister of Marine has shown, would justify this measure, so as to give the mill-owners ample notice. I would ask, is it in the interest of the lumbermen, knowing the strong view taken in the Senate, to attack a principle which has been on the statute-books so long? Let us rather put such a Bill through as we have reason to believe will pass both Houses of Parliament.

Mr. EDWARDS. I desire to say a word with respect to the apparatus for doing away with the mill refuse to which the hon. Minister of Justice has referred. The conditions vary in different places. Some lumbermen no doubt will say that it is impossible to apply the necessary apparatus; but they will afterwards find that it is quite possible. That undoubtedly is true, and it is possible that such cases may occur on the Ottawa, and I am only referring to the Ottawa. I assure this House that in most cases the mills on the Ottawa would require to be reconstructed; I need not name the mills, but the most important mills here would require to be reconstructed. As to comparing the River Otonabee with the Ottawa, I fail to see any comparison between the two rivers. The former is a very small stream.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I made no comparison. I referred to the Otonabee as a case where the mill-owners thought they could not comply with the law, but finding the law was to be enforced, they did so.

Mr. EDWARDS. The Otonabee is a very small river, and it is quite possible that saw-dust might accumulate in it to such an extent as to be a very serious obstacle, while in the Ottawa it is impossible because of the capacity of the river.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There are a great many opinions in regard to the Ottawa as to whether navigation is affected or not by saw-dust.

Mr. EDWARDS. So far as that is concerned, there is no two opinions by unbiassed men.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have been on board of a steamer on the regular line which was stopped by the saw-dust—it was the "Empress," which is running now.

Mr. DEVLIN. When was it?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was when the water was very high.

Mr. EDWARDS. The Minister of Justice never was on a steamer that was stopped by the accumulation of saw-dust so as to impede navigation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was my information as to the cause.

Mr. EDWARDS. The captain of the "Empress" has made as much of this matter as possible; but he has come over to the side of the lumbermen and has changed his views very recently.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Nearly all the steamers about here are owned by the lumbermen of Ottawa.

Mr. EDWARDS. Never was the passage of a steamer on the Ottawa impeded by the accumulation of saw-dust; but with a low-pressure engine the condenser is sometimes affected.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That does not matter much to the owner, if it causes the vessel to stop.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is only one such engine on the Ottawa River. I have been travelling on this river for many years, and I never knew a single case to occur. I think the case to which the hon. Minister has referred is the only case which has ever happened.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am entirely opposed to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Arthabaska and Drummond (Mr. Lavergne), because I am not prepared to believe, after what has been said this afternoon, that saw-dust is not deleterious to fish life. For my own part, I believe it is. Yet there seems to be a disposition on the part of a good many of my fellow-members—simply because nothing was said on the other side and we have had one distinguished medical authority giving his opinion that saw-dust is not deleterious to fish life—to accept that opinion. I believe it is deleterious, and therefore I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. GILLMOR. The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) thinks saw-dust is injurious to fish life. I should like to know if he has had any practical experience. Are there not as many fish in the streams with which he is acquainted as ever there were?

Mr. SCRIVER. No.

Mr. GILLMOR. I have lived nearly as many years as the hon. gentleman and although I know a great many streams, I am not acquainted with any in which, after

the mills have been erected there, there were not about as many fish as before. Most of the mills in Canada are situated on streams where the fish possess no commercial value and are of little consequence. Even if they do suffer somewhat from the saw-dust, and I believe they do not, it is a trifling matter. I remember very well that Mr. Rogers, a gentleman with whom the late Minister of Marine is well acquainted, published a treatise on this subject, which I read, and in it he expressed the opinion, after many years' experience, that saw-dust is not injurious to fish. I should like to know how hon. gentlemen are going to prove the fact that it is injurious to the fish. What are the fish in our rivers, or at all events in the rivers with which I am acquainted? They consist of small trout, perch or chub, and their preservation is of little importance compared with the great lumber interest. The power given in this Bill is one of which the Minister I have no doubt would be glad to rid himself. I know there are people who are afraid that this Act may not be equitably administered, that some people may be oppressed in consequence of their political views. I am slow, however, to believe that such would be the case. The Minister of Marine is a practical man, who knows the mills and the fishing in the rivers generally. I have been acquainted for about sixty years with the river near where I live, and I know that the same fish which were caught then can be caught now, and in just about equal quantities. We never, however, caught any for commercial purposes, but simply for sport. As regards saw-dust filling up the channels of navigable rivers, I do not believe such a result would happen. The saw-dust would be carried away from the main channel, although it might accumulate in eddies or dead water. The saw-dust does not rise above the surface of the water and is almost constantly in motion, and if it accumulates in bays it is cleared out by the spring freshets. I do not know whether the Government are aware that there are in this Bill powers which may be abused. I am sure that the Minister would be glad to get rid of the responsibility which attaches to him, so that he will not be suspected of favouring one at the expense of another. It is very risky to put a statute on the book which confers this power of discrimination on any one person. I do not see how it can be avoided for the present, and I really think it is the best arrangement that can now be made. I do not see many hon. gentlemen state that this is injurious to the fish. My hon. friend will remember Mr. Rogers, a fishery inspector of very great experience. The hon. gentleman will not deny that Mr. Rogers is a man of intelligence, a painstaking man, a pretty conceited man, and he could write books very well, but Mr. Rogers gave a very convincing argument that the saw-dust did not injure the fish.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And a very good one that it did. He took both sides.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Which side was the strongest?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I went on his first opinion.

Mr. GILLMOR. He took some side that did not please you and he went out. Now, with regard to the state of Maine: Does the saw-dust not go into the Penobscot River and the St. Croix River, and after the United States decided that saw-dust was injurious to fish-life, why did they not prevent it on those rivers?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows the fisheries have gone there.

Mr. GILLMOR. Well, they have not stopped the saw-dust. They are taking salmon on the St. Croix River now. It is my impression that when the Government takes the trouble to inform itself, that they will make a general exemption of all rivers on which this great lumbering industry exists. If there should be a little loss to the fisheries, it is not at all to be compared with the loss there would be if our lumbering industry were interfered with.

Mr. FORBES. I am prepared to accept the amendment for several reasons. First, the lumbering industry is far and away more important than the river fishery interests. There is vastly more capital engaged in the lumbering business, and I am told that the ratio is, that $12 are invested in the lumber industry for the $1 invested in the river fisheries. From the time the men go into the woods until the lumber is put on board the vessel, three men are engaged in that business, during the greater portion of the year, for every one man engaged in the river fisheries during three or four months out of the twelve. Is it not the supreme duty of the Government to look after the best interests of the majority of the people? They have no right to single out one section or class to the advantage or disadvantage of another. Government should legislate in the best interests of the great majority, and upon that principle I argue in support of the amendment that the word "saw-dust" should be struck out. Now, as regards the effect of the saw-dust upon the river fisheries—and I discriminate between the river fisheries and in the inshore coast fisheries in this matter. When the saw-dust gets to the coast, it has no effect whatever upon the cod, mackerel or lobster fishery. Its only effect is upon the salmon and small fish in the rivers. On the two rivers with which I am thoroughly familiar and in which I have fished for many years, the salmon fishery is not in any way seriously affected by the deposit of saw-dust. On the Medway River, in Queen's County, N.S., the salmon

pools are to-day worth 100 per cent more than they were ten years ago. The fish itself is also more valuable, and the fishermen, with the exception of those around the mouth of the river where they use nets and traps, are sportsmen, and they lease those pools because there are plenty of salmon in them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was the law in force on the Medway?

Mr. FORBES. No; it was one of the exempted rivers, and I say that the saw-dust does not affect the fisheries there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is a very rapid current in that river, and it was represented that the saw-dust was carried out to the ocean.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. gentleman says that the Medway was exempted because of the rapid current.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is my recollection.

Mr. FORBES. That may be one reason, and a very good and true one. I can take him to some of the best fishing pools in Canada, where, sitting in a birch bark canoe with a rod in his hand, he can "rise" the silver salmon, and forget all about the anxieties of Government, and even of the salary attached to his office.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no saw-dust in that river.

Mr. FORBES. There is saw-dust in that river to a limited extent only.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then the representations were false.

Mr. FORBES. I cannot help about the representations. I say that there is no saw-dust in that river to any deleterious extent. But there is a certain deposit upon that river, and we know from practical experience that it has not affected the fish-life in any degree whatever. The same argument will apply to the Mersey or Liverpool River.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not exempted.

Mr. FORBES. It is.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Mr. FORBES. I will be charitable enough to say that the hon. Minister has forgotten about it. It has been exempted for years, for there is no machinery in the mills to destroy the saw-dust, although there is for destroying the slabs. The saw-dust is lying upon the bed of that river, and upon the banks to a great extent, but I do not think any one will say that it seriously injures the fisheries there. I admit that navigation has been hurt at the bar of the Liverpool River by the saw-dust, but it is not to any extent, and it is only at that point and where vessels of light draught can easily go, and also vessels of greater draught if we had proper dredge appliances. Although I contend that navigation is paramount to the lumbering industry, yet, navigation has only been slightly impeded there, and not to any extent, whereas the lumbering industry is of very great importance. Salmon are in the Mersey River as plentiful to-day, if not more plentiful, than they were four or five years ago. In this river, nets are set, and I think the Government sub-leases those portions of the river near Liverpool, and derives considerable revenue thereby. While it is an open and debatable question whether the letting of saw-dust flow down our rivers does or does not injure fish life, yet in this new country we ought to consider the great lumber interest as far above and beyond the fishing interest of our rivers in importance. We should say to the lumbermen: We will do nothing to hamper you in your business; we will do what is fair by you, and allow you to make all the money you can out of your business without handicapping you with vexatious regulations. To the fishermen, we should say: We do not want to injure you, but it has been reported to us that the putting of saw-dust into the rivers does not injure fish life or hurt you in your calling; that is a debatable question. I think we should leave matters as they are for a few years in order that substantial proof might be obtained whether fish life is or is not injured by saw-dust in the rivers. The larger refuse, like slabs and bark, might be immediately destroyed at the mills, or sold; but the saw-dust question, which is the only bone of contention, should be allowed to stand for future settlement. The Minister has the right under the constitution to regulate the fisheries, and in so doing to see that certain conditions shall be observed. The British North America Act provides that the Parliament of Canada shall have control of the fisheries only for purposes of regulation. The Minister has not power to stop or hamper or hinder any trade or calling of any citizen of this country. He has a right to say to the mill-owner: If you are going to put your saw-dust into the river, we have the authority, under the power to regulate trade and commerce, to place an Act on the statute-book providing that you shall cut lumber under such conditions that the saw-dust shall be put in the rivers in a certain way; but he has not the right to do what will put a stop to the lumber industry of this country. If the hon. Minister is going to bring the lumber industry of this country into collision with the smaller fishing industries of the rivers, he will be taking a very serious step. I think the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) is perfectly regular, and should be accepted.

Mr. EDWARDS. In addressing the House this afternoon I distinctly stated that I did

not pretend to know the effect of saw-dust on fish life. I simply expressed my opinion that saw-dust was not injurious to the fish of the Ottawa River. So far as that river is concerned, the wood gathered by the inhabitants from the mills is far more valuable to them than all the fish in the river. I regret that this amendment has been proposed, because it introduces into the discussion a new phase, which may make it far more difficult to achieve what is desired under this Bill. The effect of the Bill, if it is passed as proposed by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, will be simply to restore the conditions which existed previous to the 1st of May, and to give two years more in which to arrange this matter in some way. The rivers will be exempted as before by the Governor in Council where it is found that that may be done without serious injury. What I apprehend is that if this amendment is insisted upon, the Bill may be killed altogether, and very serious consequences will follow. Within two years the whole saw-dust question may be disposed of. It may be that before the expiration of that time all the saw-dust now thrown into the Ottawa River, and other rivers, will be converted into fuel. All the refuse from the mills may be turned to such account that it may be profitable to the lumbermen themselves to make the change. In the interest of the lumber trade throughout Canada, it is desirable that this Bill should pass, and the introduction of amendments of this kind, which only cause more discussion and difficulty, may destroy the Bill altogether. In view of the action of the Senate last year, I do not think the Government should go further than they are going. All that the Bill means is that two years more will be given in which to make the change, or in which to have a general Act passed that will dispose of the whole question.

Mr. OUIMET. Before the question is put, I would like to mention to the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin), who has intimated his intention of voting for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Arthabaska, that if he had paid any attention to what has taken place in his own county in the Gatineau River, he would see that the dumping of saw-dust into that river has formed a shoal of very considerable magnitude near the present Gatineau bridge. The current has been completely changed, which has caused landslides in the spring. It has entailed a pretty large expenditure to stop these, and they cannot well be stopped unless that shoal is dredged, and the dredging would be certainly very expensive.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does the existence of that bar interfere with navigation ?

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. OUIMET. It interferes in this way : that it has changed the channel, and now the boats have to go up the river by passing very near the shore. The result from the washing of the shore has been a landslide of considerable magnitude. I think that the present road, leading from Gatineau Village to the bridge, has been all washed into the river. At one time the inhabitants of Gatineau Village were very much afraid that the river would take its course through the village.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. Minister of Public Works has said that if I had studied the interests of Gatineau Valley perhaps I would not have spoken as I did.

Mr. OUIMET. I put it in a much milder way. I only said that this fact had escaped your notice.

Mr. DEVLIN. What did not escape my notice then was the general interest of my county and the country. That did not escape my notice when I spoke a few moments ago. I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but I wish to say that I do not think that because a little bit of a bar may exist at the mouth of the Gatineau, mills on the Ottawa and the Gatineau, and perhaps one hundred other rivers, should be threatened with the serious calamity of being at any moment obliged to close down their operations. When I spoke a moment ago on this subject, I think I spoke in sympathy with the feeling expressed by landowners living along the Gatineau and the Ottawa rivers on both sides. I am of opinion, notwithstanding the opinion of the Minister of Public Works, that the navigation of the Gatineau River is not seriously interfered with by reason of that little bar. He said that the channel has slightly changed, but he knows perfectly well that there is an immense volume of water in the Gatineau which must find an outlet, and which has an outlet by the channel of which he speaks. Has there been any dredge at that bar ? Have there been any demands on the Department of Public Works for dredging by boat-owners complaining that the navigation has been interfered with ? I do not think so. I do not think either that the fisheries of the Gatineau have been seriously injured by reason of the deposits of saw-dust in that river. When I spoke a moment ago of the bar, I spoke of the Gatineau, the Lievre, and other tributaries. This is a serious question, one in which not only the mill-owners are interested, but those who in summer and winter have to struggle to earn a living for their own families. Those are interested in this question, and I do not think that the throwing of a little saw-dust into the Gatineau or Ottawa or any other river, should be considered so great a calamity to the country generally that we should pass

a law which will close up the mills that give bread to our working population.

Mr. LAVERGNE. In answer to the hon. Minister, I may say that the amendment which I propose does not affect in any way navigable rivers. It has simply to do with the Fisheries Act. The fact that a man has been prosecuted for throwing saw-dust into a river where there are fish has nothing to do with prosecuting him for throwing into a navigable river. They are both different acts. It is no objection to the amendment to say that a bar exists in the Gatineau River which may be an obstacle to navigation, because that has nothing to do with the question of the fisheries. A man may be prosecuted under the Fisheries Act who could not be prosecuted under the Act applying to navigable waters. Under the Fisheries Act, a man may be prosecuted on the ground that there are fish in the river, and the Act is so general that it may cover every little stream. That is why I proposed this amendment, so that an exemption should be made at least in the case of such small streams.

Amendment negatived.

On section 2,

Any exemptions granted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries under subsection two of section fifteen of The Fisheries Act, and in force on the thirtieth day of April, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, shall remain in force until the said thirtieth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, unless sooner revoked by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and all penalties incurred, or to which any person has become liable, under the section substituted by the said section six of chapter fifty-one of the Statutes of 1894, with respect to any stream or streams which were exempt from the operation of subsection two of section fifteen of The Fisheries Act upon the thirtieth day of April, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, are hereby remitted.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the section be amended by substituting the words "Governor General in Council" for the words "Minister of Marine" wherever the latter occur.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN. Is the La Have River, N.S., one of those proposed to be exempted?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not.

Mr. BORDEN. Then the observations made by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) were not very appropriate. I understood the hon. gentleman to congratulate the Government upon being about to pass legislation which would extend to the River La Have, and he felt particularly desirous that the exemption should extend to that river. Subsequently my attention was attracted by a remark which fell from the Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), to the effect that very large milling concerns doing business on the La Have had complied with the Act and constructed the necessary apparatus for burning saw-dust, and had really become penitent and asked from the department absolution for their sins. It occurred to me, if the statement made by the hon. member for Lunenburg be true, that it was an extraordinary procedure for the Government to compel these men to comply with the Act, and then, after they had done so at an enormous expense, throw the river open and allow other people, who had perhaps not gone to this expense, the privilege of throwing saw-dust into it.

Mr. KAULBACH. I do not think the House misunderstood me, though perhaps my hon. friend from King's did. I approve of the principle of the Bill, and have stated that I approve of it for this reason—that it gave an opportunity to the Government for two years to inquire which rivers should be exempted, and I said that I hoped that, in the meantime, an officer would be sent from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to examine the La Have River and report upon it with a view to having that river exempted with others.

Mr. BORDEN. But all this is after some gentlemen who happen to be politically opposed to the hon. gentleman have been put to the tremendous expense of putting up the necessary machinery to burn the saw-dust. I think it is a pity that the hon. gentleman who is now so anxious that justice should be done to the particular people doing business on the La Have River, that he did not start a little earlier.

Mr. KAULBACH. My hon. friend from King's, N.S. (Mr. Borden) has apparently taken a deep interest in the firm of Messrs. Davidson & Sons, of my county; but I do not think the interest on their behalf that he has exhibited is any greater than my own. I consider that that firm, as I have stated before, has been hardly dealt with. I would go further than that, and say that I feel that in view of the treatment extended by the Government to Messrs. Davidson & Sons, the Government, in their wisdom, might consider whether the suits that have recently been brought against them were of such a character as to warrant the imposition of a penalty, and under the circumstances it would not be advisable to drop the penalty and pay the costs of suits.

Mr. BORDEN. Then the hon. gentleman, as I understand, will urge not only that the Government will forgive them all the fines that have been imposed, but place this river under this Act, and also recoup the Davidsons for all the money they have lost during the years they were prevented from doing business, and also all the money they have expended in constructing this expensive apparatus for destroying the saw-dust.

Mr. FRASER. Is it not possible that injury may be done in making the exemptions in force from 30th April, 1895, not giving an opportunity for any other exemptions the Minister may see fit to make after that date? Under this it would appear that the Minister up to 30th April, 1895, had knowledge of all the rivers that should be exempt, and that no information coming after this would be considered. It seems to me that any river which the Minister considers should be exempt should be brought under the operation of the Act, as well as those decided upon up to 30th April last.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) has given expression to a hope as to what the Government shall see fit to do in relation to the case he mentioned. Well, it is easy to express a hope; but will he get the assurance of the Minister alongside of whom he sits, or can he get any of the Ministers to state that they are in accord with him in the opinion he expresses.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have no doubt that the Government will do what is just in the matter.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

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

After Recess.

DELAY IN TAKING THE CHAIR.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is not dealing at all fairly with the House to open the evening sitting at twenty-five minutes to nine. It puts everybody to great inconvenience when the Chair is taken on one occasion at eight o'clock sharp, on another at half-past eight, and on another at twenty-five minutes to nine. It seems to me that the Chair ought to be taken at a fixed time every night, and if it was understood that eight was the hour, the rule ought to be consistently observed.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is quite right. The understanding is that the Chair shall be taken at eight o'clock. I think there are very few evenings this session when it has not been taken very promptly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I beg to observe that on the very last Government day, Tuesday, it was fully half-past eight before we met here and opened the proceedings. There must have been special occasion on that night for the Minister of Justice, and I do not want to dwell too much upon it, but as a matter of fact——

Mr. FOSTER. There have only been two nights when there has been any considerable delay.

Mr. BORDEN.

SUPPLY—CURRAN BRIDGE—BRIGADE CAMP, NO. 1 DISTRICT.

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

Mr. LAURIER. Yesterday I gave the leader of the House notice that I would bring up the Curran Bridge matter on proposal to go into Supply. But the day is so far advanced now that it seems almost impossible—in fact it is quite impossible—to take up such an important matter to-day. I will take another occasion to refer to this subject.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to take the opportunity to bring to the attention of the House a matter of considerable interest to the section of the country in which I live and which I represent. I refer to the change which has been made in regard to the date of holding the brigade camp in No. 1 district. The House knows that until within a few weeks ago it was expected that the rural battalions would not be drilled at all; the members of these corps had every reason to believe that no camp would be held. Then, at short notice, it was announced that on the 18th of this month brigade camp would be held in No. 1 district. I believe, Sir, that the officers and men of the battalions who were ordered to camp responded and were willing to do the best they could, under circumstances of great inconvenience, to attend camp when it was desired. But I cannot understand why this change has been made at the present time. I am inclined to think Mr. Speaker, that it was inconvenience enough for the officers and men interested that the Government should not have announced their policy with regard to these camps in the usual way at an earlier date. But what is more serious than even the indefinite and undecided action of the Government, to my mind, is the change of date which was, after a great deal of consideration, decided to be the most convenient date for the volunteers to drill, if a drill was to be held at this time of the year. This is a matter that has received consideration by the department and by the officers of the various battalions, as well as by this House, for a great many years. As you know, Sir, the camps are not held in all sections of the country on the same date, for several reasons. It was found that one date would suit one section of the country, and another date would be more convenient for another section. Now, I may say with regard to the section of the country where I live, and in the interests of the battalion to which I belong, that this change will cause a great deal of inconvenience and dissatisfaction. Being a rural battalion, many of the members are farmers, and if they had been called out as intended on the 18th of this month, it would have been comparatively a time of leisure as compared

with the 25th of this month, and the time during which the camp will continue. Now, the House will recognize that that is a very important matter for the officers and men of rural battalions. In addition to that, they have received a very short notice. A great majority of the young men belonging to these volunteer corps have to make arrangements with their employers for a couple of weeks absence at camp, and having made those arrangements it would be very inconvenient perhaps for many of them now to make new arrangements to get away. The same remark will apply to the officers. They are business men, professional men, or farmers, and are connected with the battalion as officers, and having made their arrangements on such short notice, and now having to make this change, they will suffer a great deal of inconvenience. Therefore, I think that in addition to the inconvenience and want of action on the part of the Government for the past year that we have to complain of in connection with the drill, it is very unfortunate this move should have occurred at the present time. I wish to say also that, as every representative here from that section of the country well knows, the camp will extend over the 1st of July, which is a national holiday. Now, in almost every town and village in that section of the country, arrangements have been made by committees of citizens, or by the municipal authorities, to have public demonstrations. In these, every man will want to take part, the young men belonging to these battalions, the officers, and especially the bands, have to be depended on to take part in those celebrations. For this reason, also, I take this opportunity of expressing my protest against the proceeding, and I would like to know what explanation can be given to the volunteers, to the officers, and to the people in those sections, for the change that has been made. I am not inclined to scold or find fault, particularly, with regard to this matter. I will say this for the Minister himself, that having just taken the position, probably he has listened to some solicitations that have caused him to come to this decision—I can hardly imagine how, because, as every hon. gentleman knows, this has been a matter of discussion for years. It has been settled as to what date would be most convenient to the officers and men in the different sections of the country, and I could not allow this opportunity to pass without making this protest, on behalf of the volunteers concerned, against the change that has been made.

Mr. DICKEY. In reply to the hon. gentleman I have to say that the date for the camp at London was fixed by the "Gazette" for the 18th of this present month, as a matter of routine. Everybody understood that would be the date, but afterwards I learned from a great many sources in the city of London that the almost universal desire in that section was that the camp should be postponed until the 25th, as a more convenient date. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I am extremely sorry that I was not in possession of his views before I came to any decision, because I can assure him that if I had known that any serious interests would have been affected, I should not have dreamed of interfering with the regular routine. I did it, however, with the desire of meeting, what I supposed, was the general convenience of the people of the locality, and of those who were chiefly interested. I hoped that the hon. gentleman would have been so grateful to the Government and to myself for deciding to drill the volunteers this year, that he would not have said very much about these matters of drill. But I must say to him, and to the House, that I am extremely sorry, personally, that the change I made has not been satisfactory to him, and to the others whom he represents, and who, I have no doubt, are interested in the matter. However, this matter, as all other discussions connected with it in the House, will be of service to me in forming my militia character.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Can the date be changed ?

Mr. DICKEY. It has been changed once, and it is impossible to change it back. It cannot possibly be held now on any other date than the 25th, no matter who may be inconvenienced.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to corroborate what the Minister of Militia has said in regard to the camp at London. I have been written to on this subject, not by people in London, but by some of the officers in that district, asking for this change, for the very reasons mentioned by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). At first they thought there was not going to be any camp at all, and the volunteers in general were very much disappointed. Then when they were notified that they were to go into camp, they found the notice given them was too short. The hon. member for North Oxford knows, as well as myself, that it is very difficult for the officers of rural battalions to get their companies together on short notice, and many of the officers, as well as the men in that district, were not prepared for going into camp. If the Government had given them a little longer notice, they would have been able to bring out better companies and make a better battalion. On the whole, I quite agree with the remarks that have been made by the hon. the Minister of Militia.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am very sorry that the Minister of Militia has made the change. I think the first date fixed, the 18th, would have been much more convenient for the people of western Ontario. As the hon. member for North Oxford says, a great many of the young men who attend these drills, are farmers' sons and business men, and it

is very inconvenient for them to absent themselves from home at the date which has been fixed. Besides, the demonstrations that will take place on the 1st July in all the little towns, will be seriously interfered with by the absence of the volunteer companies. I would like to know what representations were made to the Minister that induced him to make the change. Did any of the commanding officers ask for the change to a later date?

Mr. DICKEY. I could not give the hon. gentleman the names here; I would be glad to give him the names at the department. There were representations from officers, certainly, but I do not remember the names.

Mr. TISDALE. I would like to ask for information, as I understand that the battalion the hon. gentleman from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) belongs to, does not drill this year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You are quite mistaken, it does drill. I may also say that other battalions outside the county of Oxford, have made even stronger complaints than our own battalion, but as we are a good and loyal set of volunteers, we accept the decision of the department, even though it is a wrong one.

Mr. TISDALE. I may say that one Lieutenant-Colonel wrote to me asking if I could possibly get the time fixed to a later date.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Not in September?

Mr. TISDALE. No; but either the 25th June, or the first part of July would have given them more time.

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

(In the Committee.)

Further amount required to meet expenditure in connection with the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic. (Authority is hereby given to transfer to "Legislation" the amount, $20,000, voted for printing, &c., in "Miscellaneous" in the Supply Bill for 1894-95, and to make it available up to 31st December, 1895).. $8,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We now want the particulars of these expenditures, so far as regards the several gentlemen who were on the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Sir Joseph Hickson, as chairman, received $2,222.81; Mr. Clarke, $2.468.67; Mr. Gigault, $2,374.11; Rev. Dr. McLeod, $6,918.76; Judge McDonald, $3,918.25; Mr. Monaghan, secretary, $10,068.66.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have already expressed my opinion that I doubt if any money was ever more recklessly expended since Parliament has come together here. This whole business looks to me like a job from beginning to end. Ninety thousand dollars of the money of the people of Canada have been expended for no conceivable purpose, except for the object of enabling the Government to shirk an unpleasant decision, and an unpleasant vote. But, wholly apart from that, I should like to know on what possible ground one member of the commission, Rev. Dr. McLeod, should have received more than double the amount paid to the chairman, and very nearly double the amount paid to any other member? I understand this gentleman is down for $6,900, as against $2,200 to the president, $2,400 to Mr. Clarke, $2,300 to another member of the commission and $3,900 to another. Surely there ought to be some reasonable proportion between the sums paid to each individual member. What possible ground could there be for one commissioner obtaining twice as much as any other?

Mr. FOSTER. The real ground was that the gentleman did twice as much work as the others. The Order in Council fixes the rate of payment at $10 a day, when they are at work on the commission, and gives them a stated allowance for living expenses. It is upon that basis the commission did its work, and on that basis the chairman and the secretary of the commission checked off the amounts to the different commissioners. Rev. Dr. McLeod received more than others for that reason, and for that reason alone.

Mr. FLINT. It is very much to be regretted that this commission has cost the Government so much money.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FLINT. I am quite confident that had the House entertained the least idea when the motion was passed that when the bills came to be paid they would amount to such a large sum, it would not have accepted the resolution. Notwithstanding the desire of members on both sides of the House to obtain all information possible on this subject, I think they would have hesitated to trust either the Government or any commission with the power given them if the House had had any idea that the country would be charged such an immense sum. I have not changed the view I held at the time of the discussion after which that resolution was accepted. Notwithstanding the length of time that has elapsed, and the experience we have had, the results given to the country by this commission have intensified the belief I then expressed that it was worse than useless, and a waste of time and money to undertake to gather information in that way. We have six volumes of 1,400 or 1,500 pages each, containing the evidence secured by those gentlemen over the English-speaking parts of North America. I do not believe that of the five millions constitut-

ing the population of Canada, 100 persons will ever read that evidence through. I would certainly pity and sympathize with any one who undertook to read it through with the idea of obtaining any very great amount of light on the matter investigated. Probably one reason why such large sums may have been allowed to those commissioners was that it may have been believed to be their duty to study the evidence they had taken, to marshal the facts in some shape out of those voluminous reports, and endeavour to give the country some idea of what was said by the witnesses whom they summoned or who volunteered to go before them. While speaking on this subject, I desire to say that it is much to be regretted that at this late date of the session of 1895 the House is not in possession of the report of the commission. That report is a very voluminous document, I understand, and will, when published, form a volume as large, if not larger, than any of the volumes of evidence already placed in the hands of members. That report might fairly demand some study at the hands of those who are interested in the economic question which arises, and the other questions which arise in connection with the subject of the liquor traffic. But in the very nature of things it will not be in the hands of those interested in the studying of those questions for some time, probably not until after the prorogation of Parliament. So this House will not be in possession of the results of this expensive experiment, and will not be able to take advantage of what has cost the country so much money, until another session. That session will, in all human probability, follow a general election, and the electors of the country, a large number of whom are intensely interested in the question which arises and which has been considered by this commission, will not be in a position to form any opinion on the subject which is there discussed. The whole management of this question by the Administration has shown a very great misapprehension of the position, and a very great neglect of all the ordinary precautions which ought to have been taken, if they sincerely desired to place the House and the country in possession of facts in regard to the extent of the liquor traffic and its results on the varied interests of the Dominion. I call the attention of the Government to the very strange circumstance, that in no portion of the country have those who are committed to the prohibition movement expressed approval of this commission or of the labours which they have undertaken. It is a curious circumstance that neither Conservative nor Liberal prohibitionists have ever given it any support whatever. This shows that there has been no serious regard for this commission on the part of those who are earnestly anxious for the promotion of temperance. In a few days we may have to discuss in this House the question of prohibition, and, unfortunately, we will come to a discussion of that question in the absence of the report which gives the result of the information which has been so laboriously gathered by the commission. I think, Sir, that the Government should have taken the House and the country more fully into its confidence before outlining the course which the commissioners should take, before fixing their remuneration at this very extravagant rate. After the passage of the resolution providing for the commission, I found in conversation with many who took a deep interest in the question, that it was thought that perhaps after all a flood of information upon economic points might be given to the House, and that the information would be valuable when we came to discuss the various questions which would arise as to the effect of the liquor traffic. That commission might have held its sessions in the capital city of Ottawa. It might have gathered a large quantity of valuable information, statistical and otherwise, from works in the library, and it might have secured in a short time all the information necessary to enable the House to discuss the question with the greatest intelligence. As it is, I very greatly fear that the question is to be clouded rather than illuminated by its labours.

The manner in which the commission proceeded aroused a certain amount of ridicule from men who had given their lives to the study of problems connected with the promotion of the temperance interests of the people. They proceeded from town to town, and from village to village, holding an elaborate court, and calling before them all and sundry who desired to express their views. Reporters of great ability were at hand to record whatever any person chose to say, and we have in the volumes of evidence the diverse opinions of hundreds of men whose opinions are not valuable in any other way than as an expression of private opinion. In those volumes, we have simply those opinions gathered together in a crude and bald way. There may be within the leaves of those books the opinions of a few men whose knowledge ought to have considerable weight, but in the majority of instances, they are a mass of hasty opinions, given by people in all portions of the country, and published to the world in those extensive volumes. The report of the commission we are not able to discuss yet. The most enterprising journal in the country could not afford more than a column or two of its space to an analysis of the contents of the report. A cursory glance at the published reports in the newspapers shows that it was impossible to give us any clear idea of the real findings of the commission, or of the evidence on which they base their findings. I learn, however, that the ma-

jority of the commission reported against the idea of a prohibitory liquor law, and that the minority, the Rev. Dr. McLeod, reported strongly in favour of legislation of that kind. So far as the House is concerned, the evidence is valueless at the present time, because we are not yet in a position to know the findings of the commission. I believe that it will be found, upon inquiry, that this money has been practically wasted. One-tenth of the sum would have placed the House and the country in possession of all the facts upon which a clear judgment could have been based in legislating upon this question. It places the members of the commission in an unfortunate attitude, because striving, as we have a right to assume they did strive, to discharge their duty, intentionally or unintentionally, they have been enabled to make heavy drafts upon the treasury ; drafts much heavier, I think, than the country is willing to justify in view of the meagre results attained.

It is to be regretted that more stringent rules were not laid down by the Government in regard to the procedure of the commission. In the first place, the commission was too large. It was unwieldy. There were seven members, when three would just as thoroughly have secured all the evidence necessary. In many instances members of the commission found that their private business interfered with their travelling abroad to listen to the evidence, and then, of course, it was left to the other members. In the cases where evidence was taken in the United States, and up and down throughout the Dominion, one commissioner, with a stenographer, could just as well, and perhaps better, have done the work than three or four, or more, commissioners, travelling at a great expense to the people of Canada. The whole plan of the commission was erroneous. The idea was clearly based upon the desire of the majority of the House to avoid coming to a conclusion any earlier than it was forced upon them, and their intentions have resulted, as we predicted they would result, in a delay, which will prevent the consideration of the evidence and the report until after the general elections, and which will relegate the whole matter to a new Parliament elected without any special reference to the temperance question. This question, instead of being cleared up, has been clouded by too much evidence—by evidence upon points which were not really assigned to the commission. I have communications from many people who have glanced hastily over the report—the report, at any rate, as given to the press—and I am informed that the commission have gone very much beyond the instructions of the resolution passed by this House. The Government itself—and this will come up later when I have the documents before me—gave the commission a larger scope of inquiry than the resolution of the House did, and enabled these gentlemen, at a great expenditure of time and a great waste of money, to pile up a mass of evidence and a lengthy report which the country will not have an opportunity of seeing until long after the time they should have seen and studied it, and in such a form that hundreds and thousands, who are deeply interested in the question, will feel anxious to avoid rather than to study it. I very much regret this in the interest of true reform. I think it has a tendency to make those who are interested in pressing this question before the electorate, feel that the sympathies of the majority of this House are not with them, and that the means which might have been used to place information clearly within their reach have been used to becloud the issue and to delay the time at which the decision should have been reached. I would like to ask the Minister if the sums he has mentioned include the cost of printing and distributing the evidence and the report ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. I gave those figures the other night, including the cost of printing the evidence and the report.

Mr. FLINT. Will the Minister give the full amount, then, that the commission will have cost, including both the salaries of the commissioners and the printing ?

Mr. FOSTER. I gave that the other night. It is in "Hansard," if my hon. friend will look at it. Then hon. gentlemen opposite were dissatisfied, because they had not the information with reference to the individual members of the commission. To-night I brought that information, so that the two together make the total information in my possession.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The item of $8,000, which the committee now have before them, is, I understand, a balance of $90,000 which it has cost this country to obtain the opinion of the five gentlemen who were appointed as royal commissioners on the subject of prohibition ?

Mr. FOSTER. No ; the hon. gentleman is quite wrong.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman the other night stated it to be the sum that it had cost.

Mr. FOSTER. I stated that as the sum to get the opinion, the printing of the report and the printing of the evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then we will add the printing of the report. Now, I venture to say that there is not a man in the House of Commons whose opinion on the subject of prohibition will be changed or modified one iota by the fact that these commissioners have reported one way or the other. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) has clearly expressed the fact in saying that both prohibitionists and anti-prohibitionists

looked on the whole thing as a huge farce. The Government were unable themselves to form any opinion; on this subject as on many others they were unable to lead the House; and they tried to get a buffer between themselves and public opinion in the form of a royal commission. I venture to say that that commission have acted in a way that did not command the approval of either the prohibitionists or the anti-prohibitionists. The House of Commons expressed itself years ago as quite willing to legislate upon this question of prohibition, and when public opinion had formed itself in favour of the proposition. That resolution is upon the journals of this House, not once, but two or three times. The hon. leader of the House was at one time in favour of legislating upon the question irrespective of whether public opinion was against it or in favour of it; but that, he explained afterwards—and he is entitled to the benefit of the explanation—was in a weak moment. What this House has the right to know is not the opinion of five gentlemen selected as a royal commission on the question, but the opinion of the electors of Canada. The Opposition expressed the view long ago that the public opinion of this country should govern, and that when that opinion is clearly expressed, the House of Commons should be bound by it. We have time and again expressed our opinion that the question should be submitted to a plebiscite of the people. The hon. gentleman was not willing to have that done and he hit upon the scheme of a royal commission.

Mr. FOSTER. That policy is very definite—to obey the people when they give the order.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The policy was not that we should take the opinion of five or six gentlemen, but the opinion of the electorate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is your opinion?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will give my opinion when called upon at the proper time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You are a little nervous now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not at all. My opinion is, as it always has been, that when public opinion is clearly expressed in favour of prohibition, this House ought to grant it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did you vote for it?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did vote for that proposition, and I am prepared to vote for it again. The Government had not the pluck to submit the question to a plebiscite. Instead of doing that, they hit upon the scheme of a royal commission. The commission went to Halifax, and called fifteen or twenty gentlemen to give their opinion on the subject; they solemnly recorded whether they were against or in favour of prohibition, and then solemnly printed it in a blue-book, of five or six tomes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Tomes—volumes—perhaps tombs—which nobody will ever read.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You have not read them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly not; I do not want the opinion of these gentlemen at all; I want the opinion of the electorate, and I venture to say that this is a subject on which the electorate are quite capable of forming an opinion themselves; and the fact that Mr. A or Mr. B record themselves in favour of prohibition will not alter the opinion of Mr. C or Mr. D. If a commission had been appointed to go abroad and ascertain facts which were not within the grasp of the electorate of Canada, there might have been something to say for it. If the hon. gentleman had appointed one or two men to go to the state of Maine or some other place where prohibition had been tried, and to report its effect in those places, there might have been something to say for it. But that was a very small part of the duty relegated to this commission. The commission did not go at all to the state of Maine; one or two, I believe, went; but the time they spent and the expenditures incurred was chiefly in travelling around Canada and going through the farce of taking the opinions of fifteen or twenty persons in each small town. Everybody laughed at it. The prohibitionists laughed at it; the anti-prohibitionists laughed at it. It was a scheme of the hon. gentleman who in a weak moment pledged himself to support a prohibitory law, in order to enable him to crawl out of an unpleasant position, at an expense of $90,000; although he must have been aware, before the commission started, that not one man's opinion in this House or outside of it would be influenced by the commission one iota. If the hon. gentleman had spent $90,000 in having a plebiscite taken, the House would be in a position to legislate; and the House has pledged itself, time and again, to legislate when the opinion of the people is clearly ascertained. The only possible way in which that opinion can be ascertained is by a plebiscite, and that is the one thing which the former leader of the prohibitionists declines to grant. He is willing to spend $90,000 on a royal commission, but he is not willing to spend that sum or half that amount to ascertain in an effective way what the people really want. If it were morally fair to move to reduce this vote, I would do so; but that would be unfair, because the work is being done, and we have to grin and pay for it. But we can, at least, enter our solemn protest against this reckless expenditure of money for no good purpose.

Mr FRASER. Does the hon. leader of the House intend to have a digest of this evidence made ?

Mr. FOSTER. Each hon. gentleman is supposed to have his own digestive faculties.

Mr. FRASER. I do not think there is enough digestive force in the House to do that, and I would recommend to the leader of the House that we should have such a digest made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That would cost too much.

Mr. FRASER. There are occasions in which so much has been spent that the only way to get the benefit of the expenditure is by making fresh expenditure. There ought to be a digest of those six volumes. There ought to be one volume giving the names of the witnesses, and briefly stating what each one said, in order that you might nicely balance the weight of evidence, and for that purpose there should be another commission appointed, for which I would willingly vote. That commission would take the opinions of those in favour of prohibition, and those against, and weigh them, as a mechanical act, in the balance. You would arrive more correctly at a conclusion that way, than by reading the evidence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That will be better than to do as the hon. member for Queen's did, come to a conclusion without reading it.

Mr. FRASER. Has the hon. gentleman read it ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly not.

Mr. FRASER. When the hon. gentleman has come to a conclusion without reading the evidence, he has come to the conclusion now that this is a good expenditure, or he would vote against the item.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not at all.

Mr. FRASER. I understand that the commission sat as judges to hear the evidence.

Mr. FOSTER. They sat all sorts of ways.

Mr. FRASER. I believe the Minister of Finance is correct, and that his statement explains the item of sundries. But I understand that the commissioners were always together in order to hear evidence, and if that be the case, I do not see how Dr. McLeod could have been twice as long engaged in the work as the others.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not surely attribute the size of his bill to the sundries.

Mr. FRASER. I would not like to say that, but I cannot understand why he has been twice as long at the work as the others. He must have been doing it alone at times, and there must have been information he got which the others did not. I suppose that will account for the fact that he came to the only correct conclusion, namely, that we should have prohibition. If the others had been employed the same length of time they would have probably come to the same conclusion, but as they were only employed half the time they could only go half-way. I think we have now full proof of the farcical and ridiculous character of the scheme of appointing a royal commission to find out whether we should have prohibtion or not. It is just on a par with that other commission which was appointed to find out whether we should have a revision of the tariff or not. There is only one way of finding out whether we should have prohibition, and that is by asking the people to vote. There was a good deal of artfulness in this attempt, by means of a royal commission, to lead both temperance and anti-temperance people to think that the Government were really honestly seeking for information, and the utter hollowness of the whole proceeding is now apparent to our cost. The only way to arrive at a true understanding of the public opinion is to put the question to the vote, and let the people have an opportunity of deciding whether they desire prohibition or not. The whole information obtained by this commission is absolutely worthless. To call in people to give their opinion and then pass a report on their evidence is something so ridiculous that the very mention of it creates laughter, because just in proportion to the number of people interrogated, and the answers they give must be the report of the commission. But when we have to pay for all this work, it is no laughing matter. What I should like to know is this : Does the Government propose to act upon the report of the committee ? The only purpose of the commission was to obtain reliable information and thus enable the Government to come to some decision. Is the Government prepared to accept the majority's report ? The report is not before the House, but it has been submitted to the Government, and they must know what it is, and we ought to know whether the Government propose to be guided by the report of the majority, or that of the minority. The Government should take a decision one way or the other, or they will have to appoint another committee. I am sure the members of the House know their own minds upon this question, and would know how to vote if a vote were taken. For myself, I have no difficulty about the question. Now, $80,000 is not a small sum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was $90,000.

Mr. FRASER. We are so accustomed to dealing with millions in these days that a difference of $10,000 does not count.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Except when a small sum is required for the proper working of the Auditor General's office.

Mr. FRASER. A whole afternoon was spent the other day in discussing a very proper subject; and the Government with unflinching integrity and determination to save the people's money, insisted in cutting off a few hundred dollars from the expenses of the Auditor General's office. And $90,000 was thrown away upon a royal commission, which is perfectly worthless. The other day for example, a large deputation waited upon the Government to ask for aid toward a bridge to be thrown across the river here at Ottawa. But nothing could be given, for the Government had no money. Now $90,000 was half what the deputation wanted to help in building that bridge; and we have spent that amount for a six-volume royal commission report. If all the books were brought together they would almost make a pier for that bridge, and I do not know that they could be put to a much better use. They are a combination of liquor evidence and temperance evidence, a mixture that ought to stand the fresh water here. And the saw-dust of which we heard this afternoon would gather about, making an admirable pier. In the province of Nova Scotia or in any of the provinces this $90,000 might be put to great use. For example, in the county of Pictou where I live, $10,000 could be very well spent; and in the county I represent and in many other counties a sum of $10,000 or $5,000; yes, even $3,000 would be very acceptable. I believe the Government themselves are ashamed of this whole affair. They did not see, when they began, what the effect was to be. Now, one word more and I will end.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The end will come.

Mr. FOSTER. This must be the big end.

Mr. FRASER. There cannot be a smaller end than the Government are coming out at in relation to this commission. I commend to the House and the country the fact that this evidence has not been read by a single member of the Government; even the report has not been read by a single member of the Government. I commend to the country the fact that the Government will not say whether they will accept the report of the majority or the minority, and they have no opinion upon this question. Theirs is the position of Mr. Facing-both-ways. They will say to the liquor party: The majority report is in favour of you; and they will say to the temperance party: The minority report is in favour of you, and we paid your man twice as much as the others—that ought to satisfy you. The only way is to leave this question to the people. Tell the people: This is a question that affects you; and when you say that you want prohibition, you shall have it. We are not going to accept the opinion of this man or that man, but we are going to act according to the declared wishes of the people. I am glad to know—no, I should not say I am glad to know, but I am surprised to know—that the Government have no opinion on this question, and they disregard alike the opinion of the majority and the opinion of the minority of this commission.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Last session we were told by the late Premier that this commission had cost up to that time about $100,000, and that it would cost $20,000 more to complete the labours of the commission. Now we are told by the leader of the House that it has cost $90,000 altogether. I have it here in "Hansard:"

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Up to the present time the Royal Commission has cost about $100,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Including this amount of $18,000 for printing and translating?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes: but that sum does not include everything. There will be a vote in the further Supplementary Estimates to cover the balance.

Surely a portion of this expenditure must have been transferred to some other account. If not, how does this difference arise? We have had a great many commissions—one on the labour question, the Civil Service, Curran bridge, on the Lake St. John railway, and others. And then we had that notable commission composed of the privy councillors, forming the Star Chamber. How much have these commissions cost? When are we going to get done with having commissions—when are we going to have responsible government in this country? We thought that the question of responsible government had been fought out long ago, but now we have a government with backbone so weak that they are afraid to assume the responsibility of directing public affairs. It is time this humbug should cease and that we should be governed by a responsible Government?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Are you referring to the Ontario Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, but to a Government that are not fit to wipe their shoes politically. I am referring to the Government, if they may be called by that name, who administer for the time being, and for the time being only, the affairs of this Dominion. I trust the day is near when we shall have gentlemen in power in this country who are not afraid to declare themselves on these questions; who will govern, instead of farming out their duties to commissions. Government by commission! In a British country! And the end of this commission has been the issuing of six volumes of evidence and more reports to come. Tons and tons of printed paper that nobody ever reads and nobody is expected ever to read. Even the Minister

of Justice says he has not read it, and he is supposed to read everything.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have been too busy reading the report of the Ontario Government commission on the subject of the prisons.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You have nothing to do with that. You have your own prisons to attend to. You have as much as you will be able to attend to ; and sometimes they say you get tired.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am pretty tired now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Sometimes they say, the hon. gentleman is overworked and that he rests for a few days, or rather he strikes. I do not know whether he strikes for a respite or what. He has not informed us, and the leader of the House has not informed us. I think it was the duty of the leader of the House, when making ministerial explanations to have informed us on this subject. Then there is another singular thing in connection with this business, and that is the discrepancy that now appears in the accounts. Has there been a shrinkage in values since last session ? Are the Government not transferring a portion of this account to another commission to make the people believe it did not cost so much ? Why are they going back on the statement of their leader last session ? Have they transferred this to some members of their commission ?

Mr. FOSTER. The Auditor General has got it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And the Auditor General will deal with it fairly, too. The Auditor General has the courage of his opinions, anyway.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You lost $500 on contingencies.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How much did the hon. Minister lose when he went on strike ? Was his salary cut off ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not a cent.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did he get it while his resignation was pending ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Every dollar.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When the Minister of Justice got down under a juniper tree and prayed that he might die, did the angels come and bake him a cake and tell him to live and go back and get his salary ? I think the hon. gentleman has got his answer, and I do believe that if he read the evidence of this commission he would go on strike again. I believe any gentleman who would read that evidence, would go on strike. I protest against this extravagant waste of public money. It is money for which nothing can be got that would serve any useful purposes. The hon. gentlemen sitting behind the Government say that they cannot get anything. They have voted subsidies over and over, and here they come and spend this money, and then they discriminate. It is like their tariff. They give one commissioner about $3,000, and they give another about $6,000. Are they men of different calibre ? Are the services of one of these commissioners worth more than those of another ? Or is it possible that one of these commissioners was related to some of the powers that be ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that might be.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If we looked up the genealogical tree, which the Minister did not want us to do, we might find that that is the solution of the difficulty, that is the reason why his services were so much more valuable. Does the Minister of Finance think that his services were more valuable than does the Minister of Justice ? It was stated so. There is something more than genealogy about this that we do not know. There is no necessity of going into this any further, but when the tree is shown forth, we may be able to see.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Take care you don't see double.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman is more apt to see double than I am. I think, if we were to judge from some of his late discussions, that he has been seeing double.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am judging the hon. gentleman now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was judging you last night. I do not believe you could scarcely see at all. But I do not think it is right for the Minister of Justice to sit in judgment upon me until he has the evidence. Now, I protest most seriously against this vote. I believe it is an outrage. This money might as well have been thrown away. If this money had been given to people who want seed grain, or who want to develop any industry in this country, or if it had been given to those poor men in want and destitution in Montreal and the other large cities of Canada last winter, there would have been some justification for it. It would have been an easy thing for the Minister to defend, it would have been an easy thing for his supporters to defend. But to take $120,000, which the late Premier said it would cost, or to take $90,000, which the present leader of the House says it will cost, and squander that money in taking volumes of evidence that are worthless trash, that will never be read, is something that cannot be defended.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is another question I would like to ask the hon. Minister. I understood there was a claim made

by one of the translators for $27,000 for translating alone, which he declared was due him under a contract made between him and the late Secretary of State. I wish to know whether that claim is now before the Government, and whether any part of it has been allowed, or is included in this $90,000.

Mr. FOSTER. All that the Government owe for translation has been paid.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not ask the hon. gentleman that. I asked him whether a claim is pending.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no claim pending before me.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman not know of this claim ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is it the intention to have the report translated, or is it to be translated ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think part of the translation has been made.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is it the intention to complete the translation ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it will be entirely translated.

Mr. DEVLIN. Then it is the intention of the Government to complete the translation of all the evidence taken, in fact to make a complete translation of all those volumes which are about to be distributed ?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman asked if the report was to be translated, and I said it was. A part of the evidence has been translated, but only a part.

Mr. DEVLIN. Then the rest of the evidence is not to be translated ?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Mr. DEVLIN. I should like to ask if the balance of the evidence is to be translated ?

Mr. FOSTER. A part of the evidence, I think, was translated by Mr. Montpetit, not a large portion of it. The translation was then stopped, and no more of it has been made up to the present time.

Mr. DEVLIN. Well, I supposed this amount of $8,000 is to be spent just as the hon. gentleman explained to-night. It is possible, then, that the difference between the $90,000 mentioned by the leader of the House to-night, and the $120,000, which it was stated by the late Premier the whole thing would cost, represents the deduction of the cost for translation. Am I to understand, then, that no further amount will be asked for to prosecute this translation ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think any further amount will be asked this year, at least.

Mr. DEVLIN. May I ask the leader of the Government if the contract entered into between Mr. Montpetit and the Government was fulfilled ?

Mr. FOSTER. On whose part ?

Mr. DEVLIN. On Mr. Montpetit's part, or upon the part of the Government ?

Mr. FOSTER. I understand it was fulfilled on the part of the Government, and so far as I know, on Mr. Montpetit's part.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman say what was the amount of that contract ?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say what the amount was.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I accept the hon. gentleman's statement that he did not know the amount of Mr. Montpetit's claim against the Government. I would like to ask the other members of the Government whether they can join in the same statement. I am very credibly informed that a claim has been preferred, and that some members of the Government have acknowledged a claim for $27,000.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman referred to the Secretary of State's office, and as I was the late Secretary of State, I suppose he referred to me, but no arrangement was made by me. When I came to the office, Mr. Montpetit came to me and claimed that the department had made some arrangement with him, which I could not recognize. I told him that the department would pay him for what translation he had done, but that we could not recognize that any contract had been made. Mr. Montpetit did not accept that view of the matter at all. He had his own views, and claimed that he had a contract with the Government, but I found no evidence of that. I have no knowledge whatever that Mr. Montpetit has continued his claim against the Government, or still maintains that he has a further claim ; although I know he was not at all satisfied with the statement I made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was the amount mentioned of the claim correct, namely, $27,000?

Mr. DICKEY. I dare say it would have amounted to that, if he had finished his work. I presume now if he had any claim against the Government, it would be in the nature of damages for refusing to allow him to prosecute his contract.

Mr. DEVLIN. Then a contract was broken by the Government ?

Mr. DICKEY. Not at all. I say that so far as I was able to judge, there was no contract at all. Mr. Montpetit did not admit that, and claimed there was a contract. I came to the conclusion that Mr. Montpetit had no claim, from inquiries I made in the department.

Mr. DEVLIN. Then no arrangements were made between Mr. Montpetit and the Government, no contract of any kind passed between him and the Government ?

Mr. DICKEY. No, so far as I was able to find out, except that Mr. Montpetit was doing some translation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am very much afraid from the statement made by the Minister of Finance that we have not reached the end of this expenditure, and that $8,000 is by no manner of means going to close the account. The hon. gentleman was careful to say that nothing more would be asked for this year, but he did not state that this was the last sum we would be called upon to pay, and bearing in mind what was stated last year by Sir John Thompson, it looks as if the strong probability is that $120,000, as was stated by the late Premier as the probable cost of the commission, is much more likely to be accurate than the sum given by the Finance Minister. We ought to know exactly what we are doing, we ought to know, not merely whether we have to vote this $8,000, but as to how near that will bring us to the closing of the account. The Minister of Finance must have some idea, and he ought to be able to inform the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. This closes the account for the present.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is no answer.

Mr. FOSTER. The House is not asked to vote any further sum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is neither an explanation nor an answer. We want to know what the total cost is to be. The hon. gentleman tells us that the House is not going to be asked now to vote more money. There may be another $6,000 for half a dozen more cousins—we may have $30,000 more added. The House should be put in full possession of all the information the Government possesses as to the probable cost of this commission.

Mr. FOSTER. You have it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman stated that a further sum was not going to be asked this year, but he did not deny that a considerable amount of money may be asked subsequently. I am informed that Rev. Dr. McLeod has put in a further bill. Is it true that he has put in a further claim ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no note here of any further claim.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman say, and if he does not know, will any member of the Government say, whether they are or are not aware that other claims have been preferred by Rev. Dr. McLeod ?

Mr. FOSTER. I find there is a further claim made by Rev. Dr. McLeod. That claim is on this basis, for payment for time for Sundays when absent from home.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And how much is that ?

Mr. FOSTER. For forty-eight Sundays, at $10.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is $480 more.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Is it the intention of the Government to translate the evidence and publish it all in French ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have already answered the question. No vote is being asked to print the translation in French.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Surely the Government knows its intention. Is it the intention to proceed with the translation already commenced, and print in French the volumes of evidence already issued in English ?

Mr. FOSTER. The report is being translated and published in French and in English. Part of the evidence has been translated, and no further vote is at present being asked for further translation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Will the vote asked for cover the expense of printing the French edition ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes ; of the report.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Then it is not the intention of the Government to print the evidence in French ?

Mr. FOSTER. I tell the hon. gentleman that at present we are not asking a vote for that purpose.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I want your intention.

Mr. FOSTER. You have all I can give you.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It is a fair straight question, and I am entitled to a proper answer to it. If I am out of order——

Mr. FOSTER. You are not out of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Then there is a fair question, and in duty bound the Finance Minister should answer it. Is it the intention of the Government to print the evidence in French ? If so, another vote will be required at a future time.

Mr. LAURIER. The refusal of the hon. Finance Minister to answer such a fair question is plain evidence that the House was misled the other day by the Government when it was told that this commission would cost only $90,000—it was a direct misleading of the House. It was the more direct as it was in opposition to the statement made last year that it would cost $120,000. The other day the Minister of

Finance stated, not once, but several times, that the cost of the commission would be in the neighbourhood of $90,000. Now, the hon. gentleman refuses to answer a plain question asked by my hon. friend. It is, therefore, contemplated that there will be further demands with respect to this commission than have been made so far, and it was not accurate for the hon. gentleman to say that the cost would be $90,000. The Government only asked for a certain sum this year, but evidently there are more items to come, and when the full items are in it will be found that the late Prime Minister was correct when he stated last year that the cost would be $120,000 or more.

Mr. BORDEN. I should like to ask the Minister of Finance on what ground the claim is made by Rev. Dr. McLeod that he should be paid for his Sundays. I understand that the other commissioners did not make any claim for Sundays?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will see the basis of Dr. McLeod's contention in this respect, it is that whereas other commissioners were close to their homes and could get there on Sundays, he, living so far away, found it impossible to get to his home. Being thus away from home on Sundays he was at more expense, and had to pay his own hotel expenses, whereas the other commissioners who were close to their homes were able to go there on Sundays. That is the basis of the claim.

Mr. LAURIER. Has the claim been allowed by the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Has it been disallowed by the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. No. It has been neither admitted nor rejected, but is under consideration.

Mr. FRASER. That would only be true——

Mr. FOSTER. I was asked on what grounds the claim was made. I have stated them. That statement is true.

Mr. FRASER. That would only be true in certain situations in which Dr. McLeod was placed.

Mr. FOSTER. They came to forty-eight Sundays.

Mr. FRASER. I think Dr. McLeod should have $10 for each Sabbath, and we ought to be glad that he does not charge double. If he had had the evidence in regard to certain Montreal people before him he would no doubt have charged $20 or $30 for his bill. Being a clergyman, however, he could not work on Sunday, and $10 per Sabbath is pretty steep for a clergyman or any other man. You can go to the Hotel Frontenac and get the best for that amount. Besides, a clergyman would not ride around the country and have a good time on Sunday, but he would have his three meals quietly in his own room. Those Sunday claims have already been passed upon by the Government in the case of the derrick to which I referred, and I think that a live man is better than a dead derrick. The Minister of Finance should take the House into his confidence now, and tell us that if the translation is made the commission will cost $120,000 as Sir John Thompson stated. Is there a translation to be made? Why should not our French fellow citizens have this evidence in French? Is it not as essential to their existence as it is to ours. It may cost a few thousand dollars to translate and publish it, but what of that. The money will be expended in the country, and do not the Government tell us that we are always getting rich when there is money being spent.

Mr. BORDEN. Did Dr. McLeod receive $10 a day in addition to his living allowance on Sundays?

Mr. FOSTER. He has not received his living allowance on Sundays.

Sir JAMES GRANT. I have listened to this discussion for a considerable time, and I am much surprised to find that so much of the valuable time of the House is being wasted in this way. We know that we are suffering considerably from the heat of the summer season, and surely there is nothing to be gained from prolonging the session by useless discussion. I am surprised to find that the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) did not ask that his evidence should be translated into Gaelic as well as French. The idea of all this talk is to throw discredit upon the Conservative party in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh, hear, hear.

Sir JAMES GRANT. It is all very well for gentlemen opposite to laugh, but there is another side of the question. The Government undertook the responsibility of issuing a commission, and why did they issue that commission? Was it not to meet the requirements of the people of the Dominion with regard to the great and important question of prohibition?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir JAMES GRANT. Rely upon it, that it will become a vital question in this country to know how it is to be settled. I have full confidence in the manner in which the Government have acted in this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir JAMES GRANT. The action of hon. gentlemen opposite in discussing this question beyond reasonable limits is not for the purpose of showing the country that they are sincere in their endeavours to promote prohibition. No, their action is for the purpose of showing the country that they be-

lieve the Conservative party in Canada in carrying out the principles of prohibition and the examination into this question, have not been doing what is right and proper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JAMES GRANT. The Government have gone into the question honestly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir JAMES GRANT. They have got the very best men in Canada to examine into it, and if the compiling of the report which they presented cost $90,000, why should they try to make the people believe that it cost $150,000 ? If the Government is trying to do things economically, why should hon. gentlemen opposite find fault with them ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, hear, hear.

Sir JAMES GRANT. It is all very well for gentlemen opposite to attempt to throw ridicule on the commission, but the people of Canada are thoroughly aware of what is going on, and they know that the Government are prepared to do what is right and proper in this great issue. It is not a discussion of this kind that is going to throw discredit upon the Government, for the people know perfectly well that the expenditure was right and proper under the circumstances. It is impossible to go from one end of the Dominion to the other, to inquire into the data, to get the facts, to examine witnesses month after month, and year after year, and to present such a report, without a large expenditure. It is not by throwing cold water on the prohibition question that gentlemen opposite are going to accomplish anything. Discuss the question fairly and openly and speak out like honourable men, but do not try to discredit those who are doing the best they can for the interests of the Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sure we do not want to throw cold water on the question, but we would really like to know whether the hon. gentleman (Sir James Grant) has arrayed himself on the side of the prohibitionists or the anti-prohibitionists.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. After that eloquent appeal made by the hon. member (Sir James Grant) both to the Opposition and supporters of the Government, the Minister of Finance ought to give us the information which has been asked for from this side of the House. The question is a simple one. Is it the intention of the Government to translate fully the evidence and to publish it in French ? The House is entitled to that information, and I cannot see why the Minister should refuse to give it. I do not think there is a single Conservative member of this House who voted for the Royal Commission who does not feel in his heart to-day that it was a great error. That is plainly seen in the fact that not a single individual has become acquainted with the evidence that has been placed before us, and not one in a thousand will read it. What I wish to know, and I think the people of this country have a right to know it, is whether the sum of $91,184, mentioned by the Minister, will close the account, and cover the cost of the whole affair.

To cover expenses of the late Hon. Sir J. S. D. Thompson's funeral..... $25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I very much regret that it should be necessary to criticise this item. Were it possible, I am quite sure every man on both sides of the House would greatly prefer that the amount incurred for the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson had been of a proportion which we could have allowed to pass without comment ; but, having reference to the expenses that have been incurred on similar occasions before, and, still more, having reference to the details which were laid before the House by the Minister of Railways and Canals last night, I am sorry to say that I cannot acquit the Government of very grave extravagance in bringing down this vote. So far as I recollect, the total funeral expenses of Sir George Cartier amounted to only about $10,000, and those of the funeral of Sir John Macdonald to only about $6,900. I am very sorry, therefore, that I must censure the conduct of the Government in allowing this amount to have been expended on the present occasion. It is a very disagreeable, a very painful thing, to have to go into a minute criticism of the items composing the accounts before us, but I am bound to say that, on looking over them a very large number of them appear to me to be accounts which cannot possibly be defended, and I think the Government had no right whatever to use their position or to make use of the Governor General's warrant for the purpose of an expenditure such as this. We are not going to criticise this expenditure in a carping or ungenerous spirit ; but there is no doubt whatever in my mind that there was no justification whatever for a very considerable portion, at any rate, of the expenditure for which we are now asked to vote, and I am quite certain that any hon. gentleman who will peruse the details of that expenditure will entirely agree with me that it is an especially unfortunate thing, under all the circumstances, that the Government should have allowed it to go the lengths it has gone. So far as I can see, there appears to have been no sort of attempt to check the expenditure that was incurred. Nobody would grudge, I repeat, any reasonable demonstration or any reasonable expenditure on such an occasion ; but there is a measure in all things, and it does appear to me that it has been very gravely exceeded on the present occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. The action of the Government in bringing down this vote, which, I admit, looks, at first, like a very considerable vote, requires some explanation on the part of the Government, and it is my duty to say a word or two with reference to it. I suppose no one in this House or in the country would quarrel with the idea of a state funeral having been accorded to the remains of Sir John Thompson, dying, as he did, as the leader of the Government, and under the circumstances of his death, at home, and with the particular marks of respect and sorrow that were shown by Her Majesty and the British Government. It has been stated to-night that the funeral expenses of other statesmen in Canada were not nearly so large. That is true, and it is also true that none died under exactly similar circumstances, and that the funeral of none took place under similar circumstances. Sir John Thompson died at Windsor Castle, as we all know, and the marks of respect and regret which followed his remains from Windsor Castle to Halifax were most notable—such as were never before accorded to any colonial statesman. If we take the Government of Great Britain and refer to this particular expenditure upon the funeral of a statesmen not belonging to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, you will find that it is no inconsiderable item. I am not able to-night to state the amount of the expenditure incurred by the British Government, but no person can think of the circumstances, no one can think of the pomp and ceremony which characterized the action of the British Government in this matter without seeing at once that the cost must have been immense. From the time the body left Windsor Castle, after having been elaborately taken care of there, until it reached Halifax, there was nothing but one large bill of expense. I am not sure that $100,000 would meet the total expenditure which the British Government incurred in paying the marks of respect it did to Canada's first citizen and the leader of its Government. All that was done, and in the British House of Parliament no person, not the most rabid radical, lifted up his voice in criticism of the expenditure that took place in showing those marks of great respect and honour to the remains of a colonial statesman. And yet the expense was immense. I can imagine that a radical, that a member in opposition, might easily have founded a very strong case, as cases are founded for instance in this Parliament, against the Government. He might have objected to the immense expenditure that took place in refitting one of Her Majesty's largest vessels from top mast down to water line in order to make it a ship—not of war—but of funeral pomp and magnificence. He might have objected to the great cost incurred in recalling that vessel from a distant station to Great Britain, and to all the other expenses incurred so willingly and ungrudgingly in order to show that the British Government respected a Canadian who had given distinguished service to the Empire to which he belonged. I mention that circumstance simply to show that it evoked necessarily a response from the Canadian people, and that the Canadian Government simply voiced that sentiment in having funeral obsequies somewhat in keeping with the respect and appreciation which was shown by the British Government. Well, the total amount at the most will only be $25,000. It may be less than that. The total of the bills which are in, and of those which have yet to be passed upon and diligently revised, as the other accounts have been, will not exceed $25,000. My hon. friend says that great extravagance was shown. Well, it was a period when perhaps the Government was not in a position to give the most minute details for the carrying out of that ceremony. That was entrusted by the Minister of Public Works to an officer of his department. That officer went to Halifax, with instructions, I am informed, to have the ceremonies carried out in a manner consonant with the respect and regret we all felt, and we were but voicing Canada's sentiment in our wish to pay to our dead chief and honoured statesman the greatest honour and respect. From first to last, what was done? There was an elaborate draping of his native city where he was buried. The provincial buildings and public buildings, the outside of many of the churches, the inside of the great church in which his remains were to lie for an hour, while the funeral ceremony took place, were draped. You may say that it was extravagance to buy tens of thousands of yards of stuff and have that spread out so as to give some mighty token of the sorrow and regret which was felt by the people of Canada for the loss of so young, so brilliant and so honoured a statesman. Call it extravagance if you like. It was an extravagance showing in some degree, and a very slight degree, the sorrow that filled the hearts of the people. It was an evidence of their respect and their honour. Now, that draping was one of the large items of expense. The undertakers in Halifax are men who understand their business. They were given the general order to carry out, so far as their part went, the funeral ceremony with becoming pomp and circumstance. They did that. Their bills have been largely cut down, and remain now at the figure at which they are valued by the officer of the department. We cannot carry on public funerals of that kind with the minute care and regard to detail which we can give the funeral of a private person. We may just as well recognize the fact to-night that every person who has anything to do with a funeral and state pomp of that kind does it in a more elaborate manner than he would in the case of a private in-

dividual, and expects to be paid accordingly. That bill and the bill for the draping are the two largest we incurred. Some say that the draping was carried out to too great an extent. Perhaps it was, but I am not inclined to think so. Not only were the public buildings in Halifax draped, but the Intercolonial had its most important buildings in St. John and other places draped as well. It may be said to have been a piece of extravagance, but these members and public men and deputations from great bodies that went from the west and came even from as far as British Columbia passed down along that line of railway, and at these large stations they saw what betokened the general respect for a statesman whose funeral ceremonies were being celebrated. These two were the largest items. We will also meet the criticism that in Ottawa expenses was incurred for the same purpose. All kinds of reports have been circulated, but we may be careful about accepting these reports as true. It is a fact that in one of the churches in Ottawa, the scene of Sir John Thompson's political life, the city where his labour took place, where his social functions were carried out, where his generous hospitalities were dispensed, where so many people knew him and loved him, the Government thought it would be right to have a public ceremony and they had that ceremony in a church, of course, of his religious faith. And a certain sum, about $800 or $900 will be found to have been expended there for decorations in that church.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that one of the items included in the $25,000?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I do not think any of these bills were paid.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that among the details to which the hon. gentleman referred?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether it is or not. That is included in what the vote is asked for. Well, Sir, it was felt that a certain official aspect necessarily marked the ceremony here in Ottawa. The judges of the Supreme Court, belonging to what might be called his own fraternity, and all the official life in Ottawa paid their respect to his memory at the service in the church. You may say that was extravagance, possibly it was, looked at from some points of view; but it was extravagance that emanated from a feeling that has its good side, which, I think will excuse it to most of the members of this House, if not to all. Now there was another item. It was thought only right and proper that a funeral train should start from Ottawa and go to Halifax and return. Invitations, official invitations were sent out for that journey. Members of Parliament, the colleagues of Sir John Thompson himself, and individuals more or less connected in official life with him were invited to go upon that train to Halifax. They went. All the expenses for hauling the cars, for sleeping the persons who went and for food on the way, were paid for and appear as an item in that expenditure. These are the larger items. Of course there were trappings which marked the funeral ceremonies in that place where Sir John's remains were laid to be viewed by the people who wished to see them. These were ornate; they were ornate in the best sense; they were thoroughly in keeping with the occasion. Everybody who visited Halifax upon that occasion had but one opinion with reference to the taste and fitness of these expressions of grief which surrounded the remains in the chamber of the provincial building where they lay in state. The vault in which his remains rest was paid for, and the amount appears in these bills. That is the general character of the bills. I hope they will not be criticized upon anything like this line—that the Government took advantage of the death and burial of Sir John Thompson to spend money purely for the sake of patronage. I have no hesitation in saying that there was not a thought of that kind in the mind of any member of the Government in anything that was asked to be carried out or that was carried out. The idea was to meet, with a fair response, the outflow of public feeling, to meet it in a manner that would show that the Canadian people had an appreciation of their fellow-citizen and statesman somewhat equal to that which the British Government itself evinced; and to do that the ceremony was necessarily marked by some pomp and circumstance. The bills are before the House. Whatever criticism is made, I hope it will not be criticism born of the idea I mentioned a moment ago, because such an idea was entirely foreign to the minds of the members of the Government and of every person who had to do officially with the carrying out of that ceremony. You may say that more money was expended than was necessary. But this much also is true, that the statesman whose death evoked such strong public feeling had during his life won such esteem as to justify the Government in an attempt to voice these public feelings at his funeral ceremonies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Adverse criticism of such a vote as we have proposed to us to-night is, I am sure, and will be felt by everybody to be, peculiarly distressing. Carping, unfair criticism, I hope, will be entirely absent. Judicious and proper criticism has been made essential by the inexpedient and unbounded extravagance which characterized the work in this connection that Government undertook to do. There is not a man, I believe—and that, at any rate, is a subject for congratulation—not a man who was indisposed to join in the responsibility which the Government assumed of granting to the late Sir John Thompson a public funeral. There is not a man who desired that the funeral should be

conducted in any other way than a befitting and proper way. But I do not think there is a personal friend of Sir John Thompson's living in Canada to-day but will bitterly and sincerely regret that the expenditure was of so disgraceful a character as to call for the criticisms that it is our duty to make. If the late Sir John Thompson was living and a similar case came before this House, there is no other member of the House who could be found to denounce unnecessary expenditure with greater bitterness than he would. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the peculiar and tragic circumstances which surrounded the late statesman's death and the honours which were paid to his remains by the Imperial Government. Sir, every member of this House and every Canadian felt rejoiced and proud that the Imperial Government offered these honours to the memory of a distinguished Canadian. But the fact that that was done and the fact that the body was conveyed in an Imperial ship and under the Imperial flag to the wharf at Halifax is no excuse for this Government or its officers extravagantly squandering public money. Upon this occasion, more than upon any other occasion, care should have been taken that, while the pomp and circumstance befitting the interment of the late statesman's body should be observed, no unseemly extravagance or rioting should be tolerated. Sir, the senseless display which the hon. gentleman referred to and the useless expenditure connected with it affords to my mind not the slightest evidence of any depth of feeling on the part of those who were responsible for it. The same scale of expenditure as marked the funeral of the late Sir John Macdonald, as my hon. friend suggested—some $6,000 or $8,000—should surely have been about the scale which these gentlemen would feel justified in following in the funeral of the late Premier, Sir John Thompson. Surely the position held in the country by Sir John Macdonald, the number of years he had filled his high place and all the circumstances connected with his death, justified a public funeral, justified the keeping of his body in state and the removal of it to the city where he had lived the most of his life, the city of Kingston. Practically there were two public funerals. And when some $6,000 was proposed to meet the expenses, the voice of criticism was silent. That money was spent, as we had hoped would have been the case in Sir John Thompson's funeral, and the amount was voted without a word of criticism amid the solemn silence of this House. But in view of the items the hon. gentleman gives, it is apparent that they took advantage—or if they did not, they permitted those over whom they had control, to take advantage—of the unfortunate circumstances attending that interment to make it an occasion of lamentable display, of inexpedient and inexcusable extravagance.

Mr. STAIRS. If I may be permitted, I think there are some circumstances connected with the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson that ought to be pointed out to the House, supplementing what has been said by the Minister of Finance, which, I think, to a certain extent will explain the reasons why the cost incurred in connection with this funeral exceeds that of some other state funerals that have taken place in Canada. One very great difference between this funeral and other state funerals was that the others took place within a fixed and short time, while in this case circumstances made that impossible. In the case of the funeral we are now considering, the time in which the preparations were to be made was at first believed to be very short indeed. Not only was the time very short, but after a few days it became known to those in charge of the preparations, that the date itself was not certain. They did not know exactly at what date to be prepared. It was some considerable time before the date of the arrival of the ship at Halifax was finally known. The effect of this uncertainty was that the preparations for the funeral had to be rushed; and, having very little time at command, and not knowing exactly what time they did have, they could not give that careful supervision to the cost of the preparations that would have been given in any ordinary business transaction. The great object of the officer having this matter in charge, was to have the preparations ready in time for the arrival of the ship. Now, the effect of extending the time naturally was, that as the days passed on, I presume the preparations grew, to a certain extent, and it is quite possible, therefore, that they were made a little fuller than they would have been if there had been a shorter delay. Having been in Halifax during the whole time these preparations were being made, I can bear testimony to what has been said by the Minister of Finance, that there was no attempt, I am sure, in Halifax, on the part of any one connected with the preparations for this funeral, to indulge in any extra expense in the way of providing patronage to any one at all. I also want to point out that, owing to the peculiar nature of these preparations, it was impossible for the officers of the Department of Public Works, who had charge of them, to obtain estimates of the cost of anything. It could not be otherwise. A certain amount of preparation had to be made, certain buildings had to be draped inside and outside; and when the officer went in and looked at a certain building, it was impossible for him to say what the work of draping that building would cost. As a matter of fact, I think I may almost say, that when the work was commenced, it was not known exactly what would be done, and probably as the time went on, the preparations grew. I can assure the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), that in all the preparations that were made in

Halifax in connection with the funeral, everything was done in perfect taste; there was no attempt whatever to make any extraordinary or unusual display. Everything that was done, was simply continuing the honours which had already been paid to Canada and to the late Sir John Thompson by Her Majesty and by the English Government. I think, therefore, that the general sense of the House will be that, subject to the revision which is being made, as stated by the Minister of Finance, and under which only reasonable accounts will be paid, this item in the Estimates should be passed by the committee.

Mr. FRASER. Having attended the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson, I must say that the very fact that the accounts have to be gone over and reduced, is, to my mind, the very best evidence of the extravagant character of the funeral.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). The bills were made by the most respectable lawyers in the country.

Mr. FRASER. I know that doctors prepare the occasion, but I did not know that lawyers are called in at the funeral. I was going to say that I would be the last man to object to a fitting funeral to the late Premier. Although I was in opposition to that distinguished statesman, my relations with him were of such a character that I would be the first to approve a public funeral being given to him. But the public funeral ought to have been with regard to two points: first, to his own tastes, which were simple; and secondly, the country in which we live. I must say that that distinguished statesman himself would be the first to object to the expenditure that was made. Now, I am not setting myself up as a judge of what an occasion of that kind should cost; but I do know that the provincial buildings, where the remains lay, after $6,000 or $7,000 was expended upon them, did not look anything like as well as they would have looked with an expenditure of $1,000. Why, the light of day was excluded. When you went in there at nine o'clock, you saw 70 or 80 electric lights. Now, to my mind, I do not think that was in keeping with the occasion. But there is another consideration: $25,000 is too much to spend upon the funeral of any man in any country. Why, Sir, when Sir Walter Scott died, who was one of the most distinguished men that ever graced British letters, Lord Althorpe was asked to give him a public funeral, and what did he say? He said he knew of no man in Great Britain who ought to receive at the hands of the people a state funeral. He deprecated spending so much on one idol of clay, and he thought that the amount that would be expended upon the funeral, should be given to his widow. I think it was Fox who refused to give his assent to a vote for the burial of Pitt, but he was willing that his debts should be paid. Now, while I do not object to a proper amount being expended for the funeral of Sir John Thompson, I do say that the expenditure of $25,000 in a democratic country like this, with only 5,000,000 of people, is setting the worst precedent that could possibly be set before the people. $25,000 on one funeral, one show, all that cloth and display. I have looked over certain items of the account, as other hon. gentlemen have doubtless done, and I must say I do not think some of them were in keeping. The Government should have seen that, while the display was befitting to the distinguished services of the late Premier, it was not upon an extravagant scale. What will the people think? Although I think the remarks of the leader of the House will find an echo in the minds of the people of this country, what are we to think when twenty miles of cloth were used upon that occasion, and not a dollar of credit for the cloth is to be found after it is used, so far as I can see.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will meet that statement at once. The cloth which was used and not damaged, in a great many cases was returned, and values struck off from the bill for that which was returned. The other materials which were not returned, and which were paid for and remained in the hands of the Public Works Department, are to be sold by public auction, and the proceeds are to be put into the treasury. I am not sure whether the bills, as they are put down there, show what has been cut down from them. No man on earth can prevent another man from making an extravagant charge, and you can only criticise a man who pays an extravagant bill without revising it. I am not sure whether these bills were revised; I am inclined to think that they were partly revised.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) These are the revised bills.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, they are not fully revised. Experts were put on, who not only valued but measured the stuff, and the report of the experts on the measurements and on the value of the stuff was taken by the officer. The bills will be revised upon the report of the experts.

Mr. FRASER. The papers do not show that. I think it would have been much better not only for the Government but for hon. members of the House if a detailed statement had been given as to what bills had been presented and what amounts deducted. But I desire to point out that $25,000 is the amount required; that the total amount of the accounts sent in is $25,600, and that, therefore, there is a margin left of only $600.

Mr. FOSTER. The Governor General's warrant was asked to cover the amount of the bills, with the understanding of course that that was the outside amount, but that the bills would be carefully scrutinized and if any charges were found to be exorbitant

they would be reduced and only the revised bills would be paid. It is not certain that the sum of $25,000 will be required as the total, but that is the outside amount which can be required, and not until the revision is complete and payments made, will it be possible to say how much less the bills will be, but they certainly will aggregate less than that amount.

Mr. FRASER. All these explanations may change materially the amount of the bills. I am assuming that the amount of the bills is correct as rendered, because the traders are responsible men; Gordon & Keefe, A. & S. Stevens & Son, of Halifax, are responsible firms, and surely would not send in bills for more than the goods supplied. I do not see what right the Government has to cut down the bills unless they are exorbitant. In cutting down the bills the Government must accept one of two positions: Either the traders were dishonest, or the Government are adopting a cheese-paring policy in reducing the gross claim. Are they going to say that the bills are excessive, otherwise it is proper to pay the amount of the bill. To use a Scotch phrase, "On all occasions it is in the face of a corpse that a man will be honest." I would expect the tradesmen to be honest; yet it appears a great reduction is to be made in their accounts. All this shows that business methods were not followed. Was there any reason for this? The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) himself answered the leader of the House when he stated they were waiting for quite a long while, thus showing that there was plenty of time to make this arrangement as business men would do, and to order 1,000 or 2,000 yards of material according to sample and at a certain price. Do I understand the tradesmen received carte blanche to supply what they pleased without regard to price? Surely that was not the case. The truth of the matter is this: That without saying a word, as regards the officer sent down, there seems to have been this idea, spend anything. The Government unfortunately made this an occasion which will not soon be forgotten in Canada. The expenditure of $25,000 on a funeral in this country is beyond all calculation too much for any man, from the Governor General down to the lowest subject. The late Premier did his duty during his life time, and the friends who went to attend his funeral, whether they were political friends or opponents, followed his remains with sorrow. But sorrow is not evinced by a great display of crape. The way the mourners acted showed:

> They bore about the mockery of woe,
> To midnight revel and the public show.

If the heart of Canada was moved it was shown more by the sorrow felt in the hearts of the people than by the gaudy show.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). That is why the people will discount what you say.

Mr. FRASER. If the hon. gentleman has any objection to offer I shall be glad to hear it. What I say is, that it is no indication of sorrow that $25,000 was spent and a great display made. Sorrow is only shown in the feeling of the people, and I believe that feeling of sorrow was genuine in Canada, and it did more to honour the remains of Sir John Thompson than all the display the Government made. I cannot help feeling, after the explanation made, the bills are out of all reason, because one, for example, was of $1,900, reduced or being attempted to be reduced to $900, and that excessive charges have been made. Do these accounts not show that the tradesmen felt that they could charge what they liked, that the Government wished to evince sorrow on this occasion and they would see they were passed. I think the amount spent in draping the Council Chamber and in draping the church, from $7,000 to $8,000, was altogether too large, and it has set a precedent—but I do not think it will be followed—at all events it has done much harm as regards paying tribute to the memory of the distinguished statesman by expending such a large sum of money in one day. I should have much preferred if the Government had expended $5,000 or $10,000 on that occasion; $5,000, I think, would have been enough. It must also be remembered that the British Government did not spend as much as the hon. gentleman stated. There was not an extra dollar paid to the men on ship board, the ship had to be somewhere and the pay of the sailors had to go on.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. SPROULE. That is begging the question.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman either does not understand what I have said or does not understand the matter. I say the expenditure of the British Government was not $100,000. In fact there would be little extra payment, but when the statement was made that there was an expenditure of $100,000, I said there was no such expenditure. I should have preferred that $5,000 or $10,000 had been expended on Sir John Thompson's funeral, and the balance expended in building a monument that would have remained succeeding generations of this distinguished statesman, rather than have thrown away $25,000 in expenditure for one day. It did not add anything to the solemnity of the occasion, and did not tend to draw a tear to the eye or elicit a feeling from the heart for the dead statesman. In this new democratic country we cannot afford to start out in this way. Our busy life is different from that of an old country like England, although there the people have learned a different lesson during recent years. They do not spend as much now as they did. We cannot afford to make such an expenditure of $25,000 on any funeral, and it is not calculated to give us in this

country that view of life and death we should entertain.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I do not think there is any man in the House who has a higher respect and esteem for the departed statesman than I have. I always regarded him as a man of eminent ability, a man of high and excellent character, and a man who should be highly esteemed in every sphere of life. You must remember, Mr. Chairman, that in discussing this question, that I intend no reflection, whatever, directly or indirectly on the memory of the lamented statesman. But we are here to-night to discuss, for a short time, the propriety of spending so much money on a burial service. Sir John Macdonald, you knew, and those of you who associated with him in political life loved him very much. He was the head of the Liberal-Conservative party for nearly forty years. He passed through many political changes in the country, and identified himself with the history of Canada as, I may say, no man ever did. When he was buried, members on both sides of the House were willing that the highest honours and respect should be paid his remains. That was done, according to the estimate of his friends of that day. They had a funeral service in Ottawa, they conveyed his body to Kingston, and buried it in what may be called his native city, and which he represented in Parliament for many years. All that was accomplished in the case of the funeral of Sir John Macdonald for less than $7,000, and how does it come that nearly four times as much money was spent for the burial of Sir John Thompson ? I do not charge the Government with being personally responsible, but I must say that they appear to have been defrauded out of large sums of money by neglect of duty and want of economy. I took the pains of going over the account very carefully, and I must say that I was really ashamed of some of the charges. I am satisfied that if the members of the Government, and the members who support them, went over these accounts, they would come to the conclusion that the Government was defrauded. Now, think of it. Over 35,000 yards of material were used in the form of bunting, which would make a length of over twenty miles. Think that the decoration of St. Mary's Cathedral, Halifax, cost $8,771.35, almost enough to erect a cathedral from the foundation upwards. How can such an extraordinary expenditure as that be justified ? Take the item of $333.34 for lighting the provincial building for a few nights. Why, they had to make an apology at the beginning of their account to show that they had burned out some of their apparatus in securing the light required. Here is one man who draws not less than $1,228 for black material used, I suppose in decorations. Work at the cemetery entrance is charged for to the amount of $249, and inside the cemetery, $251. The flowers cost $1,925. Now, does the House not see without going over many more of them, that these were extraordinary expenses. Why should flowers be used to such an extent at this funeral, compared with those used at the funeral of Sir John Macdonald. This is a matter between us, and the parties charging the Government such an extraordinary sum. Listen to one or two of the charges. Undertaker and his assistants, for opening the casket, $10. Removing the casket from the provincial buildings to the residence of John Pugh, Esq., and again returning it to the provincial building, undertaker and his ten assistants, $100. Removing the casket from the provincial building to St. Mary's Cathedral, and placing it on catafalque, undertaker, and ten assistants, $40. Remodelling two wagons for conveying flowers and wreaths and draping same in black cloth, $62.50 for each wagon, a sum sufficient to buy the wagon at the beginning. Re-painting one wagon, $80. State funeral car, complete, including ornaments, silver tassels, and silver bullion fringe plumes, and draping same in velvet and black bengaline silk and festooning with flowers, $1,500. This one item alone is nearly one-fourth of what the funeral of Sir John Macdonald cost. I might give several other items to show that the Government need not wonder, that no matter how high our esteem and opinion might be of the lamented statesman, and it is very high, we should find fault with this great expenditure. Here is another sample of the items. Fourteen pair of new knee boots for undertakers, $49. Fourteen black cloth overcoats at $20 each, $280 ; fourteen black hats, $56, and the chief undertaker got $25 a day, and his fourteen assistants, $10 each. Now, need I go any further to show, by these few items that this has been an extraordinary expenditure, and that if the Government had any knowledge of the matter, they must come to the conclusion that the men they appointed to carry out the arrangement, must have been extravagant in the extreme, and that they have taken advantage of the occasion to charge more for the work than they should have done. For all of which the Government is responsible and deserve censure for this extravagance and waste of public money.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I would prefer not to have to discuss the item now before this House. I am a Roman Catholic, and I think I have attended during my life as many religious services as any man in this House. I attended like ceremonies in Europe, and in looking into this account, I think I could not find any precedent into it. For instance, I see for decoration of the church, $8,771.55. Well, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, who are a Roman Catholic, whether it is reasonable to spend such a sum of money under such circumstances. It is plain some things have happened which were

not accounted for. I have been listening attentively to this debate, and so far I have heard no satisfactory explanation. I have as much respect as any one for the memory of Sir John Thompson, and I once more say I wish I had the agreeable duty to keep silent now. There is no question now as to the memory of a man I am sure we all regret; but we are face to face with such extravagances that it is impossible to keep silent about them. I do not even know if we would not be justifiable to ask at once that a vote be taken, and more, that that sum of $25,000 should not be granted. This account was but recently put before us, and I could not for my part know the details of it. I regret it. I am a Roman Catholic, and as such it becomes me, perhaps, more than my Protestant colleagues in this House, to request that we should not vote this sum now, or at least that it should be considerably reduced; for it is our duty not to allow the doubt to bear on the Roman Catholics, which would necessarily remain were we to approve of this account without any protest. Our religion is not a religion of luxury. It is a modest and simple religion, and one which does not require such gorgeous displays as were made in this case. We are willing that our religious services should be held with dignity; but we are not willing that they should be surrounded with such an extravagance as we have witnessed in this case, I will say, painfully witnessed. There is not a Catholic in the province of Quebec who, I am sure, would not but join me in condemning this extravagant account. It is useless for the moment to review all the items of the expenditure that was incurred, according to the accounts laid on the Table of this House. But after hearing those who spoke before me this evening, I do not know whether I should not ask, as I already stated, that this item should not pass or that it should be reduced.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) I fear the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) has not seen the accounts, otherwise he would not have stated that the Catholic church was in question in this case. The Catholic church at Halifax, where the ceremony of the funeral took place, was not paid a single dollar, and excepting what will be paid to the cathedral church at Ottawa, for the funeral service held there, nothing whatever was paid to the church. At Halifax the cathedral church was made a repository. The whole church was draped in mourning, and according to those who witnessed it, it was the finest spectacle of the kind that could be imagined. Such was the opinion of all those who had the advantage of attending those funerals. Over 8,000 yards of cloth were used as hangings, but not an inch of these remained to the church. If there was any extortion or fraud, it was solely by the suppliers. I do not say that some of them did not take advantage of the opportunity to charge about 50 per cent and even 75 per cent over the price they should have asked. But the Government cannot be blamed because suppliers charged more than the market price for their goods. Mr. Coste, an officer of the Public Works Department, who had charge of the preparations in this case, did not ask beforehand the price of the cloth, as he took it for granted that the prices would be moderate, and he presumed ordinary prices would be charged. The accounts now before the House have not yet been paid. I may say by the way that, for the protection of the Public Works Department, all the hangings were measured and valued by a man having experience in such goods. The department has taken every precaution not to be defrauded. Now, Mr. Speaker, we might be reproached with having been extravagant.

I may say in English that I am ready to admit, as the Minister of Public Works is to a great extent responsible for this expenditure that we might have been extravagant. When the sad news reached this country of the death of Sir John Thompson, it was followed by an outburst of sorrow from the United Kingdom and every part of the British Empire. To give an idea of the honour that was paid in England to our dead statesman, I may say that as far as I can ascertain the Imperial Government spent as much as £50,000 sterling for that purpose. They paid for everything. The coffin must certainly have cost £1,000, and everything else was done on the same scale. Therefore, when I sent Mr. Coste down to Halifax, I knew that he was competent for the task, and I told him that he had full scope—that he could do everything that he thought was befitting to honour the memory of the great man whose death caused so much sorrow throughout the whole British Empire. Now, that we have been extravagant I am willing to admit. Perhaps the decorations were too elaborate and costly; but was I not justified, and was my employee not justified, to a certain extent, if we were carried away by the occasion, and made more expenditures than we ever anticipated? I do not think this is one of the items that should be selected in the supplementary Estimates for discussion—and for what purpose? Just to kill time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, I will state that the people of Canada will not grudge the expenditure that has been made. The people of Canada will be ready to honour other dead statesmen, and will be ready to pay another $25,000 for any man placed in the same circumstances as those of Sir John Thompson. They would be willing to pay ten times that amount to secure the services of ten men like him. Of course, these men, who have shed so many tears——

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Do not become personal in this matter.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, I will not be personal: but I repeat that surely the taxpayers of Canada will never grudge this expenditure, and will never blame the Government for having made it, even if you call it extravagant. I am sorry to say that the circumstances did not allow me to control the expenditure, and did not even enable the employee I sent to Halifax to control it, as he would have done in other circumstances. But every gentleman who went to Halifax came back with this feeling, that as a Canadian he was proud that Canada could do what was done to honour our dead statesman.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am rather surprised at the remarks that have fallen from the Minister of Public Works. I am sure that there is not a man on either side who would not join in an expression of sincere regret at the unfortunate demise of a man of the recognized ability of Sir John Thompson. We would unitedly join around the last resting-place of that noble statesman in expressing, both personally and on behalf of the constituencies we represent, our feelings of sincere regret and sorrow that the nation should have been deprived, in such an untimely manner, of his acknowledged ability in the very middle of his life. No person who sat in this House and recognized his great abilities, session after session, but will deeply regret that we are called upon to mourn his unfortunate and sudden death. At the same time, I am surprised that the Minister of Public Works should have given such an unlimited command to his chief engineer, whom he sent to Halifax for the purppose of conducting the funeral arrangements. We would have no objection at all to passing, and I am very sorry this committee has not been in a position to pass, in profound silence the item for the funeral expenses of Sir John Thompson; but the Government has so far exceeded the limits of prudence in this matter, that we cannot permit the vote to pass without raising our objection to the enormous extravagance that has apparently characterized the whole proceeding from beginning to end. I am sorry that the management of the affair was committed to the Minister of Public Works. He appears to have entered upon the discharge of that particular duty in a most extravagant and reckless manner. It is only another evidence of the incapacity and recklessness of hon. gentlemen opposite. We do not want for a moment to challenge the propriety of giving to Sir John Thompson that recognition in the way of a state funeral that we think he was justly entitled to; but we do challenge the extravagance connected with it. The whole of the unfortunate affair appears to have been characterized from beginning to end by revelry and enjoyment rather than by the profound regret and sorrow that should have characterized it. I think the Opposition are perfectly justified in drawing the attention of the committee to the items that have been laid before us as evidences of the Government's recklessness and extravagance. We would have liked, silently and without a murmur, to have joined in the vote necessary to meet the expenses of the state funeral; but when hon. gentlemen opposite have run riot in the manner they have done, and sacrificed the public money in the face of the straitened circumstances of the country, in the face of the deficit that has to be met this year, and in the face of all the circumstances, we are sorry, and hon. gentlemen opposite should be ashamed of having to ask the committee to consent to this vote.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) It is not an agreeable task for us, that of having to protest, in the present circumstance, against the vote claimed by the Government to meet the expenditure in connection with Sir John Thompson's funeral. I wish it to be well understood that we do not protest against the State funeral given to the late Prime Minister; but we must protest against the unprecedented extravagance displayed by the Government in the expenditure of public money in this case. I was pained to hear the hon. the Minister of Public Works trying to have us believe that the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) had charged the Government, in his very judicious remarks, with having caused the Catholic church to profit by a certain portion of the money expended by the Government in this case. The Catholic church, if I know anything of it, is rather opposed to such an extraordinary pomp, which is wholly unwarranted and more likely to throw ridicule, not on the church itself, but on its ceremonies. I have no hesitation in saying that very few persons will be found in this country to approve such an exaggerated expenditure. The hon. the Minister of Public Works had to honestly confess a moment ago that some goods were supplied for this funeral which were charged 50 and even 75 per cent in excess of their trade value.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) But they have not been paid.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) But should we allow the Government to disabuse of the power they have to throw on all sides abulous sums taken out of the public money. Should we not protest, when the opportunity offers, against these abuses which are daily occurrences, we would be wanting in our duty. I have no hesitation in saying once more that these extraordinary expenditures, made in connection with the funeral of a man, however exalted was his position in the country, and however greatest merits—merits which we all acknowledge—cannot be warranted in the judgment of any man nor according to the spirit of the Catholic church. Why, Mr. Chairman, we often see our priests decline at least, but with reluctance, decora-

tions even more simple than those the Government was pleased to order in connection with this funeral. For instance, I see in this account an item for $2,000 for flowers.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) You do not contend that such an amount was paid for flowers, do you ?

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) This is what appears in the account.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) It was not the amount that was paid.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) I say that you should not pay the amount of this account. We have nothing else by which to be guided than the valuation laid on the Table of this House, and the amount for flowers, in round figures, is over $1,900. Then, if you are not going to pay it, why should you claim a vote for $25,000 ? Are there any new frauds behind this vote ? The explanation given by the hon. the Minister of Public Works are such as to have us believe this. However it may be, I think I am only discharging a duty when I say here that I have no doubt whatever that the voters in this country will all disapprove of this wild-cat expenditure. Some of the gentlemen who spoke before me have referred to the expenditure made in connection with the funeral of statesmen, just as distinguished as the one whose loss we now mourn. It was rather slight compared to the one we are now called upon to vote for, the funeral of Sir G. E. Cartier, including the expenditure made in England and the crossing of the ocean to Montreal, having only cost $10,000, and that of Sir John A. Macdonald only $8,000. And it is just at the time when the Government is unable to meet the expenditure of the country, it is just at the time when an unprecedented uneasiness is felt everywhere, that the Government chooses the opportunity to throw away money as blindly as they did in this case. I, therefore, think I will be wanting in my duty were I not protesting on behalf of the voters against such an unwarranted waste of the public money.

Mr. TARTE. What is the amount paid so far ?

Mr. OUIMET. Not a cent has been voted yet. The accounts are before the Auditor General, and are to be adjusted by him, and the Deputy Minister of Public Works and Railways and Canals. These two latter departments were entrusted with the task of seeing that the arrangements for the funeral were carried out, and I hope that this sum of $25,000 will cover the whole thing.

Contribution to the Lady Thompson Fund $25,000

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Here is another item, Mr. Chairman, against which we would much like not to be compelled to protest. If the widow of Sir John Thompson should be in such circumstances that she would require this money for keeping in the community the station which she had to hold, after the high position she had occupied, for my part I would be willing to vote it without any observation. Sir John Thompson has occupied during 25 years high positions, positions which enabled him to earn, I will not say much money, but a sufficient sum to provide for his relatives during his lifetime and even after his death. We are none of us rich in this country ; we are all depending on our daily labour. Most of us, in order to provide for our families, when we are gone, are taking as much insurance as we can bear, and it is a rather heavy burden. For my part, I cannot understand how a man so highly gifted as Sir John Thompson was could forget that he would have one day to pass away the same as any other mortal. I do not intend to make any further remarks about this, it was a question which concerned himself and his relatives. The point I wish to make out, Mr. Chairman, is this : Sir John Thompson, at the time of his death, represented a party in which there are many rich men. A public subscription was made which included not only those who supported him in politics, but also those who opposed him. That subscription, according to reports published so far, has yielded $35,000 to $40,000. If I am well informed the personal fortune left by the late Prime Minister amounted to $12,000 or $15,000, so that the widow of Sir John Thompson happens to be now in possession of a fortune of about $50,000. There are many amongst us who, were they to be taken from this world to-morrow would not leave as much to their wives and their children. I need not make any extended remarks with respect to a question of this kind. I only wished to make known in a few words the objection I had against this item.

Mr. LAURIER. Whilst I have no desire on this item to influence the opinion of any hon. member on this side and still less on the other side, I must say that, as far as I am personally concerned, I am altogether of the view expressed by my hon. friend from South Oxford on the morrow of Sir John Thompson's death. Hearing of the destitute circumstances in which the late Sir John Thompson left his family, my hon. friend sent his contribution to the fund, and said that if an application were made to Parliament for a public grant to the widow and children he would support it. I altogether share that view. It may be said that such grants are not to be viewed with favour. I admit it. It may be said that they may set a precedent which may be dangerous. I grant that, also, but in all these circumstances I do not admit that there is any precedent but that each case must stand by itself. In this matter it is unfortunate that Sir John Thompson did not make any provision for

his family while living, but the fact is that his family were left destitute, and, for my part, I could not bear the thought—whether it would be a good or a bad precedent—that the widow of a man who gave the best years of his life to the service of the state should be left absolutely penniless or even unable to maintain the station she had during his life. Of course, the amount may be large and, perhaps it might be a little smaller, but, on this I will not dilate. I think it would be a pity, a great pity, indeed, if the widow of the man who gave his services to the state should have any cause to regret that the head of her family, instead of working for his family, devoted the best years of his life to the service of his country. I hope this will not take place, and this is the reason why I support this motion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am sorry that I cannot agree with my respected leader on this question. I am here representing a class of people, the majority of whom have not one-fifth or one-tenth part of $50,000 to maintain families just as large as Sir John Thompson's. I doubt very much if there is one member in twenty in this House who has the amount I understand the widow of the late Sir John Thompson will have. I cannot, for one moment agree that we should go to people who work from early morn to late at night to make both ends meet, and ask them to contribute to a fund of $25,000 to be given to another person who does not stand in need of it. We are given to understand, on the best authority, that she will now be worth $50,000. She has not a very large family. Her two sons are young men who ought, as I had long before I reached their age, to earn their own money by the sweat of their brow. We have the power of voting money, but I do not think we are justified in voting public money for any private purpose whatever. I believe that will be the opinion of this country, and, therefore, I move that this item be struck out of the Estimates.

Mr. MARTIN. I also regret that I am not able in this matter to coincide with the views of the leader of the Opposition. I am prepared to agree with him, that these matters should be decided according to the special circumstances in each case. I would not go so far as the last speaker and agree to the rule that in no possible contingency would a grant of this kind be proper. But I take the view that, even following the principle suggested by the leader of the Opposition, the special circumstances in this case are all against making a grant to the widow. Take the case of a man who had spent his life in the service of the country, who had been for many years in opposition, serving the country better, perhaps, in opposition than he might have been able to do as head of a Government or member of a government. In such a case I think it would be proper, eminently proper, for the country to place his family in such circumstances as they would have been if the man himself had devoted his life to private gain instead of to public purposes. But, Mr. Chairman, I fail to find, in the history of the gentleman with regard to whose family this vote is proposed, any such circumstances. That hon. gentleman was never in opposition in the Dominion of Canada. He was in office all the time that he was in this House, and during all that time he was in receipt of a fair salary. He was not many years in office; he spent the most of his life, as other members of the House have done, in pursuit of his own ends. He had an opportunity of saving money, he received the benefit of a large, lucrative law practice; he was afterwards a judge upon the bench; and I fail, Mr. Chairman, to see that any circumstances exist in the history of Sir John Thompson which would justify this Parliament to do the rather unprecedented thing of granting to his widow such a very large sum of money. We learn also that the country has already made very adequate provision for Lady Thompson, and I think that fact should be considered in this connection. I regret, as I say, to differ, not only with the leader of the Opposition, but also with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), as to the principles involved in this case. I would go very much further than the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), and support, as I propose to support, the motion that has been moved that this item be struck out, because I do not see that Parliament, under the circumstances, would be at all justified in voting this large sum of public money to the widow of a man who cannot be said to have devoted his life to public purposes, who cannot be said to have made any very large sacrifices on behalf of the Dominion, who was fairly well paid for all the time he devoted to Canada's service, and who never spent a day in opposition in this House. Under these circumstances, I have no hesitation at all in supporting the motion to strike out this grant altogether.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I very much regret having to differ in my leader's opinion, but at the same time I regret that his generous heart should have led him to support the measure before the House. It is sometimes very nice to be guided by feelings and sympathies, but I think that we ought to act here as business men. It was many times asserted, since this discussion has been started, that the family of Sir John Thompson was not in a state of destitution, far from that, that it was not even in a state of want. Families are seldom found in this country having a fortune of $50,000 at their disposal, and if I believe the current reports, the family of Sir John Thompson is now in possession of such a fortune. In our country it is far from being an

embarrassed condition. I said a moment ago, when the previous item was under consideration that this was not the time for the Government to make presents and generosities. When uneasiness prevails all over the country, when the Government itself is in a disastrous condition, so to say, it is far from being the time to make such a liberality. Moreover, why should we so much compassionate the condition in which Sir John Thompson left his family? Sir John Thompson selected his career into which he went; he practised as a lawyer during some years. Then he was a candidate and a member, and later on he ascended the bench as a justice. After that he successfully got back into politics again, and as observed by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, he ever was lucky enough to side with the ruling party. During the time he was a Minister here, he drew a large salary, amounting even to $9,000 per year. If after all we were asked to show such a generosity towards a man who would had rendered to the country signalled services without any remuneration whatever, there would not be much to say about it, but the Government wishes the hon. members of this House to compassionate the fate of a family left in what one may state easy circumstances, the fate of the family of a man who occupied lucrative positions which he had sought for and which he had been happy to feel. It is impossible for me, knowing as I do the opinion of the voters I represent here, knowing at the same time what I believe to be the opinion of the voters all over the Dominion, to approve of such an item. I say these sums, if voted by the majority in this House, will not be approved of by the electorate, and I have no hesitation in saying that even the hon. members who are going to support the Government and vote this item will not do it willingly but with an earnest regret.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Having already expressed my opinion as to the question at issue, I do not propose to speak upon it at any length. Like my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier), I feel that it is a matter upon which every hon. gentleman has a perfect right to vote and express his own individual opinion. But, for my own part, I am inclined to think, while I do not believe that these cases should be drawn into a precedent, that there are circumstances in the present case which very fairly justify the representatives of the people of Canada in making a reasonable appropriation for the purpose of relieving the necessities of the family of the deceased statesman. So far as I understand the case, it is this: I have been informed, and I believe on good authority, that Sir John Thompson died in circumstances which left no provision at all for his family—no provision of any kind. Now, it is perfectly true that in a great many cases it is the usual thing to say that a man should provide for the wants of his children through the medium of life insurance or through some similar method. But I would call the attention of my hon. friends to this: In the first place, I do not believe that it was possible for any man in the position of Sir John Thompson after he became Premier of the Dominion, filling the position he filled, to make any saving of any considerable amount. I might point out to my hon. friends, also, that, in all human probability, during the last ten or twelve years of his life, it would have been impossible for him in his state of health—which unfortunately was not known—to have made any provision for his family in the ordinary way by means of life insurance. He was struck down in the vigour of his manhood. He was struck down under circumstances which, rightly, I think, elicited the profound sympathy of every class of the community; and I do not believe that, in this case at any rate, the people at large will object to vote a reasonable and substantial tribute from the whole people to the children and widow of a deceased public servant who, according to his lights and the best of his ability, I believe, endeavoured to serve the country faithfully. Under the circumstances, I take the responsibility of supporting any reasonable and proper proposal the Government may see fit on its responsibility to submit. As to the question of precedent, we have the annual vote of $1,200 to the widow of the late Sir George Cartier, who left his family, unhappily, in somewhat similar circumstances to those in which Sir John Thompson left his family. I think that is a reasonable precedent to be followed, and therefore, for my part, I shall feel fully justified in supporting the Government's proposition.

Mr. CURRAN. I have only one word to say with regard to some of the remarks that have been heard here to-night. The speech just delivered by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), is one which I think will be concurred in by the overwhelming majority of the people of Canada. But I wish to draw attention to the fact, and it is a fact within my own personal knowledge—when it was announced that an amount would be proposed as a vote in this House, and would meet the approval of gentlemen on the other side of the House, among whom was the hon. member for South Oxford, it had an effect upon the public subscription which was certainly very far from being favourable. It stopped the public subscriptions considerably. If nothing had been mentioned about it, my own opinion is, that the public subscriptions would have far exceeded the extra $25,000 which this Parliament is now being called upon to vote; and I am under the impression that the subscriptions would have reached probably $75,000. Under all these circumstances and in view of the very excellent speech that has been delivered this evening in such an admirable spirit by the hon. leader of the

Opposition. I am satisfied that this House will almost unanimously concur in voting this sum that is asked by the Government for the widow and orphans of the late Sir John Thompson.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. I was exceedingly glad to hear the admirable terms in which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) referred to this matter; and although I was not in the House while the leader of the Opposition spoke, I understand that he referred to it in terms of equal kindliness. Sir, I hope that the hon. gentlemen who have objected to this appropriation will gracefully withdraw their objections, and that they will permit the vote to be a unanimous one. As the hon. gentlemen has just said, I look upon it as being impossible that any Prime Minister, any one in the position of the late Sir John Thompson, could save anything on the allowance that he receives from the country. It is expected of them that they should entertain at the seat of government, and any one who has had the experience of that hon. gentleman, or who is acquainted with the requirements of that position, will know how impossible it is for him to save on the salary he receives. I do not think that this case should be looked upon as a precedent, but, on the present occasion, looking to all the circumstances of the case, I do trust that hon. gentlemen on either side of the House who may not have been disposed to support this appropriation, will finally see their way clear to allow it to go unanimously.

Mr. FRASER. The reason given by the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald A. Smith) compels me to vote against the proposal of the Government. If a Premier cannot save any money, then we are reduced to this strait, that the family of any man who accepts that position, unless he has provided means for them, must be provided for after his death at the expense of the country. If a Premier of this country cannot save anything as a provision for his family, then let us understand it; and then every future Premier, unless he is a man of means like the hon. member for Montreal, may expect his family to be provided for by this country. I dissent from that position entirely, and that is one reason why I am compelled to vote against it. There may be distinguished services rendered, and a man may put himself in such a position that this country ought to provide for him, and I would not object to a certain amount being paid per year, as was done in the case of the widow of the late Sir George E. Cartier; but in voting a sum total, and voting it on the grounds given by the hon. member for Montreal, we are practically setting a precedent for all future Parliaments in Canada in favour of the families of men who may hereafter become Premiers. Now, I speak with as much respect as any man in Parliament of the memory of the late Premier, but I must say that if his widow receives $25,000 because, on the salary he receives, he could make no provision for his family, then we are going to establish a precedent that every man who enters Parliament hereafter must act upon, namely, that if a Premier dies without means, then his country must support his wife and family. I dissent entirely from that view. I would not like that every man who becomes Premier should feel that when he died his wife and family would be provided for by the public. If there is no better ground than that, then I must vote against this proposition. I think every man in this country should understand that he must live according to the salary he receives. Nor do I think it ought to be necessary that a Premier who receives $8,000 or $9,000 a year, should expend it in entertaining. I think it would be much better for this country that the Premier should save part of his salary, than to expend it on entertaining. If a Premier does his work well, and no man can say that Sir John Thompson did not do his work well, then let him not entertain at all. It is no discredit to a man if he does not entertain, and I do not think it is part of his functions to entertain, especially if, in doing so, he has to spend money that he ought to save for his wife and family. This is a democratic country, and we must not set up any high position of that kind. Therefore, I must vote against this grant, although I do it reluctantly. There may be a case where a Premier is suddenly called away, and where his family is left in indigence, and in that case I would support a grant. I would not like to see any gentleman holding a high position in this country dying suddenly and leaving his family in such a position that they would have to earn their own bread, but that is not the case with the family of the late Premier; and while I have the highest respect for the late Sir John Thompson, I do not think we should grant this vote.

Mr. CASEY. As this is a case on which members are voting and speaking individually, it is proper that I should say a few words to express my views, otherwise than by my vote. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) that the remarks of the hon. member for Montreal (Sir Donald Smith) settle this question against this grant. I do not think that the question is being put before the House upon the basis of the remarks of the hon. member for Montreal. While those remarks were well meant, and in good taste, perhaps they are not the strongest arguments that could be used in favour of the amount we are asked to give. I do not think, with my hon. friend from Guysboro' in adopting this Estimate we should be establishing a precedent in favour of the

families of all deceased Premiers, and I should not like to give my adherence to with my hon. friend from Guysboro' any such proposition. I agree with my hon. friend from Guysboro' in another sentence, however, to the effect that in a case of sudden death, and a family left in destitution, compelling them to drop out of their ordinary positions in life and earn their own bread, he would be willing to agree to a grant. It does seem to me, as it seems to my leader and to the hon. member for South Oxford, that this is one of those cases. The provision that has been made by the general public, which I have heard estimated at $25,000, does not seem to be sufficient to keep the family with the interest of that sum, and if it is to be used as principal, it would not last very long. I cannot consider, therefore, that the family of Sir John Thompson is provided for in a manner at all sufficient to enable them to get an education, and to live, according to their previous position in life.

An hon. MEMBER. Why should they be ?

Mr. CASEY. I will give my ideas on that point a little later. I see no objection to the principle that in a case of this kind, public provision should be made by this House to prevent the families of deceased Premiers from falling back entirely out of the position in which he left them. That is the statement of the hon. member for Guysboro', and I do not see how he differentiates the present case from one in which he would support such a grant.

We must remember that although the latter part of Sir John Thompson's life was passed in a high and fairly well paid position, his whole life was not so spent. He began life as a penniless young man, and by the time he reached that period when he ought to be in the best position to lay by money for his family his time was taken up principally with public duties either as a judge or politician. I am not prepared to go so far as to say that those occupations create a legal claim on the country, which we all admit he well served, not as we think on the right side of politics but according to his own views.

But I do believe long service to the country, combined with special circumstances, as to time and financial accompaniments at death, create not perhaps an actual legal claim on the country, but a case where assistance may fairly be given, and I am prepared to go with my leader in this particular case, and to say that a claim for our consideration does arise.

I must say I believe such a case arose before. When Hon. Alexander Mackenzie went out of power, when he died and left his widow not well provided for, a case arose then when it would have been particularly graceful and proper if hon. gentlemen opposite had proposed a grant to that lady in recognition of the undoubted services that her husband had rendered to the state. I believe there was a case which combined all the elements calling for a public grant much more strongly than the present case. In that case, however, such a course was not adopted. I think hon. gentlemen opposite are probably sorry they did not adopt that course at that time, but I must say that because the right course was not adopted then, it is no reason why it should not be adopted now.

As to the question of how a Premier spends his money, I do not think we are called upon to decide in this connection. I hold as a matter of fact in the present condition of the country, democratic though it be, that if the Premier did not entertain pretty freely some of those who do not agree with him in politics would be very apt to say he was a mean man, that he did not keep up the traditions of his office, and so on. An hon. member behind me says, they do not entertain this side of the House very much. There may perhaps be more truth than poetry in that remark ; but at all events I say that if they did not entertain to some exent they would certainly be called very mean men. There are, however, other expenses besides those connected with entertaining. There are many claims made on the first Minister not in connection with entertainments. He has to subscribe to many funds, and I quite agree with the hon. member for South Oxford that it is very hard for a man in his position to save money. I must agree also with the hon. member for Maskinonge (Mr. Legris), who said that there are many families not in any better condition than that of Sir John Thompson, who consider themselves very well off. That may be true, but at the same time that position may not under the circumstances amount to one of being very well off for the Thompson family. From all these points of view I have come to the conclusion that in this case it is only a question of amount, and as the Government have taken the responsibility of recommending this sum, knowing it to be a delicate question, and one that would be debated in the House and that they have taken the responsibility of placing this amount in the Estimates, presumably as low as they reasonably could, knowing the circumstances of the family, I am compelled to support the stand taken by the leader, rather than that taken by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald.)

Mr. SCRIVER. It is rather an ungracious thing to oppose to any extent a vote like this, and it is very unpleasant to seem to put oneself in antagonism to the interest of the widow and the orphan ; but before taking a decided stand upon this matter I should like to have a little more information than I have at my command, and I suppose those who are responsible for this item in the Estimates will be able to furnish it. I agree with some of those hon. members who have preceded me that if Lady

Thompson has at her command, or will have at her command, $50,000, she will be in a position to live comfortably and respectably, particularly, if, as I have seen stated in the public print to be the case, the education of her two sons is to be provided for by a distinguished individual. I am not going into the question of what is expected at the hands of the Premier of this country. I am quite prepared to believe that even with the large salary he receives, it would be difficult for him to save any considerable amount. But it has been stated here with considerable positiveness that the private subscription for Lady Thompson's benefit amounts to about $35,000.

An hon. MEMBER. Thirty eight thousand.

Mr. SCRIVER. And that the life insurance which the Premier had effected before his death amounted to from $12,000 to $15,000.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). That was used up in providing for private liabilities.

Mr. SCRIVER. If Lady Thompson will command about $50,000, I do not think this country is called upon to vote an additional sum of $25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman asks for information before making his decision. I am not here to make a detailed statement as to the minute private affairs of the family; but I will say this, that the country's contribution amounts at the present time to about $38,000. The estate, after the liabilities are paid, will furnish nothing like an adequate provision for the family of Sir John Thompson.

Mr. SCRIVER. Does it amount to $12,000 or $15,000 ?

Mr. FOSTER. It does not amount to anything like that. The estate, after the debts are paid, as an investment would not yield to Lady Thompson and family $500 a year. I want to emphasize also one point brought out to-night. When the death took place subscriptions were asked, and there was a wide expression of opinion in the country that Parliament ought and undoubtedly would make some provision for the family, and I have not the least doubt that that wide expression of opinion came to be looked upon as a certainty, and therefore the popular subscription was not as large as it otherwise would have been. A good deal of thought was bestowed on the amount that should be asked. The Government did not wish to be extravagant, but it did wish to supplement the means at the disposal of the family by a fair amount, because in some respects it must be remembered that the family is not one which can, in all its branches, earn its living. Sir John Thompson had a favourite and in some respects an afflicted child in regard to her physical condition, and that child remains the care of her mother. All these matters taken into consideration made the Government determine to propose a reasonable amount, $25,000, and although this country is not rich, it is rich enough to see that the family of a public man, who, according to his light and ability, did good work for his country, even when suffering from physical infirmity without our knowing it, shall not suffer want because death has stricken him down.

Mr. EDGAR. I was rather sorry to hear the Solicitor General, I am sure inadvertently, make a statement which threw almost a slur on the generous letter of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. CURRAN. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. EDGAR. I am very glad to hear that. But the hon. gentleman suggested that the fact the letter was written prevented subscriptions coming in. Surely it was a pity to throw that across the House, especially when the hon. member for South Oxford in taking his present position in this matter, is differing from so many of his friends.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not meant.

Mr. EDGAR. It was an unfortunate reference, at any rate. Now, I would be very sorry to think that this vote to-night, if it is carried, for it will be carried, should be a precedent for making a grant of this kind, under all circumstances, to the families of ex-Premiers. For many reasons, I think it should not be made a precedent. But the suddenness of the death of Sir John Thompson prevented him making the provision which I have no doubt he soon expected to make for his family, and I think that the character of the disease which carried him off must, for years and years, have prevented his obtaining life insurance. There was another case in this country of a somewhat similar character. I refer to the death of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and I am glad to be told to-night by my leader here, that on the occasion of his death, an offer was made, or at least a suggestion was made, by a prominent member of the Ministry, that the members of the Government would be glad to consider and to support a vote to Mrs. Mackenzie, if it were necessary. That, however, was declined by the relatives of Mrs. Mackenzie, because the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie died, leaving a moderate, but sufficient provision for his widow. I do not think that a case, similar to this, is likely to occur again, and I do not think that this will be a precedent which can be quoted hereafter. I would have liked to see a grant somewhat smaller, something more in the shape of the grant which was made to Sir George Cartier's widow, in the shape of an annuity, but still I do not want to vote against this, or to strike it out of the Estimates altogether.

Mr. CASEY. In view of what has been stated, I beg to withdraw anything I have

said with reference to the Government not giving a grant to the widow of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. I was not aware that such an offer had been made.

Mr. McMILLAN. While I have every respect for the memory of the deceased statesman, and while I believe that he was a gentleman who tried to work in the interests of this country, still, I find that his family must be possessed of $48,000 or $58,000, and considering that his sons are young men who have graduated in their profession——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McMILLAN. That has been stated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMILLAN. It has been stated that a majority of the people of this country would be favourable to such a vote, but I know that in the locality in which I live, that the majority of the people would not be favourable to it, under the circumstances in which the family is placed. While I feel that my own sympathy might lead me to allow the sum to pass without a vote, yet I consider that I have a public duty to perform to my constituents, and, knowing the feeling of my constituents, I must allow my private feeling to give way, and discharge my public duty by voting for the amendment of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald).

House divided: Yeas, 73; nays, 42.

Resolution concurred in.

To pay for the purchase and distribution of seed grain to needy settlers resident in the North-west Territories, chiefly in the district of Assiniboia (to cover Governor General's Warrant of $50,000) $55,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has that money been paid, and if so, how has the distribution been made?

Mr. DALY. The money has not been paid yet. As the hon. gentleman may know, last year unfortunately a large portion of the district of Assiniboia was affected by the drouth. A number of the farmers were absolutely left without any seed grain, and, in addition to that were scarcely left with sufficient grain to meet the ordinary requirements of their household or to feed their cattle. The local government had to come to their aid by establishing relief works under which they were enabled to earn enough money to keep them going. This spring, representations were made to the Government by the Lieutenant-Governor, by the representatives in the Local Assembly, and by all the leading men in the Territories, that there were thousands of acres of land in Assiniboia and a portion of Saskatchewan that could not be cultivated unless the seed was provided. Although the Government were opposed to the granting of seed, the case was put in such strong light that they came to the conclusion that although they did not desire to follow the precedents created by giving seed grain to the people, that, under the circumstances, they were fully justified. Had the Government not done so, thousands of acres of land would have remained uncultivated, because the people were not in a position to get seed grain. They had not the means to purchase it, or credit to borrow, and we had to come to their aid. So far as I am personally concerned I may say that I am opposed to the Government being called upon to make grants similar to these, because I think the people in the Territories should deal with these matters the same as they do in Manitoba, and if aid is given to them, that it should be given by the Local Assembly, or by the municipalities. We had to deal with the facts as they were presented to us; and, in consequence of the conditions I have mentioned, the Government had to give this aid. The aid was principally given to farmers in the neighbourhood of Pense, Moosejaw, Regina and Balgonie, and a little in the eastern portion of Assiniboia. Demands were made upon us at first to the extent of $125,000; but we thought they were extravagant, and, after inquiries by officers of the department, they were cut down some 40 per cent. The grain was purchased as economically as possible, we got from the Canadian Pacific Railway half rates, and we distributed the grain through the agricultural societies. It was only given to those who made a declaration, in the first place, "that the applicant had so "many acres under cultivation, that he had "lost his crop in consequence of drought, "prairie fire, or other natural cause, or cause "beyond his control, and did not possess the "grain requisite to sow a —— number of "acres; and that he required for that pur-"pose —— bushels of wheat, which he agreed "should be sown during the present season "on the quarter-section specified." Besides making that declaration, he had to give a bond and two sureties. So that the grain has been given at a fixed price which will repay to the Government the cost of the grain, transportation, bagging and distribution; and we hold as security for it a lien upon the lands of those who have not got their patents, and a bond with two sureties in an amount sufficient to insure the repayment from those who have got their patents.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the Minister how it was that in the Regina "Leader" it was announced that it was necessary for farmers to apply to Mr. Davin, M.P., in order to get the seed grain?

Mr. DALY. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman. I shall have to refer him to the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). So far as I am concerned, Mr. Davin, the member had nothing whatever to do with

the distribution, which was made at Regina, as at other places, through the agricultural society.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman is aware that the Regina "Leader" announced that owing to technical difficulties, the Government were not able to communicate with the settlers, and that an application had to be made through the hon. member for Western Assiniboia.

Mr. DALY. Yes, I saw that myself.

Mr. MARTIN. The Regina "Leader" is supposed to be published and edited by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia. I regret that that hon. gentleman is not present and I would like this item to stand in order that he may have an opportunity of explaining that most extraordinary announcement. It will be remembered that a general election was supposed to be imminent and likely to take place in a few weeks; so that we can understand how very improper a statement this was to be made in a newspaper controlled by a member of this House as to the distribution of a very considerable sum of money, which had been obtained partly through the efforts of that hon. member. There could be only one object of an announcement of that kind; it was made with the intention of helping the hon. gentleman in his campaign; and I must say that the position of affairs in Western Assiniboia as the elections appeared to approach were such as to justify him in taking even the most extreme measures to strengthen his hold upon the electors. But I think this was too extreme a measure for the hon. gentleman to adopt, and that some explanation should, if possible, be obtained from him as to how he could possibly make a statement which I understand from the Minister of the Interior was entirely unauthorized by the department—which I felt quite satisfied must have been unauthorized by the department before the hon. Minister made any explanation of it.

Mr. MULOCK. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that the expenditure has not yet taken place?

Mr. DALY. Yes; we have bought all the grain, but we have bought it on time; we have not settled for it yet.

Mr. MULOCK. Why was the grant made, in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman and the Government thought it should be made through some of the local legislatures? In this case, the proper legislature, according to his theory, would have been that of the Territories?

Mr. DALY. That is my individual opinion; I am not expressing the opinion of the Government. I said I thought that in future any such grant, if made, should be made in the same manner as it is in Manitoba. The Government of Manitoba last session, I think, introduced a Bill, called the Seed Grain Act, by which it is provided that the municipalities can borrow sums to the amount, I think, of $5,000 to purchase grain and distribute it in quantities not exceeding $75 in value to individual applicants, and that promissory notes given for it by the persons to whom this relief is given shall become a lien on their land. My idea was that similar machinery might be adopted by the Legislative Assembly at Regina. I impressed that view on the Executive, and I hope that on no future occasion will this Parliament be called upon to make a similar grant, because we give money to the local assemblies for purposes of this kind, and I think they should deal with them. That is my own individual view.

Mr. GRIEVE. What kind of seed grain was distributed?

Mr. DALY. Wheat, barley, oats and potatoes.

Mr. GRIEVE. From whom was it purchased?

Mr. DALY. The wheat from S. P. Clark & Co., the Western Milling Company, Brigham & James, R. D. Martin & Co., and 3,000 bushels from farmers at Indian Head, purchased by Mr. McKay, Superintendent of Indian Farms; oats from Rogers, F. Mackenzie, and others; barley from Rogers, and small amounts from farmers at York and Estevan.

Mr. GRIEVE. What price was paid?

Mr. DALY. For wheat, including sacks, 57½ cents; for the barley, 40 cents, and for the oats, 33 cents. That is exclusive of freight.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to bring before the notice of the committee some resolutions with regard to this matter that were adopted by the Assiniboia Agricultural Society, which met at Regina on the 18th of May last. According to the Regina "Standard," the following resolution was carried unanimously and the secretary was instructed to forward copies to the local papers:—

Resolved,—That this society is pleased that the Order in Council granting a further sum of $5,000 for seed grain was passed, as it will greatly assist those who, in this district, have received but a meagre portion of seed;

That it is the opinion of this society that the attention of the Premier should be called to the following facts in connection with the distribution of seed grain:

(1) A great part of the grain, but more especially of the oats, was not properly cleaned for seed, and some cars of oats were, in fact, not cleaned at all. That large quantities of foul seeds, including wild oats, mustard, buckwheat, etc., were to be found in the grain, thus filling the country with noxious weeds and doing an incalculable amount of injury. We exceedingly regret that the inspection of the grain was conducted in such a careless manner.

(2) The manner in which the distribution has been carried on has been very careless and dilatory. More grain was sent to some points than was required, e.g., at Calgary over two cars were afterwards sold,—thus depriving needy districts of a sufficient quantity.

Grain was distributed at many points in Eastern Assiniboia, where they had fair crops last year, in the same proportions as the most needy districts—this not being a fair manner of distribution.

Between 30 and 40 names were left off the lists by the careless manner in which the lists were revised by the Department at Winnipeg, and many men who should have received grain at one point had, owing to their names being placed on the wrong list, to travel to another, in some cases necessitating a trip of eighty miles to get the grain.

(3) On May 10th an Order in Council was passed granting $5,000 additional for seed grain, and no definite word has been received as to when the grain will arrive here. (May 22nd, no word received yet.)

Of course after that time it was too late to sow wheat, at any rate, and even oats, while barley perhaps might be sowed.

(4) We further consider that if the original appropriation of $50,000 had been carefully expended, and if only those districts actually requiring seed, had received it, that it would have been sufficient to have given every needy settler all that he required, but for the reasons already stated, many farmers have but a small acreage in, and unless there is an exceedingly good yield this season, they will most likely require assistance again next year.

Those are the resolutions of the agricultural society, a body that is particularly interested in this matter—non-partisan body—and they certainly are calculated to reflect very strongly on the administration of the department. I have heard a good deal outside of this particular report as to the very inadequate manner in which the distribution of this grain was attended to and the almost entire lack of inspection. There is nothing in the west that people are more alarmed at than the spread of noxious weeds. In the older portions of Manitoba, along the Red and Assiniboia rivers, the country has been practically destroyed in certain places by these noxious weeds. The French weed, wild mustard, wild oats and weeds of that kind have become so thick that the Government have been obliged to pass laws by which the inspectors are authorized to go out and order the whole crops cut in order to prevent, if possible, the extension of this nuisance. In the newer portions of the country, where noxious weeds have not become a fixture, every possible precaution is used to prevent them being brought in. I am sure the Government could do no greater damage to a new portion such as that to which the seed grain was furnished, than to allow oats, wheat and barley to be sent there containing large quantities of noxious weeds. The amount of harm that would be done in that direction would go very far indeed to neutralize the benefits that were undoubtedly conferred upon these people.

Mr. COCHRANE. Could the farmers not clean the grain before using it ?

Mr. MARTIN. No ; it is very hard indeed to clean out these noxious weeds. It is almost impossible. I suppose it can be done, but it requires special appliances.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where did he get the grain ?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know, but I judged from what the Minister said that he got it at various points in Manitoba. S. P. Clarke & Co., are grain dealers in Manitoba, and there certainly ought not to have been any serious difficulty in obtaining very clean seed, indeed if these portions had been gone to where noxious weeds do not exist ; and a greater part of Manitoba is almost entirely free from them. The Government should have had no difficulty indeed in getting good clean seed. Then the charge that the grain was distributed just as largely in those districts where it was not badly needed as in districts where it was, is also a serious one. I know myself that the grain which was sent to Calgary was very considerably in excess of the amount required, and I saw an advertisement in a Calgary paper, over the signature of Amos Rowe, the Government land agent, offering for sale at public auction, I think, some carloads of grain that were not required. While I agree with the policy of the department in making this advance, I certainly regret that it is possible for a society to come to the conclusion that there has been very loose administration of the money after it was granted.

Mr. DALY. I cannot for the life of me understand why that resolution was passed by the agricultural society. I do not think it was. It may have been passed in the name of the society, but so far as my information goes it was passed at the meeting of a few disgruntled members of the society after the regular meeting had adjourned. I may say that the grain was purchased principally at the following points : Morden, Moosomin, Indian Head, Regina and Elkhorn. In such localities there are no foul seeds such as the hon. gentleman talks of. In the second place, the grain was examined by Angus McKay, superintendent of the Indian Head Farm ; Superintendent Bedford, of Brandon; and Mr. Aikman, a gentleman quite competent for that purpose. They report that there was no reason at all for this resolution, that all the grain was shipped through elevators, and that if there were foul seeds in it, they were only the seeds left there and which it was expected the farmers would take out themselves by the use of their fanning-mills as they would if sowing their own seed. It must be remembered that authority was only given on the 26th March to the commissioner to make the distribution, and that fourteen days later, 95,000 bushels of grain were shipped. The grain was distributed in exactly

the same manner as in previous years. No dissatisfaction was ever expressed before, and, though I cannot say that it is so, it may be possible that some of the gentlemen who complained at Regina did not have the same interest in the distribution of this grain that they had in previous years. But the distribution was made fairly, and all the farmers and those whose needs were made known were served, and they were not inconvenienced in any way in getting the grain. Now, as to the grain shipped to Calgary, there were 911 bushels of wheat, 646 bushels of oats, and 126 bushels of barley; and they were sold for almost the cost price, namely $859.61, and that sum was spent for a car of potatoes, and two cars of barley, which were distributed at Balgonie, and Moose Jaw, in the very districts these gentlemen complain about. As to the proportion of grain distributed in eastern and western Assiniboia, the amount distributed in eastern Assinniboia was 14,249 bushels, which were distributed east of range 10, west of the second meridian, and in western Assiniboia, 71,000 bushels. As soon as my attention was called to the resolution the hon. gentleman has read, I asked for a report from the commissioner at Winnipeg, and that was the reply I got. I do not think there is anything in the resolutions passed under the name of the Agricultural Society of Regina, because, strange to say, we have not received a complaint from any other point at which grain was distributed; and I have heard of no complaints other than those the hon. gentleman has read. The greatest possible care was exercised by the officers and the inspections were made as thoroughly as they could be under the circumstances. The best grain was got, and it was purchased at the lowest figures, and every safeguard surrounded the distribution that the officers could provide in the time they had.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. Minister say what were the exact steps taken in this distribution to reach the farmer?

Mr. DALY. Advertisements were put in the newspapers, and the secretaries of the different societies were telegraphed to to get in the names——

Mr. MULOCK. Telegraphed to by whom?

Mr. DALY. By the commissioner at Winnipeg—the names of those who wanted seed-grain. If the hon. gentleman was in the House when I made my explanation he knows that every applicant has to make a declaration——

Mr. MULOCK. I understood that point.

Mr. DALY. Every possible facility was afforded for every person who wanted seed grain to come in and get it, and they got it in the proportions they required.

Mr. MULOCK. On a former occasion this distribution was made very largely through the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), applications having to be made directly to him.

Mr. DALY. I never heard of that.

Mr. MULOCK. It was probably before the hon. gentleman took charge of the department. I am not making these remarks at all as derogatory to the hon. gentleman's management, because I have been exceedingly pleased with the business-like character of his explanation here this evening, and I wish to emphasize my approval of the policy of making this distribution wholly through official channels, and not through any person who happens, for the time being, to represent a constituency. I understand that on the present occasion the representative for Western Assiniboia —and the representative for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. McDonald) for that matter—had nothing to do directly or indirectly with the distribution of grain, but that applicants were treated impartially, and required not political assistance or political interference in order to obtain their fair share of this grain. Is that the state of affairs?

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman states it correctly—no influence whatever.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister said that the money had not been paid. Were these grains and seed vegetables bought directly from the persons named?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the Government owes this large number of persons their respective bills.

Mr. DALY. No. The seed was bought on time, sixty days, or something like that —I cannot recall it exactly. I presume we shall have the Bills in about now.

Mr. MULOCK. It seems rather an undignified procedure for the Dominion Government to be indebted to these dealers, a dozen or twenty of them, for these small quantities of grain.

Mr. DALY. The parties were quite willing to make the bargain on those terms.

Mr. MULOCK. Were any tenders asked for, for this supply?

Mr. DALY. No; that was impossible. There was not time for that. It was the 25th March when the instructions were given. But, though tenders were not asked for in the sense of advertisements being published, the samples were put in and offers made by the different dealers, and the lowest offer taken, sample considered, in each case; and the samples were examined by the gentlemen I named.

Mr. MULOCK. When are the farmers obliged to repay ?

Mr. DALY. In the fall, or not later than 1st March next.

Mr. MULOCK. Were notes taken in each case ?

Mr. DALY. Not notes ; bonds.

British Columbia Penitentiary—

To pay Hon. Mr. Justice Drake, for services as commissioner re investigation $200 00

To pay Geo. L. Foster, Accountant of Penitentiaries, the difference between $1,800 and $2,050, from the 24th October, 1894, until the 30th June, 1895..... 170 00

Mr. FOSTER. This item was allowed to stand. There is an item in the main Estimates upon which the whole discussion can come up.

Senate—

To pay Hon. Mr. Sullivan the amount deducted from his indemnity on account of absence through illness in the session of 1894..... $152 00

Mr. FOSTER. The matter covered by this resolution was brought to my attetion by Senator Sullivan, as he explained to me in a letter since, thinking that it was the rule to pay such items. He was ill and was at his home a portion of the time while he was ill. The law makes provision that a member of either House while he is ill here is to be paid. And the item was put in. There are, however, a good many cases which are parallel with this. Senator Sullivan was very kind about it and said that he had put it in thinking it was a matter of course, but if it were to set a bad precedent he would not press it. I propose to let the item drop.

Mr. MULOCK. I would remind the Minister that we have frequently voted sums under these circumstances to members who have been absent from Ottawa by reason of illness.

Mr. FOSTER. Not very often.

Mr. MULOCK. I can give a number of cases.

Mr. FOSTER. We have done it in some very serious cases.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not objecting to the dropping of this item, but I think that in these cases there ought to be a definite rule applicable to all.

Mr. FOSTER. That is to be the rule applicable to all.

Mr. MULOCK. The rule applicable to all is the rule laid down in the statute ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal—construction.... $310,000

Mr. FOSTER. The same remark applies to this as to a previous case—there will be an item in the main Estimates upon which the discussion can come up.

Resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—THE CRIMINAL CODE.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether, on the reference of the Criminal Code amendments to the committee, it will be in order to suggest any amendments that are not subjects of Bills before the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think so.

Mr. MULOCK. It is not necessary to enlarge the powers of reference ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think so.

Mr. MULOCK. If it were necessary to enlarge the powers of the reference, I would ask the Minister if he would get that power.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There are several amendments other than those referred, and I think the hon. gentleman's idea will be accepted.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 14th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 117) respecting La Chambre de Commerce de Montréal.—(Mr. Lépine.)

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FORBES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, might I ask the hon. Secretary of State when I may expect a return to the order in reference to the industrial establishments of the county of Shelburne ? The hon. gentleman submitted to the House a partial return, giving the industrial establishments of the county of Queen's, but not those of the county of Shelburne.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I supposed, when I presented the return, that it fulfilled the order of the House ; but my attention was called to the fact only yesterday afternoon that it was only partial, and I presume that the

rest of the return will be ready in a day or two.

Mr. FORBES. I would also ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he will get the report on the Fisheries ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may answer for the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that it will be ready in two or three days. It is all in type.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to inquire when an order of the House, passed on the 25th of April, regarding payments of money to Hayter Reed, will be brought down, and also the return ordered on the 26th of April in regard to superannuation ?

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to the last-named return, all I can say is that it is being prepared with all possible despatch. I cannot tell when it will be brought down. I will inquire and let the hon. gentleman know on Monday.

Mr. DALY. As to the other return, it will be here on Monday, I think—at all events, before the supplementary Estimates are brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. Minister of Finance tell me when the return moved for in April, 1894, and again in April, 1895, for correspondence connected with the Canadian Mutual Aid and Massachusetts Benefit Society will be down ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will inquire and let my hon. friend know.

Mr. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works whether a return to which I called his attention privately the other day is ready ? It was ordered by this House a year ago.

Mr. OUIMET. I inquired of my department without getting any satisfaction, and just before the hon. gentleman got up I was writing to my deputy asking again when the return would be ready.

Mr. BRODEUR. I wish to inquire of the leader of the House whether he intends to lay before this House the report of the inspector concerning the dismissal of Mr. Loiselle, postmaster of Ste. Angèle de Monnoir ? In the discussion which took place on that matter the other day, the leader of the House promised that the report would be brought down ; but it is not here yet, and I would like to know when we may expect it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not had my attention called to it before. The House knows that I promised that it would be brought down, and I will see that it is done.

Mr. BRODEUR. When may we expect it —Monday ?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose so—or later.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

To complete Valleyfield drain..... $5,700

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to this item, the Minister of Railways and Canals has handed me a memorandum of the details. They are as follows :—

To provide for overdraft.....	$1,236 33
To pay Contractor Grier's final estimate	799 21
To pay Contractor Chagnon's men's back wages.....	2,235 58
To pay Contractor Chagnon's unpaid accounts	1,302 54
Expenses in connection therewith.....	126 34
Total.....	$5,700 00

If there is no objection, I should like to have those details entered in the vote, as otherwise payment might be objected to by the Auditor General under the wording of the vote. I move that these details be added.

Motion agreed to, and item, as amended, concurred in.

To renew superstructure of pier at lower entrance of Farran's Point Canal..... $8,000

Mr. FOSTER. This work is provided for to the amount of $8,000, but at so late a period in the year that it will be impossible to spend that amount during the current fiscal year. Under the circumstances, and as I do not want to include it in the supplementary Estimates, I want to add that it be available for construction until 1st September 1895. Otherwise any portion carried on after the 1st July, 1895, could not be paid for, this vote having lapsed, unless another vote be brought down in the supplementaries.

Mr. LAURIER. You will not be able to close your account.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that will allow the account to be closed. I move that this item be amended by adding the words "to be available until the 1st September, 1895."

Motion agreed to ; item, as amended, concurred in.

Galops Canal—To renew superstructure of pier and entrance to Lock 22..... $3,500

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the same amendment be made to this item—that it be available until 1st September, 1895—and for the same reason.

Amendment agreed to, and resolution, as amended, concurred in.

Public Works chargeable to Income—Brandon Industrial School—To complete payments $2,500

Mr. McMULLEN. This, in my opinion, is unquestionably an extravagant expenditure, and I am opposed to it. I move that it be struck out.

Amendment negatived on division, and resolution concurred in.

Further amount required to meet expenditure in connection with the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic..... $8,000

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he would explain some words in the resolution that was before the House last night in regard to this item. There is in brackets at the end of the item, page 240 of the Votes and Proceedings, these words: "And to make it available up to the 31st December, 1895."

Mr. FOSTER. That explains itself, really. There is an item of $20,000 in the miscellaneous for the current year, 1894-95, for printing in connection with this commission. The printing will not be done when this year closes, and for any printing on that account that is done after the first of the next financial year, there will be no vote.

Mr. MULOCK. This is practically a supplementary estimate for 1895-96.

Mr. FOSTER. It is carrying on the vote to make it available up to December, 1895.

Mr. MULOCK. It is practically a supplementary estimate for 1895-96.

Mr. FOSTER. Just as you please.

To cover expenses of the late Hon. Sir J. S. D. Thompson's funeral (Governor General's warrant)..... $25,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When this item was before the committee last night I expressed my views to the effect that I was in perfect unison with the Government in giving a public funeral to the remains of the late Sir John Thompson. I expressed also my further view as to the extravagance which, in my humble opinion, marked the expenditure connected with that funeral. I thought the amount was about four times what it ought to have been. I was quite satisfied, as one member of this House, that the same amount, or anywhere near it, which had been paid for the funeral of the late Sir John Macdonald, should have been appropriated for the purpose of the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson; but I cannot vote in silence to expend $25,000 for the purpose, when I think it is unjustifiable, and extravagant, and opposed to the wishes of the people at large. I, therefore, without further comment, will move, by way of emphasizing my opinion on the subject, "that the amount be reduced by the sum of $15,000."

Mr. LAURIER. This is a motion which ought to be adopted by the House. I fully share in all the remarks made yesterday by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies). There is no desire at all to find fault with the Government in giving a public funeral to the late Sir John Thompson, and I agree with every word which was spoken in that sense last evening, not only by the hon. member for Queen's, but by the leader of the House. But in view of the language and the explanations which were given yesterday by the Minister of Public Works on this item, I cannot conceive how it is possible to adopt the resolution which is now before the House, and to refuse to cut down the expenditure by the amount stated in the motion. First of all, it must be remembered that it was stated yesterday by the leader of the House, and by the Minister of Public Works also, that although a special warrant was obtained from the Governor General to cover this expenditure, still the warrant has remained in abeyance, and no payments have yet been made. Now, this is what the Minister of Public Works stated yesterday upon this subject, speaking in French:

S'il y a eu extortion et fraude, c'est uniquement de la part des fournisseurs. Je ne dis pas que quelques-uns d'entre eux n'ont pas profité de la circonstance pour surcharger environ 50 pour 100 et même 75 pour 100 de plus que le prix qu'ils auraient dû demander. Mais on ne peut blâmer le gouvernement du fait que des fournisseurs ont voulu avoir plus que le prix du marché pour leurs marchandises.

I say, yes; the Government is responsible, and is to be blamed for allowing traders to take more than the market price. The hon. gentleman says that some of them have charged extortionate prices, to the extent of 50 to 75 per cent in excess, and he says the Government are not to blame. Are we to be told that when a responsible Minister acknowledges before the House that traders took advantage of a solemn occasion to extort extraordinary prices, and he could not protect himself, and that practically the Government sanctioned it, the Government are not to blame? I do not hold that opinion. I do not know the traders. I do not know whether the charges are reasonable or not, but the Minister of Public Works has acknowledged that extortionate prices have been charged, and under these circumstances my hon. friend's motion is quite in order.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is wrong on both his grounds, and I will take the latter one first. He says he objects to the bills being paid and supports the proposed amendment to strike off $15,000 and reduce the amount to $10,000 because unduly large sums have been charged for merchandise and wares that should have been obtained at current price, and that in some cases as much as 50 per cent additional had been charged, and therefore that we should cut down this amount from $25,000 by $15,000, and on that basis we should allow those extraordinary prices to be cut down equivalently so as to reach the current prices on those goods. The hon. gentleman is wrong on that ground, for although it is true that large prices in some cases have been charged, it is not true that in any one case they have been paid, and after the exorbitant charges of which my hon. friend speaks have been reduced to current mar-

ket prices there will yet remain about $23,000 at least to be paid. So my hon. friend has no ground on which to base his argument. Moreover, if this motion is passed, it will simply have the effect of saying that my hon. friend and his followers opposite when they wish to make an attack against the Government, do it at the expense of traders and merchants who have supplied wares and expect pay for them, having supplied them on the order of the Government and holding the Government of Canada responsible for their payment. If the hon. gentleman has anything to find fault with in that respect, he should cast the blame on the Government and he should endeavour to punish the Government by a vote of want of confidence, but he should not repudiate honest debts due to traders and others who have given their wares and services. My hon. friend, therefore, is entitled to move a vote of censure and find fault with the Government for their action, but he is entirely wrong on both these grounds he has taken in favour of the motion which he has asked the House to pass.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the House is undoubtedly justified in taking the course that has been adopted by the hon. member for Queen's, for this simple reason. The Minister of Public Works admits that in some cases 50 and in other cases 75 per cent more is charged than the intrinsic value of the goods supplied. No doubt advantage has been taken of the occasion. Under these circumstances, and in face of what was stated by the Minister of Finance, who declared that none of the accounts had been paid, if frauds have been attempted, as has been admitted by the Minister of Public Works, and if they exist to any considerable extent, $10,000 might cover the whole accounts. If, however, the House voted $25,000 the probability is that the entire amount will be spent in paying those accounts, and even more. Why, therefore, should not a vote be taken for $10,000, especially in face of the statement made by the Minister of Public Works, who admitted that frauds had been attempted. At another session, if it is necessary to supplement the amount, after all the accounts have been cut down to their proper amounts, the Government might ask an additional vote. but the House, in face of the statement made by the Minister of Public Works, should not vote the $25,000 asked.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you deal with your creditors in that way?

Mr. McMULLEN. The Government do wrong in pressing for a vote of $25,000 in view of the statement that has been made. No doubt $10,000 is ample for the present, and. in fact, we say that it should more than cover the total amount, but, in view of the admission made by the Minister of Public Works it should be accepted at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. OUIMET. I am sure my hon. friend is not in earnest in his support of the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's. An examination of the accounts laid on the Table will show that the total amount of the accounts produced, is $33,000. That amount is proposed to be reduced to $25,000, and even to $23,000. In that amount of $25.000 is included the account of the Intercolonial amounting to $6,000. Thus the real amount coming to tradesmen and labourers is limited to about $19,000. That sum is what we consider a fair payment for all the goods we have received, and work done; but less than that would be unreasonable. Indeed, as the Minister of Finance has said, this House should not be willing to practise economy out of the pockets of the people. I have not stated that excessive charges were made in the majority of cases, but only in certain cases, and we are not obliged to submit to them. The amount of $25,000 which we ask is a reasonable amount, deducting $6,000 that goes to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister has made several important admissions. One was that $6,000 of the amount is simply a matter of account, a payment by the Government to the Intercolonial Railway, which is the property of the Government itself; and that even, according to his own estimate, only $17,000, instead of $25,000, are due to the tradesmen and others whose bills are before the House, and whose case the Minister of Finance has pleaded so eloquently and urgently. The Finance Minister would have the House understand that $23,000 were required to cover the legitimate claims of men who furnished goods or value of some kind for the purpose of the funeral. But the Minister of Public Works distinctly says that only $17,000 are required for that purpose. When the Ministers differ to that extent among themselves, they cannot expect the House to accept as final any statement they may make in regard to the amount fairly and honestly due for services required under the bills which have been laid before the House. The Minister of Public Works went on to admit that there have been outrageous overcharges in many cases.

Mr. OUIMET. I did not say many cases.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister said, that in some cases, at all events there were outrageous overcharges. Well, we have been contending that there have been outrageous overcharges, and that these overcharges have not been checked by the Government to the extent they should have been, and that we have every reason to believe they will not be so checked by the Government in the final settlement of the account, if the $25,000 asked for is put at their disposal. Like my leader, and the hon. member who moved the motion (Mr. Davies), I can see no objection to a reasonable provision for a

public funeral, but like them I do say, that the provision proposed to be made is unreasonable. To contend, that while about $7,000 was sufficient to give a public funeral to a statesman of the eminence of Sir John Macdonald; it requires $25,000 to provide a proper public funeral for Sir John Thompson, seems to me to be absurd. With all respect to the memory of Sir John Thompson, his individuality was not built up with, and associated with, the growth of Canada to the same extent as that of Sir John Macdonald, and the reasons for a very expensive display in the one case, rather than in the other, have not been put before us, and I do not believe they exist. What we are finding fault with on this occasion, is, not that the Government have sought to do sufficient and due honour to the memory of Sir John Thompson, but that they have made the funeral of Sir John Thompson an occasion for a wasteful display for the benefit of political favourites in Halifax and elsewhere, rather than a tribute to a Canadian statesman or for the credit of the country. It is for the sake of the credit of the country that we should do honour to our great men, out of respect to ourselves. But it is not a method of showing respect for ourselves or for our great dead, to make their funeral the occasion of a party display, a party advertisement, and a distribution of the public money among party friends. The items of the accounts which were laid on the Table I have not been able to look into, any further than they have been quoted by previous speakers and put in the "Hansard," but some of them are absurd on their face, for example, 35,000 yards of material which were used for bunting cost nearly $8,800. Remember what is meant by the use of this material for the purpose of draping, let us say, a church. It simply means that the rolls of material are brought from the merchant's shop, unrolled, and hung up around the church, and when the ceremony is over they are rolled up and taken back again. Will the Minister of Finance pretend that we ought to pay the full value of the bunting in such a case as that? I am sure that even he will not contend that we ought do so. However, that bunting used only once, and scarcely at all injured in the use, is being charged for at full cost as if we had bought it outright. The expenditure for flowers, might or might not, be considered extravagant. It was about $2,000, and it seems to me we ought to get a large amount of flowers for that sum. I take these two items of expenditure as illustrations of the whole thing. There were expenditures for the entertainment of those who took part in the funeral which may or may not be open to criticism as to their amount, or necessity, and as to their propriety in keeping up the credit of Canada. There are accounts even for the clothing of some of those who took part in the ceremony, but to which I will not now invite attention. I prefer to limit my remarks to the main principle, that as far as appears on the face of the accounts before us, and from any explanations we have got from the Ministers, the expenditure in connection with this funeral was an expenditure for a big party celebration, rather than for the purpose of applying this money legitimately. It has not been shown to the House that the legitimate accounts which the Government ought to pay amount to more than the $10,000, which my hon. friend's resolution proposes to leave in this item. For all these reasons I am compelled to vote with my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), in favour of reducing this vote of $25,000 by $15,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am quite in accord with the motion of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). There is no reason at all for asking the House to vote such a large sum as $25,000 to bury the late Prime Minister. When we bear in mind that on previous occasions the public funerals that have been given to distinguished men have only cost $8,000 or $9,000 in one case, and in the case of the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald a little over $6,000, I think it is outrageous for the Government to come here and ask for $25,000 to pay the funeral expenses of the late Sir John Thompson. Bear in mind that not one single dollar of expense was incurred until the body was laid on the wharf at Halifax. When you look over the items you cannot help but be struck with the gross carelessness, and recklessness, and extravagance shown by those in charge. I confess that it is in keeping with all the transactions of those gentlemen opposite. They do not seem to regard the public money except as common plunder, and they think they can use it with a free hand because it is the money of the people. This House would be wrong in voting more than $10,000 for this service. The Minister of Public Works has admitted that a great many of the accounts were extravagant, and that the traders had tried to exact from the Government from 50 to 75 per cent more for the articles they supplied, than was a fair and reasonable price. We have the admission of the Minister of Finance that not a dollar has been paid out yet, and under these circumstances it is the duty of the Government to see that these outrageous charges are cut down, and that the money of the people is not plundered. There are about 35,000 yards of black cloth charged for, a quantity which would stretch for over twenty-one miles. Surely a great portion of that is uninjured and can be returned at a slight reduction. Most of that cost from 60 to 80 cents a yard, and was only used for a short time, so that the item could be cut down in that respect. It seems that the undertakers were furnished with fourteen black overcoats at $20 each to be worn only for a few hours. What became of these coats? There were fourteen silk hats at $4

each to be worn only a few hours, and fourteen pairs of top boots at $3.50 each. These are outrageous charges. Is it to be expected that the people of this Dominion are going to put their hands in their pockets, and literally throw away this money at the whim and caprice of a few men who are for the time being governing this country? Those who had the matter in charge should receive a direct vote of censure from the House for such a scandalous waste of the people's money. Instead of conducting this funeral as it should have been conducted, in a quiet and proper manner, it was made an occasion for revelry. A gentleman told me that it was perfectly disgraceful—that he had never seen anything so disgusting and outrageous as the way affairs were conducted in the city of Halifax, without any regard to expense or any regard to the proprieties of that solemn occasion. Bills were run up in a way that the Minister of Public Works now admits was outrageous; and I say that it is the duty of this House, as the guardian of the public treasury, and remembering that this is the people's money and not our money, and that we are only the trustees of the people, to cut down this expenditure. I think $10,000 is as much as this young country can afford to bury any man; and when we remember that the expenses in connection with the public funerals of other distinguished men have not been anything like so great, I think we can well afford to pass this amendment. An enormous amount of goods were purchased and used only a short time; and surely it is the duty of the Government to see that those goods are properly returned and a due account of them made. If that is done, I am sure that $10,000 will be sufficient expenses connected with the funeral, and I will therefore vote for the amendment.

Mr. FLINT. This subject is necessarily a painful one, and those who object to the appropriation are, of course, placed in a somewhat embarrassing position; because they are willing to do all reasonable honour to a gentleman whom they personally respected and admired for his integrity and his talents, and would not object to a reasonable allowance for that purpose. I think the principal effect of the amendment before the House, whether it is carried in the affirmative or the negative, will be to place in the breasts of those who on any future occasion are charged with responsibilities of this character, a caution as to the extent of latitude which they allow to their servants. The hon. Minister of Public Works and his colleagues have, perhaps, to a certain degree been drawn unwittingly into a position which they themselves feel compelled to apologise for, and perhaps in their inmost hearts, to a certain degree regret. The initial error was committed by the hon. Minister of Public Works when he gave his deputy carte blanche in arranging the expenses of the funeral. That gentleman, no doubt, discharged his duty with an eye single to carrying out what he conceived to be the sentiments of his superior, and that is where the mistake was made. Neither the people of this country nor this Parliament will, I believe, support an error of that kind. In my humble view, almost every canon of good taste was violated in connection with the circumstances we have been discussing. It would have been far more appropriate taste, and far more in consonance, I believe, with the personal feelings and views of our lamented friend had the part of the Dominion been conducted with greater economy and much greater simplicity. Go where you will, and read the history of the lives of distinguished statesmen to whom the honours of the state have been tendered, and you will find that, almost without exception, they have deprecated an unwonted or undue display. In glancing through the items of these bills, we can easily see that there was a combination of circumstances, added to the lack of limit given by the Minister of Public Works, which conspired to produce this very unpleasant result. Had the Minister of Public Works really considered his duty in the matter, and what the general feeling of the country and the highest sentiments of good taste would dictate, I believe he would have said to his deputy: Let this affair be conducted decently and in order, but let there be no extravagance; insist on the most rigid application of the rules of economy, and let the outpourings of the sympathies of the public do the rest. After all, Sir, let this discussion, unpleasant as it has been, be a warning, a caution, to those at the head of public affairs, and let them not imagine that lavish expenditures from the public purse can take the place of the universal sentiment of the people. Where there is really a general regret and mourning over one who has occupied a prominent position, this will manifest itself in a way that will speak as loudly to the world of the estimation in which he was held as all this wasteful and extravagant emblematic accompaniments of woe. They were not at all necessary; and although the Government may be, to some extent, committed to pay these bills, so far as they are reasonable, yet, in voting for the amendment of my hon. friend, I am simply placing on record my protest against the course adopted by the Minister of Public Works. The people of this country will not consent to carte blanche being given to their officers on occasions of display such as this. The circumstances are very rare when anything beyond a very simple and inexpensive funeral would be required; and, although my personal feelings would tend to induce me to join in deprecating any discussion over the grave of one whom we highly respected, I believe our duty to the public and our duty to the future is higher even than our personal sympathies and personal feelings. Therefore, I will support the amendment of my hon. friend from Queen's.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Davies (P.E.I.):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Bain (Wentworth),
Beith,
Borden,
Boston,
Bowers,
Brodeur,
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Christie,
Colter,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Edgar,
Fauvel,
Flint,
Forbes,
Gibson,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Innes,
Landerkin
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Lowell,
Macdonald (Huron),
McCarthy,
McGregor,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Martin,
Mignault,
Mulock,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Proulx,
Rinfret,
Sanborn,
Semple,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Tyrwhitt,
Vaillancourt, and
Welsh.—48.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Belley,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Blanchard,
Boyd,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Chesley,
Costigan,
Curran,
Daly,
Davis (Alberta),
Denison,
Devlin,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Foster,
Gillies,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grandbois,
Grant (Sir James),
Haggart,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Ingram,
Joncas,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Leclair,
Lépine,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
McAlister,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreevy,
McKay,
McLennan,
Marshall,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Montague,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Pridham,
Robillard,
Simard,
Sproule,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wilson, and
Wood (Brockville).—68.

Amendment negatived, and resolution concurred in.

Mr. GUAY. The hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris) and the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I., have not voted.

Mr. YEO. I paired with the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. McLean), or I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) I paired with the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Frechette), otherwise I would certainly have voted for the amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. member for Bothwell did not vote.

Mr. MILLS. I paired with the Postmaster General.

Contribution to the Lady Thompson Fund. $25,000

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I move that the item be not concurred in but be struck out.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Bain (Wentworth),
Beith,
Borden,
Boston,
Bowers,
Brodeur,
Campbell,
Carroll,
Christie,
Colter,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Fauvel,
Flint,
Forbes,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Hodgins,
Innes,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Leduc,
Lowell,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGregor,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Martin,
Mignault,
Paterson (Brant),
Proulx,
Rinfret,
Sanborn,
Semple,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Vaillancourt, and
Wilson.—39.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Belley,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Blanchard,
Boyd,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Chesley,
Costigan,
Curran,
Daly,
Davis (Alberta),
Denison,
Devlin,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Ingram,
Joncas,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leclair,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton)
McKay,
McLennan,
McNeill,
Marshall,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Mills (Annapolis),
Montague,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Pridham,
Robillard,
Simard,
Sproule,

Foster,	Taylor,
Gibson,	Tisdale,
Gillies,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Girouard (Two Moun-	Hibbert),
tains),	Tyrwhitt,
Grandbois,	Wallace,
Grant (Sir James),	Weldon,
Guillet,	White (Shelburne),
Haggart,	Wilmot, and
Hazen,	Wood (Brockville).—76.
Henderson,	

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. GUAY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris) has not voted.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) I paired with the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Frechette), otherwise I would certainly have voted against the resolution of the Government.

SUPPLY—COPYRIGHT.

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

Mr. EDGAR. Before the House goes into committee, I would like very briefly to refer to a matter in which the country takes a particular interest just now. I see by the public press that it is intended shortly to send an envoy from Canada to England to represent the Government in its discussion of the present position of the copyright question between Canada and the British Government. I would like very briefly to refer to what I consider to be the somewhat extraordinary position of Canada as a self-governing country on that question to-day. The Act of 1889 was passed unanimously by both Houses of this Parliament. In that Act there was a clause providing that it should not go into force until a proclamation was issued by the Government to that effect. Now, the Canadian Government have practically treated that clause as if it meant that they should obtain the assent of the British Government before issuing that proclamation. I do not think they were right in treating that clause as having that meaning. It would certainly have been perfectly reasonable, fair and proper for the Canadian Government to have, in every possible way, informed the British Government of the object of that legislation. But it must be remembered that, under our constitution, there are two years given for the disallowance of our legislation, and I think the proper course would have been for our Government to have informed the British Government that at the end of those two years they would put the Act into force. Now, to be a little plain about the matter, I do not think the Canadian Government should assent to any executive action of the Imperial Government which would have the appearance of placing a limitation upon our right to legislate on the subject of copyright or anything else which we believe we have received under the British North America Act. To my mind the British Government might just as well try to rob us of our legislating rights regarding any of the other twenty-nine subjects for exclusive Dominion legislation mentioned in the ninety-first section of the British North America Act, as to seek to prevent us practically from legislating on copyright. What would be said if the British Government did obstruct and thwart our legislation, on, for instance, the subject of customs or excise, tariffs or duties, or on the subject of patents for inventions, or on the subject of our postal regulations, or on any other of those subjects about which we are legislating every day in Canada? I do not wish to find fault with the line of discussion or the stand taken in this question by the late Sir John Thompson as representing the Government of Canada. In fact, I entirely approve of the course he took and of his arguments and contentions in favour of the rights of Canada. I am glad to be able to testify to the earnestness and the ability and the sturdy Canadian spirit which he exercised in the treatment of that question in the numerous state papers which he sent to the British Government. In fact, in 1889, in an important state paper in which he claimed the constitutional right of Canada to this copyright legislation, he used these words:

> It was to his mind perfecly plain, that the people of Canada would hold him culpable if he failed to assert that this was the only interpretation under which they received the constitution, and under which they are willing to be content with that constitution.

Now, Sir, what objections have been raised to this Act of 1889? It has been claimed that we have no jurisdiction to pass such an Act, notwithstanding the apparently clear language of the British North America Act, because it is inconsistent with prior Imperial legislation on this subject embracing the colonies, but we have not admitted that to be the proper interpretation of the law. I am not going to discuss the legal question, but there is a very simple answer from Canada to that claim, when advanced by the Imperial Government. We say to them: Admitting, for the sake of argument, your contention that there is doubt as to the sufficiency of the British North America Act to give us clear right to legislate on copyright; then, if that be so, it is your duty to submit to the Imperial Parliament promptly such legislation as, in your judgment, may be required to make it absolutely clear that Canada has the right to legislate on copyright, so that there may be no further misunderstanding on the subject. Then there are objections made to this Act also by British authors. I do not think their objections are very well founded, and I

think that the agitation they have been raising is somewhat inconsistent; because these authors are very much pleased with the recent legislation of the United States in their favour, which is very much less in their favour than the legislation we in Canada propose to give them; and yet, while they are full of compliments to the Americans for treating them so well, they are full of denunciations of Canada for treating them so badly. However, their rights or their wrongs in that matter are mere matters of detail. I shall not discuss them here; but I am sure that the British authors whom we in Canada know so well, and admire so much, need have no fear of receiving bad treatment at the hands of the Canadian Parliament. They may depend that we shall be not only just, but generous to them; and, if there are any unfair provisions in the Act of 1889, I am quite sure that the Parliament of Canada, when they are pointed out, will promptly amend the Act and make it fair not only to all classes in Canada, but also to the British authors themselves. One thing I think we must insist upon, however, and that is that amendments to the Act of 1889, and to our copyright laws, shall be sought and shall be made in Ottawa, and not at Westminster or Downing Street. I hope that the instructions to the envoy that we are sending over there will be very definite, at any rate on that point, and that he will be instructed to hold well to the front this constitutional question; and, even if he should go into the discussion of details, that he will maintain that they are of very minor importance, compared with the simple and fair settlement of this constitutional question. And I think, unless the present Government seeks to change their policy—and the policy of Parliament so far—on this question, they will maintain the position which is the only one that is proper for us to maintain in urging the separate legislative autonomy of this Dominion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has received with high appreciation the observations of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. The hon. gentleman has followed this subject with a great deal of interest, and I remember very well that the late Minister of Justice was glad to recognize his co-operation in the efforts that were being made to secure the full recognition of the powers of self-government which Canada believes she possesses, and which this Parliament has so unmistakably shown it desires to have recognized and put beyond question or peradventure. The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that when this Parliament adopted the Act of 1889, there was incorporated in that legislation a clause regarding the issue of a proclamation, until the issue of which the new Act was not to come into force: and he made some observation on the propriety of that course in view of recent experience, and, as I gathered from his remarks, suggested that it would have been better had we passed the Act here, and run the risk of disallowance. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think, perhaps, that the hon. gentleman has overlooked——

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I did not suggest that it was better to run the risk of disallowance by the Imperial authorities, but, after the time of disallowance, we should pass it and would run the risk of disallowance in the courts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Even so, I submit that the hon. gentleman has overlooked an important consideration that obtained, according to my recollection, in drawing the Bill. We had to get rid of the Berne convention, to which we were parties. I think that was the great reason that led to the course we took. In a minute of Council, based upon the report of the late Minister of Justice, our case was so urged. First, we pressed the Act for approval. We knew the difficulties that the law officers of the Crown had raised long before as to our powers, and met these in argument. The late Minister of Justice proposed to the Government that if his argument in favour of the validity of this Act, in favour of the view that such legislation was within the powers conferred by the British North America Act, then the notice should be given, under the terms of the Berne convention, of our withdrawl; and if there were doubts in reference to our power, and the arguments of the Canadian Governnment did not prevail, then that the necessary powers be secured to the Canadian Parliament by further Imperial legislation. And it does seem to me, as it certainly seemed to this House when they adopted the unanimous address, that, no matter what these legal difficulties may be, the British Parliament, recognizing the intention shown by the British North America Act to give this country such large powers of self-government, should remove all difficulties at once by Imperial legislation. However, I do not, in dwelling upon that phase of the question, desire, in the slightest degree, at this important juncture of the proceedings, to suggest, even if I dared to do so, any weakness in the argument that has hitherto been pressed as to the powers we may now legally claim under the existing legislation. But the position that is given to us in this Act, of course, is clear and apparent. I am convinced that had it not been for the very extraordinary position on the part of influential bodies in England, the authors and publishers, the wishes of this self-governing portion of the British Empire would have prevailed ere this. The Government have every reason to believe that had the

late Prime Minister not been so suddenly cut off, there might have been by this time a happy issue of the negotiations, because, having pressed with great earnestness the case of Canada in every shape and form, it had been arranged that he would consult with one of the officers of the British Government having this subject particularly in charge, on the very day after his sad death. No interview therefore of that character has yet taken place. After waiting for the further views of the British Government, the Canadian Government received an invitation to send some one to carry on that discussion in the Colonial Office, and the Government has asked Mr. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, to proceed to England at a time convenient for all concerned. He leaves this month. He has had an opportunity of following this case, in conjunction with the late Minister of Justice, very closely, and he has also been in communication and touch with those who have much technical information in regard to the operation of the Act. I may say that all who know that gentleman will feel that the case of Canada will be well presented, and certainly his instructions from the Canadian Government will be to leave no stone unturned in impressing upon the English Government that regardless of the merits or demerits of the Bill, that is to say, regardless of the plan that it embodies, or the objections that might be made to this principle, Canada has a great desire for the settlement of this vexed question; and either the recognition of our powers, or the granting of them in the line and spirit of our constitution, is demanded by all parties in Canada, regardless of political or other considerations. But the question so far as this Parliament has dealt with it, is not one for the benefit of the authors, or publishers, or printers, or any other body of men in Canada. Of course, incidentally, they are much interested in the direct effect of the Bill; but as I take it, the question with the Parliament of Canada is one of principle, and this country will not be satisfied until the wishes that have been respectfully pressed, are acceded to.

Mr. WELDON. Before the discussion has passed away from this subject, I would like to say one or two words. From the first introduction of this copyright measure to the House, I have never been able to share the views which I think prevail largely on both sides of the House as to the competency of this Parliament to pass a law of this character. I have never been able to entertain the view that under our constitution, the granting of power under section 91 of the British North America Act to make laws concerning copyright, implied, or was a constructive repeal of, that earlier Imperial law of copyright which applied to this colony. And I would not speak as I do now—as my remarks would seem to weaken rather than

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

strengthen the hands of that officer whom we are sending to fight our battles—were it not with the view of turning his attention, and the attention of the Minister who will give him his instructions, to the wisdom of pressing more strongly in the second direction, that is, in favour of an English amendment to the Imperial law, I mean an amendment to the English Copyright Act now applicable to Canada. If we fight on the first line where, as I think very strongly, we are wrong, and have been wrong, and if we succeed, as we very likely may, in inducing the Colonial Office to give way to our contention and accept our view, that itself would give no guarantee that the law for which we are fighting is intra vires of the Parliament of Canada. Moreover, if we should succeed in getting this copyright law proclaimed, and if the English authors and the English publishers, who are in conflict with us, and who are opposed to the purpose of the Canadian Parliament, should enter the law courts, I have a strong fear that in the long run they would triumph, and succeed in having the law now on our statute-books declared to be ultra vires of the Parliament of Canada. My view of the provisions contained in sections 91 and 92 of the constitution, is that they are merely a partition of legislative powers between the federal authorities and the local authorities, we having one group including copyright, and the local authorities having certain other powers. If the British North America Act gave no new substantive powers to any legislative authority in Canada, that is to say, if you add up the federal powers and the local powers given by the Act of 1867, you have the sum total possessed by Nova Scotia, we will say, before 1867, and if that be true, the consequence is that the British North America Act is not a constructive repeal of the Imperial copyright law. Therefore I strongly hope that if the Minister's emissary should fail on this question of intra vires, that he will press strongly in the second direction, namely, for an amendment to the English law which will put the matter beyond all controversy. I heartily share the views that have been so often pressed upon the House by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). I think there can be no answer, in substance or on the merits, to the contention that this colony, which has the strength of a nation, and has shown great legislative capacity, should be enabled to judge of its own interests in the matter of copyright, just as it is able to judge of its own interests in the matter of patent rights.

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

(In the Committee.)

Department of the Interior..... $98,454

Mr. LAURIER. There is a decrease of $4,000, which is so unusual a thing as to require an explanation.

Mr. DALY. There is a decrease of seven clerks, too.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like the hon. gentleman to tell us how much the decrease really is, because if I remember rightly, some of these clerks have been superannuated, and the charge is simply transferred from the department to the superannuation account. The hon. gentleman may be able to tell us which of those are not on the superannuation list, and what is the absolute difference in the two years?

Mr. DALY. There are only eleven first-class clerks as against twelve last year. This was occasioned by the death of Mr. Mills of the ordnance branch, whose position was not filled, and the position of first-class clerk was dropped. Of the first-class clerks three were superannuated: Mr. Hatch, who was in receipt of $950 a year, and whose superannuation amounts to $379.50, making a saving of about $570; Mr. Lacasse, whose salary was $1,000, and who receives a superannuation of $440, making a saving of $560; Mr. Pope, who had a salary of $1,000, and now receives a superannuation of $240, making a saving of $760. The superannuation allowances are $1,059.50, while the total salaries were $2,950. the total saving being $1,890.50.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of the Interior has informed the House that Mr. Mills, first-class clerk in the ordnance branch, is dead, and that his place has not been filled up and will not be filled. I call attention to this fact, that of the eleven first-class clerks now in the Department of the Interior the clerk in charge of the ordnance branch is Mr. Keyes. He was appointed in 1877; and he has had more than half of the eleven clerks promoted over his head. During the whole period he has been in office not a single censure of any kind has been entered against him. He is a most competent man, and entered the department when he was young. He was appointed by me when I had charge of the department, and the announcement that the first-class clerkship in this branch has been abolished, although Mr. Keyes continues to discharge all the duties formerly discharged by Mr. Mills who held the position, appears to me to be a rather extraordinary state of affairs. It may be attributed to the misfortune that Mr. Keyes received his appointment at my hands when Minister. I am sure of this, and I say it in this House deliberately, that there is not in the hon. gentleman's department any clerk more competent and trustworthy in the discharge of his duties than the party whom the Minister has left without that treatment, which in ordinary cases would be meted out to every party in any service, public or private.

Mr. DALY. In reply to the statement which the hon. member has made that Mr. Keyes has not been promoted because he was appointed by the hon. member for Bothwell when Minister of the Interior, I beg to say that if Mr. Keyes was appointed by him, I did not know it. I know nothing about Mr. Keyes, except that it is stated to me that he is a first-class man. He is a second-class clerk, not, however, at the head of the list, because there are three seniors in his class. No doubt he will receive promotion in due course, as others do. In regard to appointments made to first-class clerkships, the only one made by me since I came into the department was one in the immigration branch, and in fact that is the only appointment made over Mr. Keyes' head. The fact that Mr. Keyes was appointed by the hon. member has had nothing to do with his non-promotion, because had the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Mills been filled by the appointment to it of a first-class clerk, Mr. Keyes would have been selected for the position, and so his case could not have been prejudiced in any way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; but if Mr. Keyes had not been there the first-class clerkship would not have been wiped out. I have watched with very considerable interest and care the promotions that have taken place in that department for the last fifteen years. Nearly all those who stand in the list of first-class clerks have been promoted over Mr. Keyes' head; and even more than that, a number of those in the Department of Indian Affairs who were appointed long subsequently to Mr. Keyes, are now first-class clerks and he is a second-class clerk. No principle of fairness or justice has been observed in making promotions in that department, and I will say more on this subject when I discuss a motion which I propose to submit to the House. I am not charging the hon. Minister personally with doing an injustice, for it was done by his immediate predecessor, but I apprehend it is the party who incurs for some reason or other the personal dislike of the deputy who suffers the misfortune which seems to be incident to positions they hold in the department.

Mr. DALY. I resent the statement made that the position would not have been abolished if Mr. Keyes had not been next in order of promotion. The fact is, Mr. Keyes was to have been promoted to that position, and it was not until the Government came to the conclusion to cut down the staff that I was unable to promote him to the position which I intended him to fill. So far as myself and the deputy is concerned, we have had nothing to do with the promotion of Mr. Keyes.

Department of Indian Affairs..... $50,495

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In discussing an item under this heading in the supplementary Estimates, I called the attention of the Minister to the increase which has marked this branch of the public service, and he

promised that he would go fully into the matter when we reached the main Estimates. The hon. gentleman asks a vote of $50,495 this year. I find the expenditure last year was $48,490. Last year there were forty-six officers whose aggregate salaries amounted to that sum. In 1878 eight men were found sufficient, whereas we have forty-six now. Then $9,350 was paid, whereas now we pay $48,490. I said I did not understand very well how the increase took place, when the Indian population, I am sorry to say, had not increased very rapidly. I could understand some increase in the Department of the Interior when immigration was at its height, but if anything has been added to Indian affairs, I do not remember it. The increase looks to be so very great that I would like an explanation from the Minister. Since 1890, that is, within five years, there have been sixteen added to the staff, while within the year 1878, eight constituted the entire staff. The Minister should give some explanation in reference to this item, for the increase certainly seems to be very great.

Mr. DALY. This being an item for civil government, we do not look upon it as in connection with the Indian Affairs Department, and I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the full explanation which I will later, on items to follow. At the time he speaks of, there was comparatively little work in connection with Indian affairs in the North-west or British Columbia. At that time many of the Indians were not in treaty. They were roaming all over the province, were getting their food and supplies from the buffalo, and the Government was not called upon to give them the supervision they do now. The Indians are now obliged to remain upon their reserves, and the policy of the department is to create as much individuality among them as we can and to make them as quickly as possible self-supporting. Owing to our conducting affairs upon that line, I will be able to show the hon. gentleman that the amount for destitute Indians has decreased in an immense ratio, and that now the Indians are supporting themselves more or less upon their reserves. Upon some reserves we do not furnish them with flour, and upon other reserves we do not furnish them with meat at the present time. We have erected mills, and the Indians are grinding their own flour, and not only that, but they are able to do gristing for the neighbouring farmers in the district. In other cases we have given them young cattle and bulls, and they now have herds by which they are supplying themselves with their beef. We trust that it will be only a matter of a few years when we will have the Indians all over the North-west in such a position that they will be to a large extent self-sustaining. The largest item in connection with the food supply for the North-west is amongst the Bloods, Piegans and Blackfeet, and it has taken all these years, until two years ago, to get these Indians to give up the idea that their whole object in life was surrounding themselves with a lot of ponies. The vote two years ago enabled the department to purchase cattle for them, and now they are all crazy to get more than we can possibly supply them with. We expect that in time, instead of supplying them with thousands of pounds of beef every day, they will themselves be able to furnish sufficient beef for their reserves. The distribution of supplies to the Indians occasions a great amount of clerical work. We have adopted a system whereby it is an impossibility for any person to get away with half a pound of beef, or half a pound of flour, without that being known. A system of returns and checking has been adopted which enables us to check every cent spent on provisions. All this, as the hon. gentleman can understand, entails a large staff of officers. Then, again, with regard to Indian lands in the other provinces, it will be seen that very few of them were in the market for sale at the time the hon. gentleman speaks of. The land branch has grown very considerably since that time, and there are numerous transactions taking place in all the different reserves throughout Ontario and Quebec, which entail a vast amount of clerical work. In addition, there is the accountant's branch, where all the band funds of the different Indians have to be checked and kept, and, again, the department have gone more extensively, as the hon. gentleman knows, into the education of the Indians. The schools branch which has been established, has caused a great deal of clerical work. Exception has been taken by hon. gentlemen opposite to the policy pursued by the department in relation to the education of the Indians. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) knows from his long experience of living in contiguity with the Indians of Brant, that every person who takes an interest in the Indian holds that education is the only method by which we can civilize him, and give him a fair start in life to compete with his white neighbour. Exception has been taken by some hon. gentlemen as to the amount of money we spend upon our industrial schools. We found from experience that the local day schools upon the reserves have not been satisfactory, and that whilst the children are with their parents it is very difficult to get them to attend school. In boarding and industrial schools, we have the children away from their parents, and they are being educated and taught trades and callings, and being made conversant with the ways of the white man. It is surprising, as a visit to the different reserves will show, what a great influence the education of these Indian children has had upon their parents and their home life. We cannot expect to do much with the

older Indians in the North-west, and it is only amongst the younger children that we can effect any good work. The result attained in these different schools is evidence that the policy of the Government is a wise one. I have furnished myself with a considerable amount of data in reference to details, which I will give at length when we reach other items, and I think I can give him very good reasons for the increase in the staff of the Department of Indian Affairs.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I quite understand that the question of the maintenance and education of the Indians in the North-west will come up more properly on a subsequent item, and I am sure that not one on this side of the House, certainly not I, will object to all proper means being taken for providing for those objects. But the question I bring up now is wholly pertinent to the item under discussion. What I want to find out is why it has been necessary to increase the staff of the inside service at Ottawa, from eight officials to forty-six, and the expenditure from $9,000 to $40,000. I could understand, from what the Minister has said, that there might be reason for an increase in the outside service; but I am not dealing with that; I am dealing only with the inside service at headquarters. With reference to some of the points the hon. Minister has mentioned, I presume that the hon. member for Bothwell would be able to give us some information. With reference to administering the lands in the old provinces, I suppose that was fully attended to in 1878; and I presume that the care of the Indians of the North-west was also attended to at that time as well as now. When we reach the items relating to food and education, we shall be pleased to hear what the Minister has to say with reference to them; but at present I am confining my attention to the item under discussion.

Mr. DALY. I am very sorry to say that I have not the information that I would like to have here to enable me to reply to what the hon. gentleman has said. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, otherwise I would have been prepared. However, I will give him the information, and will present satisfactory reasons for the increase that has taken place from the time he mentions up to the present time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps I may be able to assist the hon. gentleman in giving us an explanation pertinent to this particular item. I find that the hon. gentleman has an organization which does not exactly correspond with the organization that existed at an earlier period. I think that the last time his predecessor was here, I asked him when the department was theoretically organized by Order in Council, and he said it was in 1883. Has the hon. gentleman had any Order in Council passed reorganizing the Indian Branch since that time?

Mr. DALY. Not since I came in.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that the hon. gentleman has a number of branches that did not exist at an earlier period.

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). For instance, there is the accountant's branch, the land branch, and the registrar branch, which existed from the time the department was first organized; but the hon. gentleman has enormously increased the officers in these branches, and their number at present seems to me out of all proportion to what an efficient organization would require. I would like to ask what Mr. J. J. Campbell is doing in the department, because, according to the last report, that gentleman is one of the officers in the North-west?

Mr. DALY. When Mr. Reed was moved down here, and the staff at Regina was reduced, it was necessary to have persons here conversant with Indian matters in the North-west, and Mr. Campbell was brought here from Regina, and put in the office for that purpose. He has had ten or twelve years' experience in the Regina office.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. William McGirr was also in the North-west. What duties has he to discharge?

Mr. DALY. With the possible exception of the Deputy Minister, Mr. McGirr is better posted on Indian matters, not only in the North-west Territories, but in Canada generally, than any other man in the service, and his duties are not confined to any particular branch. He is recognized. I believe, as one of the ablest officers we have.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. J. A. Macrae?

Mr. DALY. He is inspector of agencies.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). George L. Chitty?

Mr. DALY. He is inspector of timber. He was appointed from here. He is an Ottawa lumberman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How long has he been connected with the department?

Mr. DALY. I should judge about four years. He was there when I came in.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is Mr. J. J. McKenna, who was Mr. Vankoughnet's shorthand writer. Is he there still?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Moffat?

Mr. DALY. He is accountant.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He was formerly connected immediately with the deputy as a shorthand writer. Is he there still?

Mr. DALY. Yes. I see R. B. E. Moffat is a third-class clerk; and there is also T. P. Moffat.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As far as I can make out from the report of the department, and from the Auditor General's Report, there are five officials, where there were two before. Before, there were Mr. McKenna, and Mr. Moffat, and now there is added Mr. McRae, Mr. Campbell, and Miss Taylor; and these five seem all to be connected immediately with the deputy's own work. Will the hon. Minister say whether that is so, or not?

Mr. DALY. They do the general work of the department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In the accountant's branch, I find these names: Mr. Scott, Mr. Dalton, Mr. McKay, Mr. Shore, Mr. Smith, Mr. Rochester, Mr. Ross, a couple of others, and five young ladies, or thirteen in all, connected with the accountant's branch. Does the hon. gentleman maintain that thirteen are necessary where there was only one or two before?

Mr. DALY. I do, and we could satisfactorily employ two more if we could get them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Do they duplicate their work?

Mr. DALY. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is there a record in the department as to what these parties are doing?

Mr. DALY. I presume so, but I do not know anything about the details.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it would be important to bring these parties before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. DALY. I shall be very glad if you will. That would be an easy way of getting them.

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

After Recess.

DOMINION ATLANTIC RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 48) to incorporate the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Stairs.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to insert a clause, clause 15a, which will read as follows:—

The Governor in Council may enter into an agreement with the company providing for the commutation and release of any right or privilege in respect of a drawback of Customs or import duties under the said contract or agreement between the chief commissioner of railways for the province of Nova Scotia and William Henry Punchard, Frederick Barry and Edwin Clark, dated 22nd November, 1866, in consideration of the payment of such sum in cash as may be determined upon and mentioned in the said agreement, and the company are hereby authorized and empowered to enter into such agreement for commutation of any such right or privilege in consideration of the payment of a sum in cash, and to release and surrender such right or privilege to Her Majesty in consideration of such cash payment.

2. The Governor in Council may, upon the execution of such an agreement, by proclamation to be published in the "Canada Gazette," repeal any provision of any Act of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, or of Parliament, granting such right or privilege so commuted.

In explanation, I may say to the committee that the old company, the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, enjoyed a special privilege in relation to the drawback upon all the commodities and materials imported for the use of the railway. To be precise, their privilege was the right to a rebate of the customs duty upon materials and stores, and while the Government was most anxious not to impede the amalgamation of these different roads, speaking generally, the Windsor and Annapolis and the old Western Counties, and some other road operated in connection with that system, still it would be most difficult to administer that privilege without the danger of abuse. The difficulty of checking the materials that were used for a part of the system upon which, alone, the right to a drawback under this old agreement is based, would be so great that it would be impossible to assent to any amalgamation of this kind which left the Government open to that danger. Negotiations had already been entered into, some time before this application, with the company for the purpose of getting rid of that. The amounts paid, as a refund, since 1872 down to 1894, aggregate $96,968. That is an average for twenty-three years, of $334, under the terms of that old agreement, applying only to one part of the system embraced in this Bill. When the Government endeavoured to settle this by a lump sum, and get rid of a very inconvenient arrangement, the company asked $120,000. The Government offered $85,000, and there the negotiations stood. The object of this clause is to enable the Governor in Council to carry those negotiations to a settlement, because, unless that be done, the House will see that there are strong reasons to say to the company: If you stand upon your agreement, you will be confined to the charter you now have, which enables the administration of this privilege to be carried on more easily. But if you are to take, into the one system, these other railways, the difficulties would be so great that the Government would be bound to object to the amalgamation. I understand that the company did not object to that provision being inserted.

Mr. LAURIER. Why was not this brought to the notice of the Railway Committee ?

Mr. HAGGART. It was.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The question was brought up, and it was understood that, in order that the passage of the Bill might not be delayed—which the Government had no desire to see—a clause should be prepared to carry out this idea.

Mr. HAGGART. I requested that the Bill might pass but intimated that before it came up in committee of the whole House, a clause should be drawn by the Justice Department which should cover the point.

Mr. TISDALE. There was another question which I raised as chairman of the Railway Committee—that the Railway Committee had not power to deal with the question, as it affected the revenue—that it must originate by resolution considered in committee of the whole House.

Mr. LAURIER. If that point is a good one, the Bill cannot be dealt with in this way.

Mr. TISDALE. I raised the point of order, as it was my duty to do so and I had the authority there. But the committee assented to the proposition that so long as the clause was put in in committee of the whole, that would be sufficient. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that under the clause he proposes the company are not bound to accept.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Quite so ; but I propose, when we come to the last clause, to add another providing that this Act shall not come into operation until a proclamation has been published in the "Canada Gazette."

Mr. LAURIER. The only thing I wanted to know was whether the Railway Committee considered the matter. If they agreed to the course proposed, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. EDGAR. I was present in the Railway Committee when this Bill was discussed. It was shown that there was a rather important public issue involved as to whether the amalgamated companies should have the benefit of certain drawbacks and limitations of customs duties, which a portion of the line proposed to be amalgamated at present enjoys ; and the Minister of Railways and Canals, after some discussion, said he would prefer that the Government should have an opportunity of considering how far they would, as a Government, consent to anything of that kind remaining in the Bill. As I understand the amendment, it is proposed that the privilege of drawback as to part of the line may be commuted by arrangement between the Government and the amalgamated companies. It seems to me that if that can be done, and I think it should be, it is the best way of settling the matter.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I move that the following be inserted as the last clause in the Bill :—

This Act shall not come into operation until proclamation by the Governor in Council, to be published in the "Canada Gazette."

Amendment agreed to.

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

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Canadian Benevolent Society (title changed to "Canadian Sick Benefit Society.")—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Bankers' Life Association.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 39) further to amend the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society Act of 1885. —(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Eastern Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

HAMILTON AND LAKE ERIE POWER COMPANY.

Mr. McKAY moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.

Mr. DENISON. I should like to draw the attention of the House to a report of the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, as follows :—

With regard to the last mentioned Bill, the committee have to report (under Rule 63) that the following powers contained in section 3, viz. :— "to dredge, deepen and widen the said Welland River from its mouth to the point of intersection with the said watercourse and raceway with the said Welland River, and also to drdge, deepen and widen the Jordan River from the point of intersection with the said watercourse and raceway to Lake Ontario, if so found expedient for the purposes of the company," are not covered by the notice, as reported upon by the Committee on Standing Orders.

I think it is only proper that this should be pointed out to the House. The promoters of the Bill claim that the notice is sufficient, but as that is a matter coming more under the supervision of the Committee on Standing Orders than under the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, I think it only necessary to point out this fact, so that if the House thinks it necessary, the Bill can be sent back to the Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. McKAY. The attention of the committee was called to the matter referred to, and after full discussion the committee thought proper to pass the Bill as it was, and considered the notice sufficient for all practicable purpose. The Bill had been petitioned for by the different townships through which the power company will operate, and after the matter was thoroughly ventilated and discussed in the committee, the Bill was passed. The objections taken to it were technical.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand the power to withdraw water from the river and streams had been granted by this Parliament last session to another company, and although I have not the pleasure of attending the Committee on Private Bills all the time, I gathered from what I heard there that the granting of power to this company would prejudicially affect the company previously given powers, and that such action was unfair.

Mr. DENISON. That is not the point.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But that is a matter which I consider important. I understand the hon. member, as chairman of the Committee on Miscellaneous Bills, to report that notice had not been given in accordance with the standing rule. If the question is immaterial, the House may pass the Bill, and I was referring to a fact that might make it material. I ask the hon. member, as chairman of the committee, whether the Bill was opposed by another company, which claimed that their rights would be affected by those granted in this Bill ?

Mr. DENISON. The hon. gentleman is correct. The Bill was opposed in the committee by another company, and one of the contentions was that it might interfere with their rights. But the point the committee made was that the application for power to deepen, dredge and widen had not been sufficiently covered by the notice, and I thought it my duty as chairman to point out this fact to the House.

Mr. WELDON. The objection taken by the company opposing the Bill was that last year we gave them a monopoly. The committee repudiated any such construction as had been placed upon their action, declared that no monopoly had been given, and said they would be glad if ten persons were drawing water instead of one, as at the present time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another matter with respect to these companies which I think deserves more attention than it has yet received. It appears to me that when we are asked to grant, for nothing, apparently, the use of a great natural power, that it is the duty of the Government to reserve to the public the right, on making proper compensation to the parties, to reassume all these powers if, at any future time, they see fit to do so. No man knows what may be the effect of some of these grants, or what may be the result if they are carried to the extent which it is possible to conceive they may be carried, in the event of subsequent developments of electrical power, and so forth. I have a very strong impression, myself, and I think the matter is one which the Government ought carefully to consider, that wherever any power of this kind is given, it should always be hedged and guarded in such a way that the Government of the country, on making proper compensation to the individuals, might resume the grant at any time they may see fit. I do not want to interfere with any legitimate attempt to develop natural resources, but neither should we forget that all these things are, after all, the property, not of individuals, but the property of the whole community. We have been very lax in times past about granting powers of this kind, and I think that the Government ought, in all these cases, insert a carefully prepared clause by which we should retain to ourselves the right, if we see proper, to resume the control of all these great natural powers. The matter, so far as I know, has not been discussed in any of our committees, and I do not know that it has been discussed in Parliament, but I should like to hear the opinion of the leader of the House, the Minister of Justice, and, perhaps, of the Minister of Railways, on that point.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember aright, these powers are not natural, but artificial. The Welland stream runs in above Niagara Falls, and it is proposed to deepen this river in order that the flow of water which goes over the falls, may follow this stream. One corporation has a charter to the south of the Welland Canal. They intend to dig a channel from the Welland to where the water falls from a precipice in the neighbourhood of St. Catharines, and utilize it there. The other is to the north of the Welland Canal, and they intend to deepen the water there, up to the source of the river, and tap it in that way. They intend to divert and utilize water that would naturally flow over the Niagara Falls. It is a purely private enterprise. Besides that, where it is in the interests of the country, the Government has power to expropriate,

the same as in other leases of power. But the reassuming of these things costs more than the powers are of real benefit, because we have to pay for them back again, a value, which is greatly in excess of the value of the water power. Any Government will find that when they come to reassume those powers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not quite sure that that would be found to be the case in dealing with this, which is practically a power of the Niagara River. In my judgment, the waterways of the country are, in the strictest sense, the property of the whole people of Canada, and belong to us all: and while I do not desire to throw obstacles in the way of any enterprising parties who are likely to use these powers for their own advantage and the general advantage, incidentally, still, I think it should be distinctly understood that the granting of any such leases is not to confer any special vested rights, at any rate. As for the resumption of these, I grant that in many cases, it would be a very idle thing for the Government to resume them. I think we ought to have it clearly understood that in giving powers of these descriptions to private parties, they take them with the most distinct understanding that the community at large, acting through Parliament, are, at any time, at liberty to resume the rights. The companies pay nothing for these rights.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think it would be disputed that, notwithstanding this Bill should pass, Parliament could again legislate to obtain the property back. Of course, the question of compensation always comes in. It appears to me that if we are too careful, there is a danger that we might restrict very laudable enterprises in this country. That is to say, if we put in such clauses as would make the compensation slight or entirely inadequate in reference to the expenditure and interests that may grow up under these charters, it probably would defeat the enterprise. I think we will have to rest content with our inherent powers, should it appear to be for the public good that we should take this property, always, of course, giving compensation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Our constitutional right to pass such a Bill as this was questioned last session. Will the Minister express an opinion as to that?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I feel very safe in standing behind the opinion of the late Minister of Justice on this question. He and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) differed materially as to whether, in the case of these works being wholly situated within a province, we were within our powers in legislating. The late Minister of Justice took very strong ground, and outside of the merits altogether, he urged with much force, the fact that we had dealt on the assumption for so long, and that the jurisdiction had not been challenged in the courts, that he considered it inexpedient to suddenly depart from the practice that had obtained in this Parliament. That is to say, in connection with the clause of the British North America Act, whereby we obtain the power through the declaration that these works, so authorized by Acts are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. The views of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) were strongly expressed against this opinion. There was considerable discussion, and if I recollect aright, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) urged that this clause did not apply to the case of a work wholly situated in one province. Sir John Thompson, on the contrary, urged that that was the only case in which the clause was an advantage, because, if the work happened to be between two provinces, only the Dominion Parliament could deal with it, and the clause would not be required at all. I would not venture to say that the question was one beyond dispute. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) may ultimately be found to be right in his view, but the strong ground upon which legislation of this character stands is, that it has remained unquestioned.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is a Bill for a local work and undertaking, so far as the corporation itself is concerned.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is just such a Bill as that of last session.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I take the position that if the corporation is local in its nature, it ought to receive an Act of incorporation from the provincial Parliament. If it requires any franchise beyond that it may, like any other person, come here.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is very inconvenient, at least.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A foreign corporation may come here and ask for certain franchises, and the argument of inconvenience cannot increase our jurisdiction. Another thing which has been decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and in that they have simply followed a well-recognized rule, is that if we have not jurisdiction given to us by the law, no lapse of time can make that intra vires which was at the beginning ultra vires. Section 92 of the British North America Act says: "In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated," and amongst the enumerations is No. 10: "Local works and undertakings, other than those mentioned in the following classes." Now, this is a local work which it seems to me does not come within the classes that follow. The point upon which I differed from the views expressed by the Minister of Justice last year

was this, that the declaration standing alone does not create jurisdiction. For instance, we could not, by declaring that the street railway in the city of Ottawa is for the general advantage of Canada, transfer the jurisdiction over that incorporation from a provincial legislature to the Dominion Parliament. There is something more than that required; and when you look at the provisions a, b, and c, under subsection 10, which mention the subjects which are excepted from local jurisdiction, you will see what must be the attributes or characteristics of those local works to give us jurisdiction over them:

(a) Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs and other works and undertakings connecting the province with any other or others of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the province;

(b) Lines of steamships between the province and any British or foreign country;

(c) Such work as, although wholly situate within the province, are before or after their execution, declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada, or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces.

Look at the two previous subsections, and you will see what the attributes of such works must be. A work may be situated wholly within a province, but it ought to have this attribute that when it is completed it connects Canada with some foreign country or one province with another.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We would clearly have the jurisdiction without the declaration.

Mr. HAGGART. Could a provincial legislature grant a charter to a company that takes part of the water from an international river, a river dividing this province or the Dominion from the United States, diverting it from its course, and passing under the Welland Canal before it could be used?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see anything in the world to hinder it. If the hon. gentleman saw that the work was destroying a Dominion work, they might disallow the Act. They might protect a Dominion work in that way; it would be a legitimate use of the power of disallowance. But suppose that a railway in Quebec is incorporated by the legislature of Quebec, and another railway in Ontario is incorporated by the legislature of Ontario, and there is to be constructed a link connecting these two railways. This Parliament might declare that to be for the general advantage of Canada, because, when constructed, it takes upon itself a Dominion attribute or characteristic. It seems to me that, in interpreting the constitution, you are to look at the philosophy of the instrument itself. You are to treat it is an instrument of state, and to apply to it those broad rules of construction which are applicable in such cases; and a rule that might be perfectly appropriate in the interpretation of a private contract would not be applicable to the interpretation of an instrument of this sort. I think this is a local undertaking. By dredging the rivers here mentioned and making them navigable, it may to that extent become a Dominion undertaking; but the very title of the incorporation, the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, shows it to possess provincial and not Dominion attributes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They are made Dominion by the last clause.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where would you stop? Would you claim power to make everything Dominion?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman claims that the declaration confers the power. I say that that declaration is only applicable when the Dominion characteristics are possessed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This Parliament has the discretion to declare them.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like as a matter of curiosity to ask the Minister of Justice how far he thinks that power should extend?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I say as far as our discretion will carry it. Who is to limit it? The declaration has to be made that a certain work is for the general advantage of Canada. Opinions may differ upon the question as to what is for the general advantage of Canada. This Parliament can stultify itself in that declaration, as well as in others. We have a right to make a declaration of that kind in regard to this work if we deem it to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The rule, ejusdem generis, does not apply to the interpretation of that clause. You are to read subsection "c" as wholly distinct and separate from those which precede it.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of Finance—First-class clerks, four at $1,800; one at $1,600; one, S. J. Jenkins, at $1,400, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $10,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why are we constantly presented with this clause "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act." Who is Jenkins,

and what are his special qualifications that he should be appointed contrary to the Civil Service Act ? I want full details with pedigree.

Mr. FOSTER. The pedigree, I am sorry, I cannot give, not being an authority on matters of genealogy, and not having any particular interest in looking up the genealogy of this particular person.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will you swear he is not a cousin ?

Mr. FOSTER. I may not swear under the law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will you declare to the circumstances ?

Mr. FOSTER. He is my private secretary, a graduate of the University of New Brunswick, and he practised as a lawyer in St. John before he came with me in 1885 to Ottawa as my private secretary. He has been in the service ever since, having been transferred to the Finance Department from the Marine and Fisheries Department, when I took hold of the Finance Department. He has been at the head of his class, and the proposition is to promote him to the first class, and he is not related to me in any way. I ask the committee to promote him, because I have to employ other secretarial assistance in the way of shorthand writing, and so a part of the salary, as private secretary, of Mr. K. Jenkins goes in that way. I thought it only fair that he should be promoted and made a first-class clerk, inasmuch as he loses a part of the salary which he has enjoyed the last two years, even though he is made a first-class clerk.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long has he been second-class clerk ?

Mr. FOSTER. Ever since he became my private secretary in October, 1885.

Mr. McMULLEN. What increases have been made of clerks in the Finance Department in the last three years ?

Mr. FOSTER. None ; there has been a decrease.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there has been an increase in all the departments at Ottawa, within the last three years, of 165 clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman has noticed carefully, he has noticed that there has been a decrease in the Finance Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I give the hon. gentleman my authority. There was a commission appointed in 1891 to investigate into and report upon the condition of the Civil Service. According to that report, there was then in the inside service at Ottawa 733 clerks. If my hon. friend will take up the report of the Civil Service and count the names that contribute to the superannuation fund, he will find that there are now 889. I would like to know in what departments this increase of 165 has taken place ?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must recollect that we are discussing the Finance Department. He put a question with reference to that department, and I answered it. It is only fair that we should take each department by itself, and it is only fair that we should take this department by itself, and not discuss the whole Civil Service on an item of the Finance Department. The hon. gentleman knows that it is not in order to do that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this is an opportune moment to call the attention of the committee to the increases that have taken place, and I cannot——

Mr. FOSTER. But they did not take place in the Finance Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot see that there is any reason for these increases taking place, for there is no increase in the business done to justify an increase of 165 clerks in the inside service in three years. I have given my authority, and I challenge the Finance Minister to prove that my statement is not correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Who said it was not correct ?

Mr. McMULLEN. At first you were disposed to say——

Mr. FOSTER. At first I was disposed to say no such thing. The hon. gentleman asked some questions with regard to the Finance Department, and I gave the information. What is the use of putting up a man of straw and knocking him down again ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not doing so. The Finance Minister only the other day pleaded hard times as the reason for not allowing the expenditures that were considered necessary in the Auditor General's office. He went on to show that there had been more increases in the Auditor General's office than in any other department and sought to prove that the Government had been economical in the administration of public affairs. And yet he cannot deny that 165 clerks have been added to the inside service in three years.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. But we are on the Finance Department now.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am going to discuss that ; I have not reached that part of the question yet. The Minister has not explained why he has placed Mr. Jenkins in the position he has. Whenever some favourite seeks a lucrative office, the Civil Service Act is suspended so far as he is concerned, and every year we see more votes passed "notwithstanding any provision in the Civil Service Act to the contrary." We might

about as well suspend the Civil Service Act at once.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) Do I understand that this gentleman is the Finance Minister's private secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) Is he a short-hand writer ?

Mr. FOSTER. He is not a good short-hand writer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) The $1,400 he receives is in addition to the $600 he receives as private secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. It is rather hard that I should be expected to explain this three times to as many different gentleman. But let me explain it for the third time. Mr. Jenkins is my private secretary; he has been with me ever since I became a Minister in 1885. He is at the maximum of his class. He is a very worthy man and an excellent secretary, but I am obliged to get some secretarial work done otherwise than by him—work involving quick short-hand writing—and therefore I have to deduct $200 from the allowance for private secretary. In view of that, I have asked the committee to allow me to promote Mr. Jenkins to a first-class clerkship. He will then get less salary than he has received for the last two or three years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) Well, Mr. Chairman, I object to Mr. Jenkins or any other person being exempted from the provisions of the Civil Service Act and dealt with in this way. I do so because I know that there are persons in the Civil Service who have not received fair treatment at the hands of the Government. The hon. Minister gave as a reason for dealing in what seemed to me a niggardly way—I use the expression not offensively—with the Auditor General, that times were hard, and said the circumstances are such that he was obliged to cut off $500 asked for extra clerks. And yet the hon. gentleman finds it possible to promote Mr. Jenkins, and to give him a larger salary than he is now receiving. The hon. gentleman admits that Mr. Jenkins is not a short-hand writer. He now receives, if he is paid the whole vote, $2,000. The Minister says that he is incapable of doing that work, so the hon. Minister is obliged to take a portion of the vote from him, but he does not propose that Mr. Jenkins shall be in a worse position than if he were competent, and so he proposes to give him a higher rank, in order that he may still receive the amount he is nominally charged with here—$2,000. So long as a large number of gentlemen, faithful in the discharge of their duties, sober, upright, competent, men who have been in the department for nearly twenty years, receive no promotion, I am not prepared to support this proposition of the hon. Minister.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I listened to the hon. gentleman's explanation, but I did not understand what obstacle the Civil Service Act presents which is to be overcome by this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Otherwise the promotion examination would have to be passed. My private secretary came in without passing the entrance examination, being eligible as a graduate of the university. He has been doing work for ten years, and, so far as concerns the step from second to first class, I should think that formality was not a matter of great importance. It is not that that he is unable to pass the examination.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman wants to promote his private secretary without obliging him to pass the examination which the Civil Service Act says shall be passed in such cases. This is a very serious step, and one that ought not to be taken except under extraordinary circumstances. I do not know Mr. Jenkins, I am not aware that I ever saw him. But if he is competent, as the hon. gentleman says, why does not he go up like a man and pass his examination ? There surely could not be any difficulty about it. If he is not able to pass his examination, we should be doing a great wrong to others in the service, to his competitors or rivals, by foisting him into a position he is incompetent to fill.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not just to the other members of the Civil Service to make a man in Mr. Jenkins' position a first-class clerk by resolution of this Parliament, so that he may draw first-class salary, although the Minister himself admits that he has not the qualifications necessary to make a private secretary. He is not a short-hand writer, and yet, notwithstanding his incapacity, the Minister asks that we make him a first-class clerk in order that he may draw $1,400, so as to make up to him the $200 which has to be taken from his allowance as private secretary and given to another person who does the short-hand work he is incapable of doing. But the secret of the whole thing is that Mr. Jenkins, I suppose, is related to the Finance Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Call him Jenkins, don't say Jinkins.

Mr. McMULLEN. He may be Jenkins or Jinkins, but he is not entitled to the position that the Finance Minister wants to give him. If he has got the education that enables him to go before the Civil Service Board, let him pass an examination, and begin and creep up to the first position like other clerks. But where is the necessity of making a special case for him, carrying him over the heads of other clerks and giving him a first position ? There must be some reason for it. Is he a good hand at keeping the scrap book for the Minister of Finance ?

Mr. FOSTER. He never puts any of your speeches in it.

Mr. McMULLEN. He must have some peculiar qualification for which the Minister wants to keep him. Perhaps he gets up some of the speeches that the Finance Minister delivers in the House. He may be a very desirable assistant in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps he may be.

Mr. McMULLEN. And the Minister wants the country to pay for it.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be; I did not think of that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Now, I contend that the Finance Minister has no right to expect the House to sanction a violation of the Civil Service Act in this way, nor to give to a favourite like Mr. Jenkins an additional salary, putting him in the position of a first-class clerk, and then give him the larger share of an allowance for a private secretary, $400, in addition to that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand this Mr. Jenkins is a graduate of a university, and still he has to go up for an examination. If he is qualified to pass a university, I think, from what I have seen of the examinations, that he should be able to pass the Civil Service examinations. What branch of the genealogical tree does he belong to? I presume the Minister of Finance could tell us that.

Mr. FOSTER. I could not tell.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We are not going to press him, if he don't want to tell, because he said he did not like to go up that tree himself. If it is a family matter, I do not want to press him any more. There was a time in this country when it was ruled by a family compact. I suppose this Government would like to bring that time back again. Now if there is to be an exception made in Mr. Jenkins's case—he may be a very excellent officer for aught I know—I do not see why others who have prior claims in the department, should be passed over. It is apt to destroy the morals of the department. If a university graduate is free for admission into the service without passing an examination, let the Minister say so, and let him defend it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe here that there is no less than twelve second-class clerks at the maximum of their class, apparently. How long have these twelve gentlemen been at the maximum of their class?

Mr. FOSTER. Some of them have been there for a long while, I cannot say how long.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, this is a point that deserves consideration. My remembrance of these gentlemen is that a great many of them have been in the service for a long time. I think some of them as long as twenty years, perhaps longer. A considerable number of them, I think, have been at the maximum of their class for, I should suppose, seven or eight years.

Mr. FOSTER. Some of them have, certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under such circumstances, there is no doubt that the promotion of one gentleman who has not been in the service perhaps a third of the time that they have been, and leaving them as second-class clerks, can hardly fail to create a good deal of heartburning, unless they are superior to the ordinary frailties of human nature.

Mr. FOSTER. I think they are, in that department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does appear to me that in that respect, at any rate, waiving all other questions, it is a hard thing for men who have been serving as these men have been, some of them for a quarter of a century, to see a man who has only been in the service ten years at the outside, made a first-class clerk over their heads. It must of necessity prevent, or interfere materially with, their promotion. There is only a limited number of first-class clerks in the department, and when this promotion has been made, there is no doubt that these men are put back, perhaps, for one or two years, perhaps for a longer term, before a first-class clerkship becomes vacant.

Customs Department..... $39,037 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is one of the results of adopting a bad precedent. Here are five or six persons, apparently, intended to be promoted or paid sums of money contrary to the Civil Service Act, and the Minister of Finance cannot very well interfere with it, because he has already set the example. It does appear to me that, unless there are very strong reasons to the contrary, this is a vote which should not receive the consent of the committee. If you are going to make this wholesale sweep, and to promote these men in a single department without any regard to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, it does appear to me that there is little use in keeping that Act on the statute-book.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the Civil Service Act is going to be overridden in the way we have seen in one department, I do not see much use in insisting upon its application in another department. We have passed a Civil Service Act, which, presumably, is for the purpose of protecting the rights of civil servants, and giving them fair-play, so that favouritism, political or otherwise, shall not enter into the promotion or advancement of these gentlemen, but that in so far as possible they shall be promoted on their merits.

Now, if this law is to be overridden at the caprice of every Minister for the time being, it will be a very serious thing. There may be, of course, grounds for the application of the Minister. Now, take the first name, R. R. Farrow. I understand that charges of some kind have been brought against that gentleman by one of his fellow-clerks, and I understand an investigation was held into those charges. I do not know what the result of it was, but rumours in the corridors of the House tell us that the investigation resulted in the man who laid the charge being punished, instead of the man against whom the charge was laid. I would like to know from the Controller of Customs what the charge was, who made the investigation, what the report was, and whether the hon. gentleman will lay that report before this committee ?

Mr. WALLACE. The charges against Mr. Farrow are :

(a). That he improperly retained $3.30 of public money, as follows :—He received a registered letter from Sydney, N.S., on the 15th day of December, 1891, containing this remittance. He used this money, and not until the 22nd March, 1892, did he pay it to the consolidated fund. That he did not do this until warned by Mr. Dunlevie that Mr. A. C. Bleakney intended reporting him.

(b). That on the 14th October, 1893, Mr. Bristol handed him $1 to deposit to the credit of the Receiver General, but there is no further trace of this in Customs books.

(c). That large sums of money have been charged to the various ports which were paid through the contingent fund for the postage stamps taken for Customs duties on small parcels. That these stamps are retained by Mr. Farrow, instead of being sent to the Post Office Department for redemption and proceeds deposited to credit of Receiver General.

(d). And also any charges that may be preferred in connection with defalcations of T. J. Watters.

The charges were investigated. Under the provisions of chapter 115 of the Revised Statutes, the Controller of Customs recommended that three commissioners, consisting of J. M. Courtney, Deputy Minister of Finance, W. G. Parmelee, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, and F. E. Kilvert, Acting Commissioner of Customs, should be appointed to investigate and report on the conduct of Mr. Farrow in relation to such charges. That recommendation was adopted by Council ; the investigation was held, and Mr. Farrow completely exonerated in connection with each charge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He was absolutely exonerated ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes. In further reply to the hon. member for Queen's, I may say that the duties of chief accountant in the Customs Department are very important. The chief accountant should be chief clerk, but we are only proposing to make him a first-class clerk. Mr. Farrow's salary was $1,250, and it would be increased by the regular increment to $1,300 were he to remain in his present position. He is acting chief accountant, and it is proposed to make him a first-class clerk, with the minimum salary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the obstacle in the Civil Service Act, which the hon. gentleman is trying to overcome by this vote ?

Mr. WALLACE. To make him a first-class clerk before he has reached the maximum salary of a second-class clerk.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why is that recommended ?

Mr. WALLACE. Because a first-class clerk is required as accountant. The law requires it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How long has he been in the service ?

Mr. WALLACE. He has been in the permanent service eleven years, but several years previous to that he was employed as a temporary clerk.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many clerks has the Controller in his own office ?

Mr. WALLACE. I have no clerks at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I mean in the next room to yours : how many clerks are there in your immediate attendance ?

Mr. WALLACE. We have three back in the room. If we had space elsewhere, I would only have my private secretary there.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many were there when the Controller came in the position he now occupies ?

Mr. WALLACE. There were none. The Minister of Customs, Mr. Chapleau, had his private secretary, but I presume he went out with him.

Mr. McMULLEN. The former Minister had his private secretary ; now the Controller has three clerks. Is that the case ?

Mr. WALLACE. No, not at all. I said there are two additional clerks there because there is no room for them elsewhere.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where were they before ; was there sufficient space before ?

Mr. WALLACE. A rearrangement of all the rooms has taken place. The commissioner had a room, and a room behind that for his private secretary. There was a readjustment a year or so ago, by which an additional room was taken by the commissioner and his secretary, which took away one room.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suppose this is one of the departments that is responsible for the 165 additional clerks appointed during the last three years. No wonder the rooms are crowded, and the Controller has had to

take some clerks into his own room where there would usually be only his private secretary.

Mr. WALLACE. There are no clerks who are not required, and they work most constantly up to ten o'clock at night, or even 12. They go there to work because the work has to be done. There is scarcely a night out of six months when they are not working till ten o'clock.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many increases have there been during recent years ?

Mr. WALLACE. Some of the increases asked have been for clerks who were previously temporary clerks. We have put them on the list of permanent clerks at what are really smaller salaries than they were previously receiving, so that there is a decrease instead of an increase.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has Mr. Kilvert been appointed commissioner ?

Mr. WALLACE. No ; he is acting commissioner.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is he commissioner, or who is to fill the position ?

Mr. WALLACE. That is not decided.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has not given any very substantial reason for dispensing with the ordinary formalities of the Civil Service Act in Mr. Farrow's case. It is quite clear this gentleman has been promoted over the heads of four or five other officers, several years before the proper time. In order to do an act of that kind, there should be some extremely good and cogent reason shown. This should not be done except for very good and sufficient reasons, unless the Controller is prepared to say that none of the other officers are able to discharge the same duties, which I did not hear the hon. gentleman state. But, apart from Mr. Farrow, there are five other cases named, in which the Civil Service Act has been utterly and wholly set at defiance. Here are six men who are to be promoted, the Civil Service Act to the contrary, notwithstanding. The hon. gentleman did not give the House one scintilla of information in regard to any of these men except Mr. Farrow, and he was prepared to let the item go through without any further explanation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he applied to Council for the appointment of commissioners to investigate the charges made. To whom did the commissioners report ?

Mr. WALLACE. The Governor General in Council.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then there was an Order in Council passed on that report I presume.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the matter was grave enough for the Council to appoint a commission to inquire into it, that commission must have reported back to Council and the Council must have acted upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. The representative in Council of the Customs Department is the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the report was sent to him. Unfortunately the Minister of Trade and Commerce is ill at Sherbrooke, and the Council has not yet acted upon the report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If this report is so palpably plain, there can be no doubt that it will be acted upon at once. I am willing to assume for the moment that Mr. Farrow is absolutely innocent, but the charge is there and not yet disposed of, and it is a most extraordinary thing to ask that this committee shall give him promotion contrary to the Civil Service Act until the Government determine that they will adopt the report exonerating him.

Mr. FOSTER. The report of the commission has not been acted upon formally, and I think it would be perhaps well that the item should stand until the matter has been disposed of by Council. We can go on with the other items.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Very well, let the matter about Farrow stand.

Mr. WALLACE. With reference to Mr. Breadner : we have not created a new department but we have enlarged the checking branch so as to have a complete check upon all the invoices and entries made at every port in Canada, and have uniformity in the rates of duty imposed at all the ports, and values made by competent and experienced men. We have promoted Mr. Breadner who is a very industrious and competent man as head of that branch. He was a third-class clerk and we ask that he be made a second-class clerk at the minimum salary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What length of service has Mr. Breadner had ?

Mr. WALLACE. He was appointed on the 30th September, 1884, but was in the service in the Eastern townships for about a year before that as acting collector. He was in the Post Office for a number of years before he came into the Customs Department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did he take his examinations ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, on his appointment. As to Mr. Watson, Mr. Rorke and Mr. Lafontaine. Mr. Watson and Mr. Lafontaine are appointed to this new checking branch which requires very competent and careful men. Then with regard to Mr. Bayles, he was voted this amount last year but in consequence of the words "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service

Act" being omitted, the Auditor General would not pay it. This is simply a revote. He is a messenger and this gives him the maximum.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would seem from all this, that hon. gentlemen opposite think the Civil Service Act is a very bad thing. It stands in the way of the Government and so they ask us to adopt a rule which may exist in a country that has no law but the will of the supreme authority. They say : The Act is an impediment in our way, we wish to make certain appointments, and in order to make these appointments we seek to get the sanction of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. We could not do it otherwise.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think it ought to be done at all. You should either repeal the law or make the promotions according to law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What earthly object can there be in the public interest for departing from the law in the case of a messenger who would receive his annual increase of $40 ?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Bayles was appointed in 1890, and had he got his annual increase he would have received the maximum by this time. That is all that is asked for.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) What stood in the way of him not getting his annual increase ?

Mr. WALLACE. The Auditor General would not pay because the words " notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary," were omitted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If he was entitled to it under the law that would not prevent him.

Mr. WALLACE. He is a competent and capable man and if he got his annual increase his salary would now be $500.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why did he not get it ; was he suspended ?

Mr. WALLACE. No. His conduct has been excellent as far as I know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has not explained why he did not get this annual increase. He tells us that he has been five years in the service, that he was appointed at $350 a year, and that he is entitled to an annual increase of $30, which would entitle him to receive now $500 a year ; yet he says he cannot get it without this special clause. I cannot for the life of me see where the necessity for violating the Civil Service Act comes in here, if the statement made by the Controller be correct.

Mr. WALLACE. Last year and the year before Parliament voted the increase, but the Auditor General refused to pay the money, because these words were omitted ; and now the time has arrived when by the natural increase of $30 a year he would have the right to the maximum salary of his class, $500 a year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the hon. gentleman has not told us why he proposed to give this man a greater increase than he was entitled to two years ago. This man appears to be a special favourite of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. No ; the proposition was made before I came in.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see that the absence of these words would prevent him receiving the increase the law allows, the $30 a year.

Mr. WALLACE. We did not put that amount in the Estimates.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You put a larger amount.

Mr. WALLACE. We put a larger amount, which the Auditor General refused to pay on that ground.

Mr. FOSTER. It is just the arrears that are being asked for now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why did the hon. gentleman recommend that this special messenger should be singled out and paid this allowance, contrary to the provisions of the Act ?

Mr. WALLACE. It was in the Estimates which were submitted to this House. He is a very good and efficient messenger.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are plenty of other good and efficient messengers in the service.

Mr. WALLACE. There are two other messengers and they receive the maximum. One has been thirty-eight years in the service, and the other has been in since 1891.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. gentleman tell me why he does not, as a matter of simple justice, propose that every good and efficient messenger shall receive an increase equivalent to what he gives to Mr. Bayles ?

Mr. WALLACE. The first recommendation was made before I came in ; the next year I made the recommendation again ; but the Auditor General on both occasions refused to pay the money.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has been asked several times on what ground he makes this recommendation. He said a moment ago because this man was a good and efficient messenger ; but that applies to many in the service. What we want to know is why this messenger was singled out ?

Mr. WALLACE. I suppose it would be difficult for him to live on $350 a year. He remains in the office till the mail goes out

at ten o'clock every night, and works long hours, and I think he is entitled to consideration.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman's statement, if it has any value at all, is an attack upon the sum fixed by the law at which these messengers come in. He says $350 is not enough. Why does he not propose a change, and make it more ? The hon. gentleman says this man is a good officer. That may be ; he ought to dismiss him if he is not. Why does the hon. gentleman single him out to receive more than he proposes as a general sum to everybody in the same class for the same length of service ?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose explanations have been given of all this, and as the item is to stand, we might as well proceed to the next item.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is just one question which I wish to ask with reference to this man Bleakney. It was stated that he made a charge against Farrow, and that the charge was not sustained. Has any action been taken with respect to Bleakney? Has he been suspended, and is he now under suspension ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

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

Mr. WALLACE. A week ago or less.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What was he suspended for ?

Mr. WALLACE. The principal thing was disobedience of orders that I gave him.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Had it anything to do with the charge he made against Farrow?

Mr. WALLACE. That was one of the reasons, but the principal reason was disobedience of orders I gave him as to the performance of his duty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There were two reasons, then. One was being mixed up in the Farrow charge. Does the hon. gentleman say that he acted in that matter before Council had reported upon it ?

Mr. WALLACE. The reason, as I said before, was disobedience of my orders.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What were the particular orders ?

Mr. WALLACE. I suppose that will come up at the regular time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not wish to know what particular orders he disobeyed. I think it is sufficient for a head of a department to say : An officer disobeyed my order, and I suspended him. That was one of the reasons the hon. gentleman gave. In addition, this man made a charge of malfeasance of office against Farrow, and that has been inquired into and now stands for judgment.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not quite correct, that he made a charge. There are other matters indirectly involved in that matter which, I think, it would be better to leave for discussion when they come up in the regular way.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole item stands over until Council has dealt with that matter, and the report is brought before the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All I hope that is that the whole matter is not as mixed up as the Controller's explanation of it.

Inland Revenue Department—Chief clerk, accountant, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..	$2,000
Allowance for private secretary to Controller, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.....	600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. More contradictions to the Civil Service Act.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I wish to explain with regard to the first item. Mr. Campeau the assistant accountant, has been performing the duties of accountant of the department since 1894, and discharging them satisfactorily. Mr. Robbin died in July, 1894, and since that time Mr. Campeau has been doing the work. It was thought that he was entitled to an additional $200, when the appointment of accountant would be made in the person of Mr. Campeau, but the postponement of the promotion examination prevented that being carried out, and it was recommended that he should receive $200 in addition to his salary when the appointment would take place. A few days ago, I drew the attention of the Minister of Finance to the danger that the words " notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary," would enable Mr. Campeau to receive this $200 without passing the promotion examination, which I did not intend, and which, I am quite sure, Mr. Campeau did not intend. There was nothing left but to ask the committee to reduce that vote by $200 and make it $1,800, and I asked that this be done. I may also explain with regard to the words " notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act," added to the item for an allowance of $600 to my private secretary, that when I first examined the Estimates, on taking charge of the Department of Inland Revenue, I was informed that the Act only made allowances for Ministers, and that the Auditor General raised the point that the Controller, not being a Minister, but a member of the Government by statute, was not entitled to have this allowance voted for his private secretary. I thought the point was well taken, and not wishing to argue the point, I added these words. They are not overriding anything in the Civil Service Act

at all. I moved that the item "chief clerk accountant," be reduced to $1,800.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Post Office Department.....$203,205

Mr. FOSTER. There is nothing but the statutory increases and some reductions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that there are some nine clerks less and should like to know the reason.

Mr. FOSTER. These are old clerks, some of them over seventy years of age, whom it is proposed to superannuate, and their places will not be filled.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many have been superannuated ?

Mr. FOSTER. Ten.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the total amount of superannuation allowance granted to the ten ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see that calculation made. Their names are as follows : The accountant Mr. Smithson, age 61, salary $2,600. To him succeeds Mr. Barrett whose salary is at present, $1,800. Mr. Brophy, seventy years of age ; Mr. Benjamin, sixty-three years of age ; Mr. Shaw, seventy-five years of age, Mr. Dunlevie, fifty-seven ; Mr. McDonald, sixty-four ; Mr. Burrell and Mr. Fortier, aged seventy-six. Also a third-class clerk, forty-one years of age who was superannuated on account of ill health. His health was such that he could not do any work in the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are several of these persons besides the last-named who are very little above the earliest age at which superannuation can take place, and one below it. So far as I can make out, the total amount of superannuation will be heavy. I imagine the superannuation allowances of these ten gentlemen would be about $10,000 or $12,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Not so much as that. It is to be remembered that the places of most of these gentlemen are not to be filled. The aggregate saving will be about $6,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That report has not come down yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The superannuation report ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The report relating to the dismissed postmaster.

Mr. LAURIER. That will come down on Monday—or later.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think you can take that up on such an item as this ; I do not think it is germane.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know ; it may prove to be quite germane to some of these votes.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville).

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes ; the connection would be very clear. It is very possible some of these officials may be mixed up in this matter. I do not see that we are going to save much by this superannuation. As to those of seventy years, or over, there is not much to be said, perhaps. There is a point here which I think has been the same for a number of years, upon which I would like a word of explanation. The superintendent of the dead letter branch is a chief clerk, apparently in the same position as others who are heads of what seem to be more important branches.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the same plan was followed in dividing these classes as was followed in the department at Washington and the department at London.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would not like the Minister to get away from this item with an erroneous impression. He seems to think it would not be well to stay proceedings because a certain report was not brought down. The hon. gentleman knows that the redress of grievances must precede the granting of supplies, and he will remember that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) complains of a very serious grievance, and moved for certain papers relating to this department, which motion was adopted by the House, but these papers are not before us. So the hon. Minister will see that he is proceeding contrary to the rules.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. gentleman has put himself out of court. The redress of grievance is to precede the granting of supplies, and he has allowed us to get into Supply. So the hon. gentleman is about four or five hours too late.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the redress of grievances precedes the granting of supplies, not going into Committee of Supply. If the hon. Minister thinks he has the supply, he might ask the committee to rise.

Mr. FOSTER. But grievances are to be ventilated on going into supply. Surely my hon. friend would not try to ventilate all grievances on one item of supply. The hon. gentleman is clearly out of court.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No ; it is the hon. Minister. The rule is that letters and papers must be in hand before the supplies are granted. The granting has not taken place.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman may as well understand that when we come to contingencies of this department, we expect that report to be brought down——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Or no contingencies.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is a contingency you had better not deal with.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister may as well understand this point. We have an order of the House calling for these papers, and we have the promise of the Prime Minister that the papers shall be brought down, and the day fixed, and if the report is not down, the Opposition must assert their rights.

Department of Agriculture..... $5,540

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is a decrease in the general item, as hon. gentlemen will notice. Increases that are shown in some of the individual items, which are statutory, with the exception of the cases of two clerks whose names are mentioned, and for whom the vote is asked, "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act." Both of these clerks have been employed some years and their salaries taken from contingencies, and this vote is to transfer them to regular appointments. As to the case of M. Leyden, this clerk is in the copyright, trade-mark, industrial design, and timber-mark branch, and is an expert in that branch, especially in the copyright work; and in consequence of that expert knowledge and extended experience in that work, the department are asking for the privilege of employing her on the regular staff. T. B. Bassett is an expert in the patent branch, and has been employed for some time. This vote is to transfer him from contingencies to the regular salary list. He has been about ten years in the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does he get an increase in salary?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; this is a reduction, I think.

Department of Marine and Fisheries..... $58,305

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman explain this increase of $4,000 or $5,000 in his department.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The increase is not quite what the hon. gentleman states; it is less than $3,400. If the hon. gentleman will take into consideration the fact that I have provided a salary for commissioner of fisheries, $2,000, and taken it from the outside vote, in which it appeared before, he will see that a great proportion of the apparent increase is accounted for. The reorganization of the department involved changes that should be explained. The first change was the retirement of Mr. Bauset, chief clerk, and the promotion to the position, of Mr. Venning. The next change was the promotion of Mr. J. S. Webster to the position vacated by the promotion of Mr. Venning; and Mr. James A. Murray was promoted from the third-class.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) Is this Mr. Webster the man who was brought down from the North-west and employed as a canvassing agent?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; that is not the Mr. Webster the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is this M. C. Doyle, a third-class clerk at $900? Why is he mentioned specially?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is a young lady, Miss Doyle.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why is she specially mentioned in the vote?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Miss Doyle has been in the department for quite a number of years. She is getting $600, and was getting $300 additional as private secretary during the time of my predecessor. I knew the ability of the young lady when I acted at one time for my predecessor; and I was very glad to avail myself of her services in that capacity, not only as an ordinary writer, but as one well able to write letters and to prepare documents. When the transfer was made, I took my private secretary with me, having had him for a long time. I could not, in justice to him, as an old private secretary, take away a portion of his salary and give it to Miss Doyle. Therefore, I thought that it was only fair to give her half the amount, $300, because she was doing the work she always did, and doing it in the most satisfactory manner.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You have practically two private secretaries.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There always have been two there. I think if the hon. gentleman will call in any morning, he will recognize the fact that there is plenty of work for both.

Department of Public Works..... $48,985

Mr. FOSTER. These are statutory increases, and a decrease of the difference in salary of a first-class clerk, $400, and a second-class clerk dropped, $1,400. Two second-class clerks dropped, $1,000. The net decrease is $2,007.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Any superannuations?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I think those are not superannuations; I think they are clerkships estimated for, but not filled.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In this department an investigation was commenced in the Public Accounts Committee in reference to some defalcations alleged to have been committed by a man named Hamel.

Mr. FOSTER. Not included in this.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It reached a certain stage before the Public Accounts Committee, and then it was understood the papers were

to be referred to the Minister of Justice for his opinion. I wish to know if the Minister of Justice has given that opinion, and what it is.

Mr. FOSTER. The papers have been transferred, but whether the Minister of Justice has perfected his opinion, I do not know; I scarcely think he has.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will give the hon. gentleman notice that I will expect an answer when we come to the contingencies vote for this department.

Department Railways and Canals..... $46,712 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe in this item that there is an alteration, apparently, that a gentleman who is described as law clerk seems to have been dropped. Who was the law clerk in former days?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Fissiault.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that for the future this law clerk is no longer to be attached to the Department of Railways and Canals?

Mr. HAGGART. No, I have a young man in the office who is in training for a barrister, and he does any work of this kind that is required to be done.

Geological Survey $49,742 50

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has charge of this department with reference to the superannuation of Dr. Selwyn. Dr. Selwyn was, upon the death of his predecessor in office, at the head of his branch. I understand that he has been superannuated, and that Dr. Dawson has been appointed in his place. I did not understand that Dr. Selwyn applied for superannuation, that he was complaining of failing health, or want of fitness for the further discharge of his duties. I understand that upon his retirement, if he was retired upon the number of years' service that he actually performed, there was no addition made to his period of service. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why this was so, and what rule the Government have adopted for their guidance with reference to this matter. Have they adopted the rule that upon the retirement of a public officer, no matter what may be his special fitness for his office, or the circumstances under which he retired, that the practice of adding a number of years to the period of service is no longer to be followed? Because, unless there is some specific rule adopted by the Government, where one party receives an allowance beyond that which his actual years of service entitle him, while another does not, the natural inference is that there is a reflection upon the conduct of one man, and an expression of approval of the conduct of the other as a public servant. Now, I understood last year that in the case of Mr. Vankoughnet, who was retired against his will, and while he maintained he was fit for the discharge of his duties, the Minister offered to add ten years to his services if he would tender his resignation, but because he did not tender his resignation, there was no addition made whatever. I have no doubt but what I am stating the facts with strict accuracy in this case. Was there any application made to Dr. Selwyn to send in his resignation, and was he dealt with as Mr. Vankoughnet was dealt with for a like reason?

Mr. FOSTER. Not being the Minister of the department directly interested, I cannot speak with absolute definiteness in my reply. With respect to the first question asked by the hon. member, the rule is that time is not added. There are exceptions of course to that rule as to every other rule, and the exceptions are based on two considerations. One is for eminent and distinguished services, where a man has been well qualified for his position, and he is superannuated after long service. But that would apply to very few occasions indeed. The other case in which an extension is made is, where a person may not have been so distinguished as members of the class to which I have just alluded; but whose office is abolished, and it is not intended to fill it. In some cases of that kind additions have been made to the time of service. Those are the rules upon which this matter is determined. I do not remember the circumstances with respect to Mr. Vankoughnet; and as to Mr. Selwyn, my recollection is that it was understood by the Minister that Dr. Selwyn was to be superannuated, and when leave of absence was given him it was understood by the Treasury Board and Council, that it was preparatory to his retirement, and the appointment of Dr. Dawson in his place. I have not heard anything of a condition imposed or promise held out that if he did so and so a certain course would be adopted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand that Dr. Selwyn was for a great many years in the service here.

Mr. FOSTER. I think he was close up to, if he had not filled up his time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Admitting that to be so, I am also informed that the first holidays during the whole period of his service occurred just before his retirement when two or three months were given to him. The hon. Minister will see that granting leave of absence to Dr. Selwyn after spending a quarter of a century in the service it was not unreasonable, and it would have been reasonable on the part of the Government, in view of his eminent services, an addition had been made to his time, for in my opinion Dr. Selwyn's case would properly fall within the rule. My impression of him was that he was a public officer, a very competent man and a very industrious man,

one who discharged his duties, so far as he was individually concerned, as well perhaps as any man likely to become his successor.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I call the Minister's attention to the fact that the Civil Serivce Act is again violated in the case of the geographer.

Mr. FOSTER. Increases are not given by statute to members of the technical service of the Geological Department; but it has been the practice every two years to grant them statutory increases, and this I suppose is to give a statutory increase to this geographer for this year, which would have fallen to him last year if he had been in the service.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 17th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Niagara, Hamilton and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Lowell.)

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonell, Algoma.)

Bill (No. 77) to amend the Act to incorporate the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 97) respecting the Clifton Suspension Bridge Company.—(Mr. Northrup.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 115) for the relief of Helen Woodburn Jarvis (on division) from the Senate.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Bill (No. 110) for the relief of Mary Bradshaw Falding (on division) from the Senate.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 117) respecting La Chambre de Commerce du District de Montréal.—(Mr. Lépine.)

CORDWOOD FOR QUEBEC CITADEL.

Mr. BRUNEAU (for Mr. Choquette) asked, 1. Who held, last year, and who holds, this year, the contract for cordwood for the Quebec Citadel? 2. Were the said contracts based on tenders? 3. What is the price per cord of wood?

Mr. DICKEY. From 1st July, 1893, to 1st July, 1894, the contract for cordwood for the Quebec Citadel was held by Mr. George B. Lawrence. This year—from 1st July, 1894, to 1st July, 1895, the contract is held by the same person. The contracts were based on tenders. Under the contract for 1893-94, the prices were $6 per cord for hard wood; $5 per cord for soft wood. Under the contract for 1894-95, the prices were $8.25 per cord for hardwood; $5.50 per cord for soft wood.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SIR JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. YEO (for Mr. Rider) asked, 1. Have accounts and vouchers been received covering all expenses authorized by the Government in connection with the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson? If so, what is the amount? Otherwise, what amount has been received? 2. Have any claims been presented for expenses of any kind in connection therewith which were not authorized by the Government? If so, by whom, for what amount, and how much has been allowed or paid thereon?

Mr. OUIMET. The answer to the first question is, yes; the total amount of account received was $33,779.43. The answer to the second question is, no; all the work for which accounts were presented was authorized, but the prices were not in all cases acceptable, and reductions have been made that will bring the total within the amount of the vote.

LIGHTSHIP AT ST. ROCH DES AULNETS.

Mr. BRUNEAU (for Mr. Choquette) asked, 1. Who has the contract for the cordwood required for the steam whistle on the lightship at the Lower Traverse at St. Roch des Aulnets? 2. Was the contract awarded on

tender, and if so, when were tenders called for ? 3. What are the names of parties who tendered, and the amounts of the several tenders ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. As there is no cordwood used, and the Marine and Fisheries supply vessel furnishes coal for that fog-whistle, there is no such contract, and no tenders have therefore been called for.

TENDERS FOR FREIGHT SHED, HALIFAX.

Mr. FORBES asked, 1. How many tenders, and what are the respective amounts and names of the tenderers, received by the Government for rebuilding the foundation of the freight shed at deep water terminus, Halifax ? 2. To whom has the contract been awarded, and why is the work not progressing ?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. The following is a list of tenders received for the construction of the foundation of the freignt shed at deep water terminus, Halifax ; they are tenders on schedule prices which money out the following amounts :—Theophilus Leblanc, Moncton, N.B., $7,622.90 ; Jas. W. McDonald, Halifax, N.S., $13,309.75 ; S. M. Brookfield, Halifax, N.S., $13,564.12. 2. The contract has been awarded to Theophilus B. Leblanc, Leblanc's tender has only recently been accepted, and the contract has not yet been executed.

EXPENSES OF MR. COCKBURN, M.P., COMMISSIONER AT COLUMBIA EXPOSITION.

Mr. BRUNEAU (for Mr. Choquette) asked, Whether the Government had the accounts current of Mr. Geo. R. R. Cockburn, Esq., M.P., examined ; and if so, were they found correct, and have they been paid in full, that is to say, $4,425 ?

WORLD'S COLUMBIA EXHIBITION, CHICAGO.

George R. R. Cockburn, Commissioner.

1893.	
April 28 and 29—Expenses from Toronto to Ottawa and return	$ 20 00
May 22 and 29—Expenses, Toronto to Chicago, and while there and return. Hotel bill, $30.70	79 74
May 31, June 2—Expenses, Toronto to Ottawa, thence to Montreal to meet Hon. Mr. Angers and Mr. Tassé	47 40
June 10th, Nov. 4, 148 days, including extra supplies for Canadian Pavilion, cabs, railway fares, porterage, exhibition entrances, extra dinners, sundries, &c., express charges, cigars for Pavilion, &c	957 08
	$1,104 22
Hotel bills, as per vouchers	3,320 78
Total	$4,425 00

Mr. BRUNEAU.

I hereby certify that the item of expenditure of $957.08, for which I have no vouchers, was wholly for the service of the commissioner in connection with the Pavilion during the Columbian Exposition in the particulars stated.

(Sgd.) GEORGE R. R. COCKBURN.

Ottawa, April, 1894.

G. R. Cockburn, Esq.,
To Hotel Cadillac, Dr.

Detroit, Mich., 11th September, 1893.

1½ days at $11	$16 50
Bar	2 25
Livery	3 00
Cab	2 70
Cleaning shoes	0 20
	$24 65

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

2nd November, 1893.

To Cash paid cabman	0 50
News-stand	0 10
	0 60

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

2nd November, 1893.

To Board, 4½ days	$72 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors	2 90
Laundry	3 75
Livery	0 75
	$79 40

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

28th October, 1893.

To Telegram	$1 62
Shoes blacked	0 60
C. O. D.	0 30
	$2 52

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

28th October, 1893.

To Board for 1 week	$112 09
Extra meals, wines and liquors (including $5.80 for lunches for Pavilion)	33 20
Laundry	5 91
Livery	13 00
	$164 11

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

21st October, 1893.

To Shoes blacked	$0 50
Cash paid for cab	2 00
Drugs, 50c. and 50c. ; telegram, 55c.	1 55
	4 05
Drugs	1 00
	3 05

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
21st October, 1893.

To Board from 10-14 to 10-21, 7 days at $16	$112 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors	5 80
Laundry	5 50
Livery	16 50
	$139 80

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
14th October, 1893.

To Express charges, 25c.; drugs, 40c. and 35c.	$ 1 00
Paid cabman, 50c. and 75c., 50c. and $1.50	3 25
Order for salmon, 75c.; messenger, 25c.	1 00
Theatre tickets, $9.75; shoes blacked, 50c.	10 25
Telegram, 40c.; C.O.D., Fields, $1.20	1 60
	17 10
	10 50
	$ 6 60

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
14th October, 1893.

To Board from 9-30 to 10-14, 2 weeks	$224 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors	61 10
Laundry, including borrowed table linen and washing it	18 10
Livery	25 50
News-stand account	0 23
	$228 93

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
30th September, 1893.

To Orders for chicken, &c., for Pavilion.	$ 5 75
Shoes blacked	1 00
Telegram, 86c. and 50c	1 36
C.O.D., Fields	0 75
Messenger	0 50
Cab	1 25
	$10 61

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
30th September, 1893.

To Board from 9-23 to 9-30, 1 week	$112 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors	14 50
Laundry	0 67
Livery	6 25
	$113 42

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
23rd September, 1892.

To Shoes blackened	$1 00
Express	0 25
C.O.D.	0 50
	$1 75

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
16th September, 1893.

To Cash paid C.O.D., $4.90 and 40c	$ 5 30
" advanced	5 00
" paid on shoes blackened	1 00
	$11 30
Returned	5 00
	$ 6 30

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
23rd September, 1893.

To Board from 9-16 to 9-23, 1 week	$112 00
Extra wines, meals and liquors	23 00
Laundry	6 70
Livery	11 25
	$152 95

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
9th September, 1893.

To Board from 9-2 to 9-9, 1 week, at $16.	$112 00
Extra wines, meals and liquors	17 00
Laundry	1 30
Livery	6 25
	$136 55

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
16th September, 1893.

To Board from 9-8 to 9-16, 1 week	$112 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors	14 90
Laundry	1 75
Livery	17 25
	$145 90

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
9th September, 1893.

To Shoes blackened	$ 1 00
Messenger	0 45
Cash returned	25 00
	$26 45

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
2nd September, 1893.

To Board from 8-26 to 9-27 days (2) at $16	$112 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors	5 70
Laundry	0 90
Livery	1 00
News-stand	0 60
	$120 20

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.
26th August, 1893.

Cash paid for shoe blacking	$1 20

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

26th August, 1893.

To Board from 8-10 to 8-26, 1 week at $16		$112 00
Extra wines, liquors and meals.....		15 30
Laundry		1 55
Livery		12 25
		$141 10

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

19th August, 1893.

To cash paid for blacking shoes.....	$2 80

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

19th August, 1893.

To Board from 8-5 to 8-11, 6 days at $20.		$120 00
" 8-11 to 8-19, 8 days at $16		128 00
Extra wines, meals and liquors.....		29 20
Laundry		2 60
Livery		12 50
Telegram and postage.....		0 64
		$292 94

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

5th August, 1893.

To cash paid for shoe blacking.....	$0 40
" " C.O.D., M. Field.....	0 60
	$1 00

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

5th August, 1893.

To Board from 7-29 to 8-5, 1 week.....		$140 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors.....		10 75
Laundry		2 20
Livery		14 00
		$166 95

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

29th July, 1893.

To paid porter for shoe blacking.....	$1 10

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

29th July, 1893.

To Board from 7-22 to 7-29, 1 week at $20		$140 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors.....		13 25
Laundry		2 05
Livery		10 00
		$165 30

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

22nd July, 1893.

To Porter's charges on shoes.....		$1 50
Cash paid for cabman.....		1 50
" C.O.D.		0 45
		$3 45
		0 45
		$3 00

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

22nd July, 1893.

To Board from 7-15 to 7-22, 7 days at $20		$140 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors.....		14 50
Laundry		3 75
Livery		3 50
		$161 75

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

15th July, 1893.

To Porter's charges on shoes.....	$0 90

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

15th July, 1893.

To Board from 7-8 to 7-15, 1 week at $20		$140 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors.....		33 20
Laundry		1 65
Livery		5 00
Cash to have hat pressed.....		1 25
" paid for flowers.....		3 80
" " news-stand		0 50
" " cabman		1 25
		$186 65

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

8th July, 1893.

Porter's charges on shoes.....	$0 90

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

8th July, 1893.

To Board from 7-1 to 7-8, 7 days at $20..		$140 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors.....		46 35
Laundry		2 20
Livery		3 50
Drug bill		0 75
Cash paid for cab and flowers.....		2 75
		$195 55
		0 75
		$194 80

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

1st July, 1893.

Porter's charges on shoes.....	$0 90

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

1st July, 1893.

To Board from 6-24 to 7-1, 7 days at $20.	$140 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors.....	25 30
Laundry	6 40
Livery	11 00
Messenger	0 20
	$181 90

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

24th June, 1893.

To Porter's charges on shoes.....	$3 10

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

24th June, 1893.

To Board from 6-10 to 6-24, 14 days at $20	$280 00
Extra meals, wines and liquors.....	30 20
Laundry	9 65
Livery	7 00
Drug bill	0 40
	$327 25
Less.....	0 40
	$326 85

Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, Dr.
The Virginia Hotel, Chicago.

27th May, 1893.

To Board from 5-22 to 5-27, 4½ days....	$27 00
Wines and liquors.....	1 50
Order for milk crackers.....	0 25
Shoes blackened.....	0 20
	$28 95
Luncheon	1 00
Luggage	0 75
	$30 70

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call the attention of the House to the special display which is made on the Order paper, of what purport to be accounts of the World's Columbia Exposition at Chicago, by George R. R. Cockburn, Esq., M.P., but between which and any question which is asked, I can trace not the slightest connection. If advantage is to be taken of the Order paper to display, for partisan purposes, a matter of that kind, I do not know where we shall end. I should like to call the attention of Mr. Speaker to this matter.

Mr. MULOCK. There is another question just like it lower down.

Mr. FOSTER. The same applies to the other question. The bad example here has caused others to follow, and the same remarks apply to each.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot see that this question is out of order, because it refers to a public matter. But I think it is very objectionable that these accounts should be extended upon our proceedings. However, I cannot rule the question out of order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the answer?

Mr. MONTAGUE. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that Mr. George R. R. Cockburn, M.P., was appointed Commissioner of the World's Fair by Order in Council. He was given no salary, he gave his time gratuitously; but the Dominion Government paid his living expenses. The bills were sent in and were certified to by the executive commissioner, and were properly examined by the department. There were some small items in the bills as first made out which did not properly come under the heading of living expenses, and these items were deducted from the amount of the accounts by Mr. Cockburn himself, and were paid out of his own pocket. These were only small, of course. The accounts were not adjudged exorbitant, and were paid.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand, Mr. Speaker, your ruling was that you have no power to prevent these accounts from appearing. If you have not, and if they do not come within the rules of the House, I should like to ask the leader of the Opposition just now whether he would not support the Clerk, or the Speaker, and the Government side of the House, in refusing to receive such displays as these, which are not pertinent to the questions which are asked? Certainly it is the creeping in of an abuse which may have no end, and there ought to be some method by which the good sense of the House would prevent these displays.

Mr. LAURIER. If they come within the rules at present existing, I do not see how the Speaker or the Clerk can refuse them.

EXPORT OF SELF-BINDING HARVESTERS.

Mr. HENDERSON asked, 1. How many self-binding harvesters were exported from Canada during the year 1894? 2. The names of the different firms or companies so exporting the same, and the number of such harvesters so exported by each of said firms? 3. The average amount of drawback on account of duty paid on raw material, allowed and paid by the Government on each of such harvesters? 4. The total amount of drawback paid on all self-binding harvesters exported from Canada in year 1894?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. 3,385. 2. All exported by the Massey-Harris Co., Limited. 3. $2.97,

and 9-10 of a cent on each machine. 4. Payment of drawbacks on account of the machines exported during the year ending 31st December, 1894, is yet under consideration, but the total amount would equal $10,083.91.

YAMASKA AND ST. OURS LOCKS.

Mr. BRUNEAU (for Mr. Mignault) asked, How much does the Government charge vessels passing through the Yamaska lock, and how much for vessels passing through the St. Ours lock? Is there any difference in the charge, and if so, why?

Mr. OUIMET. Vessels: Canadian steam, per ton, 1 cent each way; scow, &c., do; sail, per ton, 1 cent each way; pleasure boats, either row or sail, 15 cents each way.

EXPENSES OF CANADIAN COMMISSION AT PHILADELPHIA EXHIBITION.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) (for Mr. Taylor) asked, Were Hon. E. G. Penny, Hon. R. D. Wilmot, B. R. McDougall, Esq., and the then Hon. Minister of Agriculture, appointed commissioners in connection with the Canadian exhibit at the Centennial Exhibition, held in the city of Philadelphia, U.S., in the year 1876? Was Joseph Perrault, Esq., appointed secretary-treasurer, 14th May, 1875, at $250 per month? Were a number of other persons appointed in connection with the said exhibition? Were the following sums paid for the services of the said persons for their travelling expenses, hotel fares, and other expenses, in connection with the said exhibition:—

CANADIAN COMMISSION—LIVING EXPENSES. PHILADELPHIA.

1876.			$ cts.	$ cts.
April 1	J. Perrault	General expenses		69 50
do 1	Three servants	Wages		10 00
do 1	Plaister & McCollin	3 tons stove coal	22 50	
do 1	do	2 tons broken coal	15 00	
do 1	do	Stowage	2 50	
				40 00
do 6	W. B. Weir	1 month's house rent to 1st May, 1876		333 34
do 6	Henry Connell	Groceries, amount of bill		36 79
do 8	Three servants	Wages		17 21
do 8	Charles McBride	Provisions, amount of bill		44 66
do 15	Servants	Wages		10 00
do 15	J. Perrault	General expenses	23 00	
do 22	do	do	15 35	
				38 35
do 29	Servants	Wages		20 50
May 6	W. B. Weir	House rent to 1st June, 1876		333 34
do 13	Rozet & Kent	Rent of silver and linen	350 00	
do 13	do	Coal and wood	7 50	
				357 50
do 13	John McGaughran	Oysters, porter		3 76
do 13	Knickerbocker Ice Co	Ice		2 18
do 13	H. Connell	Groceries, amount of bill		28 09
do 13	Charles McBride	Provisions, amount of bill		121 59
do 13	John Moore	Dusters and brooms		1 39
do 13	J. Perrault	General expenses	7 56	
do 27	do	Servants' wages	40 00	
				47 56
do 27	G. N. C. Lewis	Dinner at 11, George House		50 00
do 27	J. Perrault	Contribution to dinner		3 79
do 26	T. Burnett	do	6 00	
do 24	do	do	10 00	
				16 00
do 26	C. W. Broadbent	Sprinkling pot		0 75
do 27	Washerwoman	Washing		10 00
do 27	Cook and maid	1 month		40 00
do 27	J. Perrault	Expenses	14 10	
do 27	do	do	7 04	
do 27	do	Servant-maid	10 61	
do 27	do	do	10 00	
do 27	do	Petty expenses connected with maid	0 80	
				42 55
do 27	Chas. Brintzinghoffer	Parlour feather duster		2 05
do 27	Whital, Tatum & Co	1 dozen salts		3 80
do 27	James P. Fennell	Wine basket		4 12
do 27	Whital, Tatum & Co	½ dozen ½-gallon jars	1 70	
do 27	do	1 do	5 20	
do 27	do	¼ dozen quart jars	1 25	
				8 15

CANADIAN Commission—Living expenses, Philadelphia—*Continued.*

1876.			$ cts.	$ cts.
May 28	J. Perrault	Postage and street cars	3 05	
June 5	do	Sarah Merrick, milk	7 55	
				10 60
do 1	Henry Connell	Provisions, amount of bill		39 59
May 31	W. E. Grigg	Bread		8 56
do 31	Knickerbocker Ice Co.	Ice		1 99
June 1	Charles McBride	Provisions, amount of bill		119 42
do 6	W. B. Weir	House rent to 1st July, 1876		333 34
do 10	J. Lavigne	Travelling expenses		15 25
do 10	H. R. Lewis	2 green lounges		12 00
do 5	Chapman & Co	"Graphic" newspaper		7 80
do 6	E. E. Nock	Berries		2 25
do 10	J. Perrault	Petty expenses		8 81
do 10	King & Brown	Use of glass		9 00
do 10	J. Perrault	Petty expenses	1 37	
do 17	do	Sundry expenses	6 25	
				7 62
do 17	John Gilmore & Co.	3 dozen Bass' ale	6 75	
do 17	do	½ dozen Urbanna champagne	8 00	
do 17	do	1 bottle Hennessey brandy	2 00	
do 17	do	1 still Catawba	0 60	
				17 35
do 12	Centennial Photo Co.	12 stories		3 00
do 23	Alfred Winkle	Cleaning rooms, St. George's Square		48 00
do 24	Lafayette Restaurant	32 dinners	176 00	
do 24	do	5 champagne extra	17 50	
do 24	do	50 cigars	12 50	
do 24	do	1 box cigarettes	2 50	
do 24	do	Flowers	10 70	
				219 20
do 22	John Gilmore & Co.	½ dozen Clavelle claret	3 25	
do 22	do	1 case Urbanne sparkling wine	16 00	
do 22	do	2 dozen Bass' ale	4 50	
do 22	do	1 bottle amber sherry	1 00	
do 22	do	1 gallon d. and g. sherry	4 00	
do 22	do	1 dozen Clavelle claret	6 50	
do 22	do	1 dozen Bass' ale	2 25	
				37 50
do 22	W. H. Haskins	50 bills of fare	6 00	
do 22	do	60 invitations and envelopes	3 50	
do 22	do	50 dinner cards	1 50	
do 22	do	50 entrance cards	2 00	
				13 00
do 27	J. Perrault	Salary of maids	20 00	
do 27	do	Cab-hire, petty expenses	21 90	
				41 90
do 27	Sarah Merrick	Milk		7 50
July 1	Charles McBride	Provisions, amount of bill		154 96
June 30	W. E. Grigg	Bread		9 45
July 11	Henry Connell	Groceries, amount of bill		44 69
do 8	J. Perrault	Cook, dismissed	15 00	
do 8	do	Washing	5 00	
				20 00
do 12	W. B. Weir	Rent of house to 1st August, 1876		333 34
do 12	O'Sullivan Bros.	Clothes lines		0 60
do 10	Knickerbocker Ice Co.	Ice		5 30
do 3	E. E. Nock	Provisions, amount of bill		1 55
do 15	J. Perrault	Tickets, cab-hire, petty expenses		19 00
do 13	John Gilmore & Co.	3 cases Clavelle Medoc	19 50	
do 13	do	¼ dozen Hennessey brandy	12 00	
do 13	do	2 cases sparkling wine	32 00	
do 13	do	1 case do pints	18 00	
				81 50
do 20	J. Perrault	Annie, one mo th	20 00	
do 20	do	Cook	10 00	
				30 00
do 20	F. Schencal	Omnibus	0 28	
do 20	do	6 glasses	0 75	
do 20	do	1 picture	0 60	
				1 63

CANADIAN Commission—Living expenses, Philadelphia—*Continued.*

1876.			$ cts.	$ cts.
July. 24	J. Perrault	Servants	40 83	
do 1	do	Expenses	21 90	
do 1	do	Washing	10 89	
June 1	do	Expenses	6 28	
				79 90
July 22	do	Cab-hire, petty expenses	7 50	
do 30	do	Telegrams	7 90	
				15 40
Aug. 1	Knickerbocker Ice Co	Ice		3 71
do 1	Charles McBride	Provisions		173 71
do 1	Sarah Merrick	Cream and eggs		8 30
July 31	W. E. Grigg	Bread		10 31
Aug. 1	Henry Connell	Groceries, amount of bill		25 99
July 3	Herbert M. Morse	6 lbs. mixed cake	3 00	
do 3	do	8 quarts ice cream	4 00	
				7 00
April 29	W. E. Grigg	Bread		5 40
Aug. 5	J. Perrault	Petty expenses		9 47
do 7	W. B. Weir	House rent to 1st September, 1876		333 34
June 26	W. R. Moore	Ice		2 45
do 17	H. G. Hill	2 pitchers	1 00	
do 17	do	1 slop basin	0 40	
do 17	do	4 wooden faucets	0 25	
do 17	do	Car fare	0 13	
				1 78
May 30	J. P. & J. B. Hand	3 papers of tacks	0 18	
do 30	do	1 pair pocket scissors	0 50	
do 30	do	1 pocket screw	0 50	
do 30	do	1 set knives and forks	2 25	
do 30	do	2 dusters	1 00	
do 30	do	2 brooms	0 50	
do 30	do	Oil	0 25	
				5 18
do 30	James Walker	1 doz. wine	1 25	
do 30	do	½ doz. tumblers	0 62	
do 30	do	½ doz. plates	0 60	
do 30	do	1 pail	0 25	
do 30	do	½ doz. towels	0 75	
				3 47
Aug. 19	J. Perrault	Expenses	6 25	
do 19	do	Cook	10 00	
do 19	do	Annie	20 00	
do 25	do	Petty expenses and washing	17 06	
do 12	do	do do	5 00	
do 12	do	Washing	3 00	
do 19	do	Petty expenses	5 64	
				66 95
do 31	John Gilmore	1 gall. superior pale sherry	4 00	
do 31	do	1 case Clavelle Medoc claret	6 50	
do 31	do	4 doz. English ale, Bass & Co	9 00	
				19 50
do 12	J. Perrault	Expenses	8 00	
Sept. 2	do	do	9 75	
				17 75
Aug. 19	Knickerbocker Ice Co	Ice		1 80
Sept. 4	J. Perrault	Maid, Seraph	10 00	
do 4	do	Washing extra	1 00	
do 4	do	Petty expenses	0 14	
				14 00
do 1	Charles McBride	Provisions, amt. of bill		128 98
do 4	Knickerbocker Ice Co	Ice		5 41
Aug. 31	E. E. Nock	3¾ lbs. chicken		1 01
do 31	W. E. Grigg	Bread		13 31
Sept. 1	Sarah Merrick	Milk and eggs		4 62
do 16	Henry Connell	Groceries, amt. of bill		25 51
do 16	John Gilmore	1 gallon pale sherry	4 00	
do 16	do	1 case Pleasant Valley sparkling	16 00	
do 16	do	4 doz. Bass' ale	9 00	
				29 00
do 9	J. Perrault	Cab hire and petty expenses		10 25
do 11	W. B. Weir	House rent to 1st October, 1876		333 34

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

CANADIAN Commission—Living expenses, Philadelphia—*Continued.*

1876.			$ cts.	$ cts.
Sept. 16	J. Perrault	Washing	10 50	
do 16	do	Newspapers	6 00	
do 9	do	Expenses	10 25	
do 16	do	do	45 75	
				72 50
do 24	Knickerbocker Ice Co	Ice		8 52
do 16	J. Perrault	Wages to Annie	20 00	
do 16	do	do Cook	10 00	
do 16	do	Petty expenses	15 75	
do 16	do	Cab hire, washing, etc	26 50	
				72 25
do 30	do	Telegrams, and petty expenses		16 22
do 16	Thos. L. Chandennet	Dictionaries		5 00
do 19	A. J. P. Trindell	Gold watch presented		269 00
do 29	W. F. Johnson	3 linen towels	0 60	
do 29	do	1 feather duster	1 50	
do 29	do	2 brooms	0 70	
do 29	do	1 hair brush	0 50	
do 29	do	1 oz rouge	0 15	
do 29	do	1 lb. whitening	0 06	
do 29	do	5 sheets emery paper	0 15	
				3 66
do 25	E. P. Buckley	Postage stamps	0 50	
do 25	do	Arnold's fluid	0 40	
do 25	do	2 quires foolscap	0 50	
do 25	do	1 package note paper	0 65	
do 25	do	2 packages envelopes, French	0 36	
do 25	do	Lead pencils	0 15	
do 25	do	Pens	0 18	
				2 75
Oct. 2	Knickerbocker Ice Co	Ice		4 15
do 1	Sarah Merrick	Milk and eggs		5 93
Sept. 30	W. E. Grigg	Bread		15 60
do 28	S. R. Morrison	4 copies of bill of fare		10 00
Oct. 1	Charles McBride	Provisions, amt. of bill		221 35
do 2	Henry Connell	Groceries do		50 08
do 6	W. B. Weir	House rent to Nov. 1st, 1876		333 34
do 7	J. Perrault	Telegraphing	7 55	
do 7	do	Servants' wages	8 00	
do 7	do	Washing	10 00	
do 7	do	Cab hire and stamps and petty expenses	7 50	
				33 05
do 14	do	Extra newspapers and subscriptions		6 60
do 14	Mrs. Penny	1 box luggage	1 00	
do 14	do	1 box luggage	1 20	
do 14	do	2 gallons mushrooms	1 25	
do 14	do	2 lbs. grapes	1 40	
do 14	do	½ dozen bananas	0 40	
do 14	do	1 box figs	0 45	
do 14	do	1 dozen pears	0 70	
do 14	do	1 jar prunes	1 00	
				7 40
Sept. 30	J. Perrault	Expenses	16 22	
Oct. 7	do	do	33 05	
do 14	do	Wages, cook and maid	30 00	
do 14	do	Advanced to Mrs. Penny (special)	10 00	
do 14	do	Catalogue and stationery	4 00	
do 14	do	Cab hire for special	5 00	
do 14	do	Rent of room (special)	12 00	
do 14	do	Telegraphing	5 50	
do 14	do	Stamps and tickets	2 00	
do 14	do	Washing, extras	7 50	
				125 27
do 5	Herman W. Lentz	1 dust brush		1 00
do 9	Herbert M. Morse	2 lbs. maccaroni	1 50	
do 9	do	2¾ lbs. currant cake	1 38	
do 9	do	1¼ lbs. French cocoanut	0 63	
				3 51
do 18	Thomas Keenan	Moving tables	1 00	
do 18	do	Putting drums in	1 00	
do 18	do	Taking awning down	0 50	
				2 50

CANADIAN Commission—Living expenses, Philadelphia—*Continued.*

1876.			$ cts.	$ cts.
Oct. 20	W. Williamson	Car fare	1 00	
do 20	do	2 papers tacks	0 16	
do 20	do	Catalogue for Mr. Penny	0 25	
				1 41
do 20	J. Perrault	Petty expenses	0 43	
do 20	do	Waiters, 8 days	21 00	
do 20	do	Cook (extra)	32 00	
				53 43
do 11	E. F. Harvie	Collection photographs	1 25	
do 20	Wm. Akers	1 buff, cream	1 25	
do 20	do	2 cake plates	2 50	
do 20	do	½ doz. plates	2 50	
do 20	do	1 doz. dessert spoons	7 00	
do 20	do	Use of chamber set	2 75	
				16 00
do 24	G. W. Emerson	1 copy (cloth) cent portfolio and 1 scratch ruler		4 50
do 21	W. F. Johnson	1 feather duster		0 65
do 14	Pennock Bros.	Basket flowers	4 00	
do 14	do	12 button-holes	1 50	
do 14	do	Filling 8 glass dishes	4 00	
				9 50
do 11	Steele Bros.	Loan of fine cut English glass, amount $96.00	4 80	
do 14	do	Porterage	2 00	
do 14	do	Loan of English star claret glass	0 45	
do 14	do	Loan of 1 Bohn stock glass	0 54	
do 14	do	Loan of 1 English star wine	0 37	
				8 16
do 21	J. Perrault	Telegraphing	5 25	
do 21	do	Stamps and tickets	3 50	
do 21	do	Stationery, paper	2 00	
do 21	do	Petty expenses	5 00	
do 21	do	Washing	5 50	
				21 25
do 21	Trustees, Philadelphia Gas Works	Consumption of gas	12 04	
do 21	Trustees, Philadelphia Gas Works	5 per cent penalty for non-payment of bill within five days	0 60	
				12 64
do 19	George P. Groves	10 yards matting		4 65
do 6	J. M. Peck	Whole amount of bill for fish, oysters, clams and crabs		22 08
do 1	H. Mullin	Bread served		1 65
do 21	D. T. A. Chandonnet	Post stamps	3 12	
do 21	do	Paper and envelopes	2 50	
do 21	do	Catalogue	0 25	
				5 87
do 24	J. Perrault	Petty expenses		0 92
Sept. 12	Egg Harbor Wine Co.	1 box Perl of California		15 00
do 13	W. E. Grigg	Bread		17 75
do 29	Knickerbocker Ice Co.	Ice		3 10
Oct. 25	Edgecumb	Telegram	0 40	
do 25	do	Expenses and car fares	0 50	
do 25	do	Stationery	1 25	
do 25	do	Postal on circulars	2 25	
do 25	do	Expenses to cattle show	0 70	
do 25	do	Advertising, "Ledger"	1 20	
do 25	do	do "Bulletin"	1 00	
do 25	do	do "Press"	1 00	
do 25	do	do "Times"	1 80	
				9 35
Nov. 3	Henry Connell	Fine groceries bill		63 74
do 1	Sarah Merrick	Milk and cream		11 05
do 29	J. Perrault	Petty expenses	0 36	
do 29	do	Cook	10 00	
do 29	do	Washing	4 50	
do 29	do	Telegraph	5 20	
do 29	do	Messages and tickets	3 50	
do 29	do	Stationery and stamps	2 75	
				26 31
Oct. 28	do	Expenses		25 95
Nov. 11	Thos. A. Chandonnet	Paper, envelopes, stamps and catalogue		5 25

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

CANADIAN Commission—Living expenses, Philadelphia—*Continued.*

1876.			$ cts.	$ cts
Oct. 3	Herbert M. Morse	1 lb. rolls	0 12	
do 3	do	2 quarts ice cream	1 00	
do 3	do	1 lb. cake	0 50	
do 3	do	2 quarts ice cream	1 00	
do 3	do	1 lb. cake	0 25	
do 3	do	½ lb. water and cream	0 50	
do 3	do	1 lb. candy	0 40	
				3 77
Nov. 1	J. Perrault	Tickets	0 98	
do 4	do	Telegraphing	10 00	
do 4	do	Messenger, paper	3 50	
do 4	do	Tickets, cab hire	5 50	
do 4	do	Washing	4 50	
				24 48
do 7	Wm. Mann	Binding 4 vols. invoices		4 00
do 7	E. Helmbold	Oysters, from Oct. 6th to Nov. 3rd		11 08
do 1	Chas. McBride	Provisions, amount of bill		221 98
do 1	W. B. Weir	House rent in full, according to contract		333 34
do 21	E. S. West	2 tons stove coal and stowage	13 80	
do 21	do	1 do do	6 90	
do 21	do	1 do do	6 90	
do 21	do	1½ do do	10 55	
				38 15
do 15	E. P. Buckley	1 yard white linen	0 12	
do 15	do	1 yard brown linen	0 10	
do 15	do	1 ball twine	0 15	
do 15	do	1 bottle mucilage	0 12	
				0 49
do 18	J. Perrault	Washing	4 50	
do 18	do	Carting boxes	10 00	
do 18	do	Telegraphing	6 00	
do 18	do	Tickets, stamps and messenger	5 50	
do 18	do	Petty expenses	0 26	
do 11	do	Servants	30 00	
do 11	do	Washing	4 50	
do 11	do	Telegraphing	7 25	
do 11	do	Tickets and stamps	3 00	
do 11	do	Messenger and petty expenses	5 00	
				76 01
do 13	do	Petty expenses		0 25
do 22	No name	Carriages	5 00	
do 22	do	Telegrams	4 00	
				9 00
do 22	Sarah Merrick	Milk		6 00
do 22	E. Helmbold	Oysters		11 88
do 29	P. M. MacKen	Cleaning out ashes		7 50
do 27	Knickerbocker Ice Co.	Ice		2 56
Dec. 1	J. Perrault	Cook	10 00	
do 1	do	Maid	20 00	
do 1	do	Paid M. A. Rasch for meals	6 00	
do 1	do	do do breaking plates, goblets, wine-glasses, gilt china and cut-glass	2 50 5 25	
do 1	do	Petty expenses	3 82	
Nov. 28	do	Washing	4 00	
do 28	do	Cook	10 00	
do 28	do	Express wagon	5 00	
do 28	do	Telegrams, stamps, tickets	10 00	
				76 57
do 25	A. Lavigne	Street-car tickets		0 85
do 27	John Gilmore	1 case Rodner champagne	28 50	
do 27	do	1 case Chateau claret	28 00	
do 27	do	1 gallon pale sherry	4 00	
do 27	do	½ dozen superior port wine	15 00	
do 27	do	½ dozen laline blanche sauterne	7 50	
do 27	do	1 dozen pale sherry	4 00	
				87 00
do 29	J. Perrault	Expenses	29 00	
do 29	do	do	20 00	
				49 00
do 27	Samuel Richardson	Cartage of baggage		19 50
do 13	Lewis & Bros.	Cab-hire		216 50
Dec. 1	Joseph Lavigne	Cartage from house		1 50

Canadian Commission—Living expenses, Philadelphia—*Continued.*

1876.			$ cts.	$ cts.
Nov. 27	John Gilmore	1 gallon pale sherry	4 00	
do 27	do	3 do	12 00	
do 27	do	2 bottles Hennessey's brandy	4 00	
do 27	do	1 gallon pale sherry	4 00	
do 27	do	2 dozen Bass' ale	4 50	
do 27	do	1 case Pleasant Valley wine	16 00	
do 27	do	2 dozen Bass' ale	4 50	
do 27	do	1 gallon pale sherry	4 00	
do 27	do	2 do	8 00	
do 27	do	4 dozen Bass' ale	9 00	
do 27	do	1 case Pleasant Valley wine	16 00	
do 27	do	2 bottles Hennessey's brandy	4 00	
				90 00
Dec. 1	J. Perrault	Telegraphing	7 50	
do 1	do	Tickets and stamps	4 50	
do 1	do	Washing	3 50	
do 1	do	Petty expenses	5 00	
do 1	do	Small acconnts	10 00	
				30 68
do 2	do	do		26 41
do 16	do	do		11 33
Nov. 30	Chas. McBride	Provisions, amount of bill		169 38
do 30	W. E. Grigg	Bread		14 77
do 30	Henry Connell	Fine groceries, amount of bill		39 48
1877.				
Jan. 6	Lovell Printing Co	Printing		7 00
do 5	Cyrille Paré	Disbursements		9 00
Mar. 24	J. Perrault	Petty expenses		4 00
Feb. 1	do	Cab-hire, petty expenses		7 60
do 9	Goodman	Gas consumed at house, Philadelphia		34 48
		Total		7,625 87

Summary of total expenditure on account of Canadian Commission, Philadelphia Exhibition, for salary, expense of living, travelling or otherwise.

		$ cts.	$ cts.
Joseph Perrault	Salary	6,500 00	
do	Paid in Canada	2,935 85	
do	do Philadelphia	266 53	
do	From refund account	84 50	
			9,886 88
Canadian Commission	Living expenses, Philadelphia		7,625 87
Hon. R. D. Wilmot	Travelling, &c.		630 67
Hon. E. G. Penny	do		319 63
Hon. L. Letellier	do		300 00
D. McDougall	Paid in Canada	4,096 13	
do	do Philadelphia	387 95	
			4,484 08
J. P. R. Casgrain	Paid in Canada	498 05	
do	do Philadelphia	110 66	
do	Salary	527 50	
			1,136 21
W. F. Burdett	Expenses in Canada	235 00	
do	do Philadelphia	25 20	
do	Salary	909 44	
do	From refund account	18 00	
			1,187 64
W. J. McGuire	Paid in Philadelphia	50 00	
do	do Canada	87 50	
do	do Philadelphia	75 00	
			212 50
H. J. Hubertus	Services	113 34	
do	do	75 00	
do	do	50 00	
			238 34
Hon. James Skead	Services as Judge		750 00
S. C. Stevenson	Expenses		144 00
H. Prendeville	Services		40 00
H. Beaugrand	Salary 13th August to 10th September, 1875	72 00	
do	Stationery	6 60	
			78 60

SUMMARY of total expenditure on account of Canadian Commission, &c.—*Concluded.*

	$ cts.	$ cts.
Sundry Employees, viz. :—		
George Carpenter	38 70	
C. Paré	598 60	
H. Wilmot	279 00	
W. Williamson	808 34	
J. Laidlaw	841 68	
F. W. Tuerk	916 68	
W. Moore	350 00	
Robert McBride	237 50	
A. Larochelle	217 00	
T. Chandonnet	337 50	
W. McLean	258 33	
James Ryan	312 50	
S. J. Lyman	175 00	
W. Dick	130 00	
J. C. Risteen	125 00	
A. Stephens	141 66	
G. S. Bingham	116 66	
E. B. Black	108 33	
R. Sutherland	155 05	
W. Edgecumb	175 00	
J. Johnston	133 33	
S. Leslie	133 33	
John DeWolfe	131 23	
W. A. Cross	151 18	
W. Walsh	50 00	
James Lavigne	42 00	
Robert Stewart	116 66	
R. Beauchemin	150 00	
F. A. Bender	36 53	
F. Patenaude	20 82	
J. Laudon	25 00	
J. Burdett	25 00	
Joseph Roy	15 00	
— Gentesse	14 37	
— Lemieux	7 35	
— Farrow	5 91	
— Prendeville	7 50	
S. Sillan	7 50	
J. H. Pine	7 50	
John Lorton	7 50	
S. C. Rogers	108 33	
		7,518 50
Wages to men in Philadelphia, viz. :—		
Richardson's men	257 02	
Lavigne's men	538 45	
C. Paré's men	369 56	
Beauchemin's men	91 35	
Tuerk's men	644 71	
Larochelle's men	152 57	
Log-house men	741 74	
McBride's men	146 80	
Moore's men	324 76	
Williamson's men	919 21	
Stephen's men	230 50	
Ryan's men	185 00	
Johnston's men	75 00	
McLean's men	15 00	
Leslie's men	130 00	
Waterous' men	7 50	
		4,829 21
Men's board in Philadelphia		287 84
		39,670 04

Summary of Payments made to J. Perrault.

	$ cts.	$ cts.
Amount paid for salary	6,500 00	
do expenses in Canada	2,935 85	
do do Philadelphia	366 53	
do from Refund Account	84 50	
		9,886 88

1875.		$ cts.	$ cts.
May 28	To amount from Hon. L. Letellier	329 50	
July 10	do do do	400 00	
Oct. 23	do of official cheque	500 00	
1876.			
Mar. 21	To amount of official cheque	500 00	
Oct. 14	do U. S. currency in Philadelphia $100 00		
	do do do 52 00		
	do do do 400 00		
		500 00	
1877.			
Jan. 8	To amount of official cheque	1,000 00	
do 9	do do	200 00	
do 15	do do	200 00	
Mar. 15	do do	149 24	
April 15	do do	1,213 10	
Aug. 17	do do	1,508 16	
			6,500 00

Statement of Moneys paid J. Perrault in Canada.

	$ cts.	
1875—By travelling expenses, from 9th February to 17th April	229 43	
do do 13th to 25th May	142 20	
do do 28th May (paid to Hon. Letellier)	270 50	
do do June	159 40	
do do July	45 25	
do do 10th July (paid by Hon. Letellier)	600 00	
do do August	27 00	
do do September	57 50	
do do 25th September to 21st October	90 55	
do do 26th October to 8th November	81 65	
do do to 2nd December	88 10	
1876—By travelling expenses to 29th January	51 25	
advance, 17th February	100 00	
travelling expenses to 11th March	93 02	
balance of travelling expenses	900 00	
		$2,935 85

EXPENDITURE—J. PERRAULT—By Canadian Commission in Philadelphia.

				$ cts.	$ cts.
1876.					
April 22	J. Perrault		Telegram, cab hire		15 35
do 15	do		do do		33 00
Dec. 16	do		Return from Philadelphia to Montreal	21 00	
do 16	do		Trip to Ottawa and back	11 00	
do 16	do		do 3 days	18 00	
do 1	do		Telegraphing	7 50	
do 1	do		Tickets and stamps	4 50	
do 1	do		Washing	3 50	
do 22	do		Ottawa and back	20 00	
do 22	do		Petty expenses	5 00	
do 22	do		Small accounts	10 18	
do 22	do		Paid Lavigne's ticket	10 00	
					110 68
1877.					
Mar. 24	do		Montreal to Ottawa	28 00	
do 24	do		do	15 00	
do 24	do		do	37 00	
					80 00
Feb. 1	do		do	20 00	
do 1	do		do	17 00	
					37 00
do 10	do		do	18 50	
do 10	do		do	12 00	
					30 50
do 7	do		do	31 00	
do 7	do		do	25 00	
					56 00
do 24	do		Travelling expenses		4 00
					366 53

EXPENDITURE—J. PERRAULT—From Refund Account.

			$ cts.
1877.			
Mar. 31	J. Perrault, travelling expenses to 16th March		84 50

Mr. MONTAGUE. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that those gentlemen, Hon. E. G. Penny, Hon. R. G. Wilmot, B. R. McDougall, Esq., and the then hon. Minister of Agriculture, were appointed commissioners in connection with the Canadian exhibit at the Centennial Exhibition held in the city of Philadelphia, U.S., in the year 1876. Mr. Joseph Perrault was appointed secretary-treasurer on 14th May, 1875, at a salary of $250 per month. A number of other persons were appointed in connection with the said exhibition. The sums mentioned were paid for the services of the said persons, for their travelling expenses, hotel fares, and other expenses, as shown by the return to Parliament dated 2nd May, 1879.

ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES IN CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. Was any charge recently laid by Mr. Arthur Blakeney, of the Customs Department, against Mr. Robt. Farrow, of the same department, with reference to the dealing of the latter with public moneys? 2. If any such charge was made, what were the particulars of it? 3. Was any inquiry instituted by the Government into any such charge, and if so, before whom was the inquiry made, and with what result?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. Yes. 2. The particulars of the charges are:

(a). That he improperly retained $3.30 of public money, as follows:—He received a registered

letter from Sydney, N.S., on the 15th day of December, 1891, containing this remittance. He used this money, and not until the 22nd March, 1892, did he pay it to the Consolidated Fund. That he did not do this until warned by Mr. Dunlevie that Mr. A. C. Bleakney intended reporting him.

(b). That on the 14th October, 1893, Mr. Bristol handed him $1 to deposit to the credit of the Receiver General, but there is no further trace of this in Customs books.

(c). That large sums have been charged to the various ports which were paid to the contingent fund for the postage stamps taken for Customs duties on small parcels. That these stamps are retained by Mr. Farrow, instead of being sent to the Post Office Department for redemption and proceeds deposited to credit of Receiver General.

(d). And also any charges that may be preferred in connection with defalcations of T. J. Watters.

3. Yes, the charges were investigated. Under the provisions of chapter 115 of the Revised Statutes, the Controller of Customs recommended that three commissioners, consisting of J. M. Courtney, Esq., Deputy Minister of Finance; W. G. Parmelee, Esq., Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, and F. E. Kilvert, Esq., Acting Commissioner of Customs, should be appointed to investigate and report on the conduct of Mr. Farrow, in relation to such charges. That recommendation was adopted by Council; the investigation was held, and the report is now under consideration.

THE TOBIQUE VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. MULOCK asked, 1. When was the Tobique Valley Railway opened for traffic? 2. Has this railway been leased to the Canadian Pacific Railway? 3. If so, what is the rental? 4. Are regular passenger trains run daily? If not, what is the extent of such passenger service? 5. What is the extent of the freight service? 6. What have been the total passenger receipts, and what the total freight receipts since the opening of the line?

Mr. HAGGART. The Tobique Valley Railway has not been regularly opened for traffic, but on the 24th November, 1893, the first traffic train was run. The Canadian Pacific Railway are under agreement to lease the Tobique Valley Railway when certain conditions precedent are fulfilled; these conditions not being yet fulfilled, the Canadian Pacific Railway have never taken possession or operated the road regularly with consent of the company. The rental is to be 40 per cent of gross earnings, when possession is taken of under lease. For convenience in special circumstances, the Canadian Pacific Railway have occasionally run a train to take in or bring out freight. The gross earnings for the year 1894 were twenty-two hundred dollars; so far this year there is practically nothing.

Mr. WALLACE.

RAILWAY FACILITIES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) moved for:

Return of all correspondence, petitions, memorials, reports or documents relative to the extension of the railway system in the province of Prince Edward Island.

He said: In 1871 a Railway Act was passed by the local legislature of Prince Edward Island under which a road was built from Alberton to Georgetown. Branches were afterwards constructed from Mount Stewart to Souris, and from Alberton to Tignish. A large section of the country known as the Belfast and Murray Harbour district did not at that time, apply for railway extension, and did not secure railway facilities. Railways have become as great a necessity to the people as highways were to the early settlers. The policy of the Dominion Government with respect to granting subsidies to railway has become very general in its application. Lines have been built in different sections at a large expenditure of public money. Railways have been built through Cape Breton, and elsewhere, which have proved of great advantage to the people, and have shown the wisdom of undertaking the various works. The districts to which I desire now particularly to refer are known as the East Point and Belfast and Murray Harbour districts, which requires the construction of railroads through their very thickly-settled and prosperous settlements. The number of people benefited would be about 23,000; the population of the districts equals fifty to the square mile. The districts through which these lines would run are highly cultivated and thickly settled. I have taken the trouble to consult the census of 1891, and ascertain the agricultural products raised there. I find as follows:—

—	East Point District.	Belfast and Murray Harb'r Dist	Total.
	Bushels.	Bushels.	Bushels.
Wheat	14,053	124,791	139,844
Barley	6,002	12,355	18,357
Oats	91,699	526,916	628,615
Potatoes	234,136	1,669,517	1,903,653
Turnips and other roots	16,290	406,384	422,674
Grass seeds	102	1,472	1,574
Flax seeds.....	.....	220	220
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
Hay	5,075	27,225	32,300

Besides a large quantity of other productions. From the Fishery Inspector's report for 1893, I find that the quantity of fish caught in the sections to which I have referred is as follows:—

Lobsters, canned	Lbs.	682,000
Dried cod, hake, &c.	Cwt.	21,000
Smelts	Lbs.	52,500
Fish oil	Galls.	5,000
Bait fish	Bbls.	6,500
Oysters and clams	Bbls.	1,559

Besides many other products of the sea, amounting in value altogether to $251,049.16. I also wish to produce, from the Census returns, the following schedule of live stock, animal products, &c. :

SCHEDULE of Live Stock, Animals, Products, &c.

—	East Pt. District	Belfast & M. H. District	Total.
Horses	1,187	6,861	8,048
Working oxen, cows and horned cattle	3,704	18,238	22,941
Sheep	4,840	34,160	39,000
Swine	2,418	6,059	8,487
Poultry	18,482	120,740	139,222
Cattle killed or sold for slaughter or export	1,217	4,758	5,965
Sheep killed or sold for slaughter or export	1,430	13,850	15,280
Swine killed or sold for slaughter or export	1,464	5,943	7,407
Home-made butter....lbs.	73,924	372,842	446,766
Home-made cheese....do	10,355	30,065	40,420
Wool production.....do	16,407	97,671	114,078
Home-made cloth and flannel.....yds.	16,881	81,794	98,675
Home-made linen....do	271	1,253	1,524
Amount paid for farm labour	$ 8,349	$105,699	$114,093
Number of weeks of hired labour upon farms in 1890	1,414	23,750	25,164

I may here also mention that at present there is a branch line running from Cape Traverse to Emerald Junction, which connects with the down train from Summerside to Charlottetown. The Cape Traverse train lies over at Emerald Junction until the return of the Summerside train in the evening. I may say that Emerald Junction is situated in a very flourishing part of the country, and I think it would be a proper and judicious thing for the Minister of Railways to consider the advisability of running a line from Emerald Junction toward the deep water at Stanley, through this very productive section of the country. The train at Emerald lies idle for a part of each day, the train hands are doing nothing, and it is so self-evident that it would be a paying line, considering the means of operating would be available, that I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything further on this matter. When our present line in Prince Edward Island was constructed in 1873, it cost $15,000 per mile. The difference in the cost of constructing a line at present may be inferred from the fact that some of the iron rails in the Prince Edward Island Railway cost as high as $90 per ton. In 1873, the steel rails cost the then Liberal Government $54.81 per ton, but the present value of steel rails laid down in Prince Edward Island would be, I am told, $21 per ton. All the other outfits necessary for railway construction are now much cheaper than they were then, so that a railroad would cost much less at the present time than when our Prince Edward Island line was built. The rolling stock of the present road would be nearly sufficient for the contemplated branch lines, the construction of which I advocate. The machine shops at present in use would be amply sufficient for the increased mileage, and it would entail no extra cost for superintendence. Having consideration for these facts, there can be no doubt that a 3 feet 6 inch guage road could be built at a cost not exceeding $8,500 per, mile, or a total of $550,000 for the sixty-five miles to which I refer. In deciding on the terms by which we entered confederation it was estimated at the time that the Canadian Pacific Railway would cost $30,000,000, and that there would be an outlay of $8,933,333 for the enlargement of canals. It was also estimated that it would take $4,552,148 to complete the Intercolonial. I find on looking into the Public Accounts of Canada, that instead of that there has been an authorized expenditure for railways and canals since 1873, at which time we came into confederation, as follows :—

AUTHORIZED EXPENDITURE ON RAILWAYS AND CANALS SINCE 1873 OVER WHAT WAS CONTEMPLATED.

Railways		$129,370,305 18
Canals		45,218,221 93
Total expenditure		$174,595,526 01
Less estimated cost of C.P.R.	$30,000,000	
Less estimated for enlargement of canals	8,933,333	
Less estimated for I.C.R.	4,552,148	
		43,485,481 00
Difference		$131,010,045 01

As I have shown from the Public Accounts, the excess of expenditure for railways and canals over what was contemplated in 1873, when Prince Edward Island entered the union, has been $131,010,045. Prince Edward Island's proportion of this amount is $3,275,251, against which Prince Edward Island has received $1,196,693.09, as follows :—Amount expended on capital account of Prince Edward Island Railway, $596,693.09 ; amount received under 50-51 Vic., cap. 8, $500,000, being $20,000 a year, or the interest on $500,000 at 4 per cent, which we have been receiving for some years past. These two items make a total of $1,096,693.90, which, deducted from the $3,275,251.27 of over-expenditure, leaves a balance in favour of Prince Edward Island of $2,178,558. Having shown our actual claim, I will now

take another method of looking at the figures. The Finance Minister, in his Budget speech of May 3rd, 1895, said :

The total net debt on 30th June, 1894, amounts to $246,183,629. Deducting from this the amount assumed by the provinces, you have a net Dominion debt, from 1867 to date, incurred by the Dominion for Dominion purposes, amounting to $136,752,881.

We have services and works representing, in connection with railways and canals, a grand total of capital expenditure of $166,369,288. Thus you will find that $28,616,407 more than has been added to the Dominion debt, has been expended on capital account for the services of the country.

I find that the liabilities of the Dominion matured or current on the same date amounted to $9,844,316. In the same speech, the Finance Minister said :

We have railway subsidies under contract of $2,257,059 ; also railway subsidies granted, but not under contract, amounting to $2,587,257. Then, to finish the St. Lawrence Canal system, widening and deepening the canals according to the demands presented by the Minister the other day, we must spend $6,000,000. But, as I am taking this from the 1st July, 1895, I estimate that $5,000,000 will have to be spent after that time. * * * This makes a total of these liabilities of $9,844,316. These are liabilities that are current or probable.

By the report of the Minister of Finance for 1894, I find that the sinking fund has increased by $28,758,334.19 since Prince Edward Island entered the union, as follows :—

Up to year ending 30th June, 1894.	$32,356,776 65
do do 1873.	3,598,422 46
An increase of.....	$28,758,334 19

Since we came into confederation, I contend that this sinking fund is even more justly included than the net debt itself. The debt might be repudiated, but the sinking fund is debt paid off, to which Prince Edward Island has contributed her share. Then there are contingent liabilities, amounting to $15,000,000, which are represented by the following :—

Short Line Railway, about.....	$ 2,250,000
Regina and Prince Albert Ry., about	1,280,000
Calgary and Edmonton Ry., about...	1,280,000
Hudson's Bay Railway, about.....	1,600,000
Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway...	250,180
Chignecto Ship Railway.....	3,412,000
Various subsidies authorized, estimated at	5,000,000
Total.....	$15,000,000

I may just here say that I have included the Chignecto Ship Railway, because, although the country may not be committed to the construction of that work, I believe to a very large extent, the honour of Canada is pledged to go on with it. In reference to these contingent liabilities, the hon. Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech this session, said :

We have obligations current to the amount of $6,543,400, being in the shape of subsidies to the International Railway Company, to the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway Company, to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, and others, which are provided for by yearly appropriation, and which amount to $6,543,400. There is also a subsidy by special Act to the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway, $250,680, and a transport subsidy to the Hudson Bay Railway of $1,600,000. These fall in the list of contingent liabilities, which, when they accrue, will be charged to railway subsidy account.

Our net federal debt and other net liabilities is made up as follows :—

Total net debt, 30th June, 1894....	$246,183,029 48
Total expenditure over debt.....	28,614,407 00
Liabilities not fully matured, but current or probable.....	9,844,316 00
Increase of sinking fund since 1873	28,758,354 19
Contingent liabilities.....	15,000,000 00
Estimated shrinkage of assets.....	7,500,000 00
Total.....	$335,900,106 67

The estimated shrinkage, referred to above, I arrive at in this way :

Albert Railway loan account.....	$ 14,725 56
Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge and Railway Company.....	300,000 00
Quebec Harbour debentures.....	3,748,519 62
Three Rivers Harbour debentures.	81,760 92
Shrinkage on province accounts..	3,000,000 00
Total.....	$7,145,006 15

The reason why I conclude that these items are worthless is that there is a very large amount of overdue interest upon the first four items. There is also shown in the Public Accounts of 1894, the old province accounts. These old accounts, I contend, are claims that cannot be made good, and some of which, those of Ontario and Quebec, have been referred to arbitrators. I would therefore estimate about $3,000,000 shrinkage on them in addition to the sums I have mentioned, making in all about $7,145,006.15 for shrinkage of assets. Taking the total of the various sums which I have mentioned above, $335,900,106.67, and dividing it by our population in 1891, you have an average of $68.27 per head for the whole of Canada. Now, the basis on which we entered confederation was a federal debt of $50 per head. But I have shown that this federal debt now actually amounts to $68.27 per head. The population of Prince Edward Island in 1891 was 109,078. Multiply that by the amount in excess of $50, or $18.25, and you have a sum of $1,990,673, or practically the same figures as I found by my first calculaton, the difference being only about $80,000. I shall now refer to the capital expenditure, and it may be well to state that in the case of the Prince Edward Island Railway nearly all the expenditures are charged to working expenses. Only one item in seven years, namely $8,300 is charged to capital account, while on the Intercolonial, during the same period, $2,339,393 was charged to capital account. This is no doubt the reason why the Prince Edward Island Railway does not make a better showing. Our people complain

very much that the Railway Department discriminates against us in the matter of freight rates. You can go from the upper provinces either to Pictou or Halifax at less freight than you can to Charlottetown via Point Duchene, notwithstanding the fact that Charlottetown is eighty-nine miles nearer to western points. I find that the local legislature in Prince Edward Island has certain idea with respect to the increase of its subsidy with which I am not in accord. In the Legislative Assembly on the 9th April, 1894, the Premier of that province proposed a resolution, which reads as follows :—

Whereas, the expectation which the Government of this province has heretofore held, that this province would receive from the Government of Canada such an increased amount of subsidy as would make it unnecessary to supplement the revenue of this province by any mode of taxation, has not been realized, although the Government looked forward to its realization in future, and it is, therefore, necessary, for the time being, by some measure of taxation to add to the revenue of the province.

With respect to this resolution, I have this to say, that I am entirely opposed to any amount being granted to the local government of Prince Edward Island until its public works are attended to. If there be anything due to Prince Edward Island—and I contend there is—it should be expended in the shape of public works. The local government, I may say, have shown themselves entirely incapable of husbanding the resources of the province and the public moneys entrusted to them. When they came into power, the province had been ruled by a Liberal-Conservative Administration for thirteen years. Previous to the incoming of the Liberal-Conservative Government, my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) had imposed certain taxes on the people when he was Premier. But the Liberal-Conservative Administration, by its rigid economy, remitted those taxes, and conducted the business of that province in a manner which could not be surpassed for economy and ability by the government of any other province under the sun. It wiped out the taxation imposed upon the province by the preceding government, which was presided over by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and it carried on the administration for thirteen years, without any taxation for the most of that period, leaving a very trifling debt when they went out of power. But when the Liberal party came into power, they put on a land tax, a succession tax, a commercial travellers' tax, they increased the fees in the registry office, they put on other taxes, they disposed of the public lands at whatever price they could get by private arrangement, they sold the debentures of the province to the extent of $185,000 ; and yet, notwithstanding all this taxation, they were unable to carry on the affairs of the province without running it almost head over heels in debt. Under these circumstances, I think that in any arrangement for equalizing the debt of Prince Edward Island with that of the Dominion of Canada, the Government should most decidedly give the money to the province in the shape of public works. I shall now consider the cost of running the Prince Edward Island Railway and its present earnings, and compare them, per train mile, with the cost of the Intercolonial Railway :

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Maintenance of line and buildings....	$ 99,178 10
Working and repair of engines.....	57,457 74
Working and repair of cars.....	16,804 52
General operating expenses.....	53,450 60
Total expenses.....	$226,891 06
The cost of operating per train mile on the Prince Edward Island Railway.....	$1 02
The cost of operating per train mile on the Intercolonial Railway.....	0 71
Total earnings per train mile, Prince Edward Island Railway.....	0 71
Total earnings per train mile, Intercolonial Railway	0 71
Passenger earnings on Prince Edward Island Railway per train mile.....	0 29
Passenger earnings on Intercolonial Railway per train mile.....	0 22

None of the public works built by Canada give returns to Government as interest of cost and excess of earnings over working expense.

Total cost of Intercolonial Railway, including interest, is over.....	$ 55,000,000
Total cost of Canadian Pacific Railway, including interest, is over....	100,000,000
Total cost of canals, including interest, is over.....	66,000,000
Total amount of various subsidies is over	32,000,000
Making the total loss to Canada ..	$253,000,000
Prince Edward Island's share, 1-40th, about	6,000,000

By the same means of computation, the Prince Edward Island Railway cost the Dominion of Canada about $2,500,000. It will thus be seen that the pro rata burden on the people of Prince Edward Island for the construction and maintenance of the great public works, from which they derive little if any benefit, is about three times as great as the burden which the Dominion tax-payer on the mainland is called upon to bear for the Prince Edward Island Railway. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, my contention is that Prince Edward Island is entitled to material consideration on account of the large expenditures upon public works which have been made since confederation from which, on account of her isolated position she has received little if any benefit, and which expenditures were not contemplated at the time of the union. I further contend, Sir, that while the present operating of the

Prince Edward Island railway shows a loss, the building of the branches I have indicated would create additional earning powers for the whole road without increased cost for operating expenses, which now amount to $53,000. I further contend, Sir, that the branches would go through a thickly-settled and productive farming country, having also, at one end, some of the best fishing coasts of the province, which, of themselves, would afford a large traffic, more particularly on the east coast, where the people would be only too glad to have the opportunity of making use of the railway having no harbour. I may also say that the southern section goes through a splendid country, fertile, well settled and prosperous, which has large productions and great possibilities. It would give easy access to markets to the people of these sections who are now obliged to haul their products great distances to market, over almost impassible roads in the few weeks in the fall of the year. But above all, Sir, while these branches could be cheaply constructed and while they would not increase the present expenditure for management, machine shops, or operating expenses, they would become profitable feeders to the main line, and, without doubt, their operation would result in turning the present deficit on the Prince Edward Island railway into a surplus.

Mr. WELSH. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat interested in this motion, for I have a very similar motion on the Order paper myself. I listened with attention and interest to the remarks of my hon. friend; but I am at a loss, from his description, to know where this railway should be built. He suggested to the Minister very plainly that there should be a branch road from Emerald down to Stanley. I agreed with him as to that; but he has failed to inform you and this House where his southern road is to be located. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that for once since I became a member of this House there has been one man supporting the Government able and willing to stand up in his place and ask for some measure of justice for Prince Edward Island. I regret that he should have made some of the statements that he did make. He cast a severe reflection upon the present government of Prince Edward Island, which is conducted upon Liberal principles; and he complimented the Liberal-Conservative Government for their actions while they were in power. Well, I have often said at political meetings that if the Liberal-Conservative party had been on trial before a jury on a charge of deceiving the people, and if that offence were a hanging matter, every one of them would have been hanged long ago; —and I am going to tell you exactly how that was. My hon. colleague (Mr. Davies) was the Premier of Prince Edward Island, and he introduced a system of equalizing revenue and expenditure. I am glad to see the Finance Minister is looking at me; for he had better try to do the same thing that my hon. friend did. When my hon. friend assumed the reins of power in Prince Edward Island, he found there was not $100 in the treasury, and our expenditure equaled our income. He said at once: I am going to make the income and expenditure equal. So he put a tax upon the people. That new tax was not exactly agreeable to the people. The Liberal-Conservative party went before the people and declared that this was an iniquitous tax and that if they were returned to power, they would carry on the government without it. Though the balance between expenditure and revenue had been restored under my hon. friend's administration the people were quite willing to get rid of the new tax if they could, and, taking the Liberal-Conservatives at their word, they returned them to power. But they collected that tax for three years under my hon. friend's Tax Act; and after all the province was in debt. I make this declaration here, and I challenge contradiction—that the Liberal-Conservative party when in power spent over $1,000,000, and charged it to current expenditure when it ought to have been charged to capital account. Do you call that honest? No one dares deny it; for I will stake any money on the truth of what I am saying. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) speaks of the Liberal Government of Prince Edward Island using money realized from sales of land for current expenditure. Why was he not generous enough to say that the Conservative party when in power did the very same thing? I am sorry that my hon. friend frim King's could not make a speech without attempting to throw obloquy upon our friends in Prince Edward Island; because I go upon the principle that we had better wash at home any dirty linen we may have, rather than bring it up here. However, the southern railway is the question before us. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th March, 1890, my hon. colleague (Mr. Davies) made a speech in this House in the course of which he said:

I submit to the Minister that the demand I make with respect to a railway, is very small indeed. The hon. gentleman knows, for he has been in the province, that the Island is divided into two parts by a large river, and that the portion lying south of the river, embracing what is known as the Belfast and Murray Harbour district, comprising fifteen or sixteen townships, with a population one-fifth that of the whole Island, has no railway communication whatever. It has been suggested by some surveyors that, for a very small cost, a small feeder could be built, running from one of the stations on the road through these two districts of Belfast and Murray Harbour, touching somewhere near the great village of Montague, and going down from Belfast towards this Wood Islands breakwater. I believe that could be built for about $7,000 per mile, and it would not require any additional rolling stock, because we have rolling stock there already. The total cost of the branch alone, which I ask the hon. gentleman to build, would

not be one-sixth of the cost of the Pictou Town branch. Now, I submit the hon. gentleman would do well, in the interests of justice and fair-play to that little Island, for which I know he has some kindly feeling—for it benefited him some years ago—to have his engineer consider fairly that proposition, and give it his serious consideration. When we come to compare the way our Island is settled with other parts of the Dominion, hon. gentlemen will be surprised to learn that, while the population of the Island per square mile is fifty-two, the population of the rest of the Dominion is a little short of five. We are, by long odds, ten times as thickly populated as any other part of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman will see further, if he looks at the statistics, that there are very few parts of the Dominion where farming is carried on as it is with us. I find, on looking over the statistics, that Prince Edward Island owns fifty-five head of live stock for every hundred acres of improved land, while the rest of the Dominion only owns thirty-eight head. Our field products are 108 bushels per acre of improved land, while those of the other provinces are only 61. This shows what a rich and valuable island it is. If the hon. gentleman will build that small branch from the main line to this harbour of Wood Islands, it will run through a fertile country, every inch of which is settled by well-to-do farmers, and it will be a most valuable feeder to the trunk line. No doubt the existing line has not paid heretofore, but there is this to be said of it, that it pays better than the Intercolonial Railway; and whereas the Intercolonial has a very large amount of expenditure from year to year charged to capital account, every dollar expended on the Island Railway is charged to running expenses, so that the loss is larger than it would be if the same system were adopted which is followed with regard to the Intercolonial Railway. I do not think I have put forward a claim on behalf of the Island which is not reasonable and just. I have been talking to a great many members on both sides, and I believe the members of the Government, if they could spare the time to give this matter a little consideration, would acknowledge the justice of these claims; and I am in hopes, as far as the Minister of Public Works is concerned, that these four particular works—New London, Tracadie, Pinette and Wood Islands—this session—not next year—will be put down in the supplementary Estimates for a sum sufficient to carry them to completion. I may not have any influence with the right hon. the leader of the Government, but he has many warm friends on the Island, as he knows—men who fight very hard for him, as I know to my cost—and if the Government would construct this branch line, their action would meet with the approval of their friends as well as opponents, and be an act of simple justice. The road would be a valuable feeder to the existing line, would not require additional rolling stock, would tend largely to reduce the deficit which year by year, unfortunately, appears in our account, would open up a valuable stretch of country, and would confer a lasting benefit on a great many people.

Now Mr. Speaker, I followed with a few words in support of the same matter. Now, it appears—and I wish my hon. friend had stated it—that they contemplate another route for this railway. From what I hear, the contemplated route is from a place called Southport, opposite Charlottetown, to Murray Harbour. Well, whatever I said in support of this branch, I will transfer in support of this route from Southport to Murray Harbour. During the nine sessions that I have been in this House, I have, year by year, brought forward to the notice of this House, as you, Mr. Speaker, and every hon. gentleman will remember, the claims of the people of Murray Harbour and Belfast, for some share of the public money. I have merely asked for the improvement of their harbour, of their piers, and their breakwaters, and I must say, with very little result. But I will say that I have to thank the Minister of Public Works, who was kind enough, on my representation that a breakwater was absolutely necessary for the prosperity of the country, to grant it, and he has done something there which is a credit to the Government, and will be of great benefit to the island, and to the Dominion at large. Before it was built the people were leaving that section, on account of having no harbour and no facilities to ship their produce, and they were going away to the States, instead of remaining to till the land. Now, they have a fine harbour there, and when my hon. friend has completed the dredging, which he has promised will be done this year, or as soon as possible, this harbour will be a great benefit to the people of the island, and to the Dominion, because it will add to the revenue. Now, I want to say a few words about another matter. My hon. friend says that the Dominion of Canada owes to the island a large sum of money. There is no doubt about that, but I do not see, in the supplementary Estimates, that the island is going to get it, so that my hon. friend need not fear that a Conservative Government is going to handle it this year. He says that this Government owes the money, but he throws out a suggestion that this Government do not pay it to the Government of Prince Edward Island in a lump sum, but give it to them in public works. My hon. friend knows that that cannot be done. If there is an amount due to Prince Edward Island, that amount must be handed over to the Government of Prince Edward Island, to do with it as they think proper. Perhaps the Conservative party may be in power when it is granted them, and perhaps not. However, I think it is in rather bad taste for my hon, friend to cast a slur on the Government of Prince Edward Island in reference to that matter, and in the manner he has done. Now, I have a very able document in my hand entitled, "Correspondence respecting the establishment of steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada." The Government at that time was Liberal-Conservative, the leader of which was the Hon. W. W. Sullivan, since promoted to the bench, a position which he well fills, and in which he does his duty. Associated with him was the Hon. Donald Ferguson, now a member of the Senate, and also a Cabinet Minister.

There were also members of the local Government at that time the Hon. Mr. Prowse, now a member of the Senate, and the Hon. Mr. Arsenault, also a member of the Senate. These three gentlemen were members of the Liberal-Conservative Government of Prince Edward Island, they are now Senators of the Dominion, and one of them is a Cabinet Minister. Well, what do they say? I was looking over their statement, and I find that a resolution was passed unanimously by both branches of the legislature of Prince Edward Island, making a claim on the Dominion Government for the amount due. I will read it:

> The legislature submit that on every principle of justice this province should receive compensation in view of the immense loss and disadvantage which have accrued by reason of the failure of the general Government to provide the efficient and continuous communication guaranteed by the terms of confederation; and they, therefore, claim as due the present time——

This is over ten years ago.

> —the sum of $5,000,000, to which we consider this province is justly entitled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, both branches of the legislature of Prince Edward Island unanimously passed this resolution claiming $5,000,000 from the Government of Canada. They sent as delegates to Ottawa, the Hon. Mr. Ferguson, now a member of the Dominion Government, and the Hon. W. W. Sullivan, at that time leader of the Government of Prince Edward Island. They came to Ottawa, and put in their claim, but they met with no satisfactory result, and went back to the island. I find in looking over the records that they were appointed by a Minute of Council, which I will read:

> Council Chamber, 14th January, 1886.
>
> At a meeting of the Executive Council in Committee—
>
> Present: Hon. Messieurs Sullivan, Arsenault, McLeod, Ferguson, Lefurgey, Burns, Campbell, Prowse, Macdonald. * * *
>
> They further recommend that the Hon. W. W. Sutherland, Premier and Attorney General, and the Hon. Donald Ferguson, Provincial Secretary, do compose the said delegation; and the committee request that Your Honour will be pleased to inform His Excellency the Governor General of such an appointment, in order that the delegates may be provided with an introduction to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies; and that Your Honour will also be pleased to ask His Excellency the Governor General to inform the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies of the appointment of such delegation.

Those gentlemen proceeded to London; they had several interviews, and also some correspondence with the home Government and also with the Commissioner of Canada, and the trip cost the colony some money for the expenses of the delegates. But we have not obtained any satisfactory results in the shape of a payment of money; the Government of Canada have not recognized the claim made, they have not seen fit to allow the matter to be settled by arbitration or in any equitable manner, and the claim of $5,000,000 remains now as formerly. We have the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) supporting the Government, and we have Senator Ferguson, a member of the Cabinet, the latter having been a delegate to London, and they occupy favourable positions in which to press our claim. I hope the senator and the hon. member for King's will see that we obtain those five millions. They are in an excellent position to advocate the construction of the Southern Railway. Last winter in Prince Edward Island, when we considered we were on the eve of an election, there were, I suppose, twenty or thirty Liberal-Conservative meetings called in my riding of Queen's, and which Senator Ferguson was the leading spirit, and at which Senator Prowse and the hon. member for King's also took part. The principal object was to advocate the building of this projected road. This is the first movement I have seen made in either branch of the legislature towards pressing this matter on the Government. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) has brought it to the attention of the House, and I hope Senator Ferguson will also press the matter, and the Government will not treat it as it has treated other Island matters. There was the tunnel matter, which has been going on for four or five years, a few holes being bored now and then. I hope that if the Southern Railway is going to be built we will soon have a statement to that effect from the Government. The people do not want to be fooled. The people became so agitated after the holding of those meetings to which I have referred at which Senator Ferguson, a Cabinet Minister, was present, that they ground heir axes and were ready to cut the sleepers. Why, they said, we had a member of the Cabinet at the meeting, and we have practically got the road. At what other conclusion could they arrive when a member of the Government came to the meeting and sanctioned the agitation and the resolutions passed. The people, I repeat, do not want to be fooled any longer. If this road is not going to be built, the people will know who their friends are and who agitated for it five years ago, and also who on the eve of an election agitated the district for a scheme when the Government were not honest in their intentions to carry it out. If the assurances given by one member of the Government were honest, let the remainder of the Government back him up and declare that the Government will give the Island that road. The people want a fair and square answer to the question. Is the Government going to build the Southern Railway, or is their action simply to blind the people? Honesty is the best policy, and it is better for the Government to come forward and openly say what they

are going to do. I will not say anything at the present time about the tunnel question, because the holes are not bored, and I am afraid we will all be bored before they are bored. I second the motion of the hon. member for King's for the production of the papers, and I hope before the session closes the gentlemen will give some satisfactory assurance to their friends in the island and to my friends that they intend to see this work completed.

Mr. PERRY. Coming from that beautiful little island which lies in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, I beg the indulgence of the House while I say a few words on this question which affects its welfare, financially and especially as regards the comfort and accommodation of the people. No doubt the hon. member for King's has made a very good claim on behalf of the people of the eastern portion of the island. Surely the hon. member has had sufficient time to look after the interests of his constituents, and to gain courage to ask the Government to do a small measure of justice to our people. I observe that the date of the notice of motion is 22nd April last, and now we are on 17th June, an interval of nearly two months, and no doubt by this time he has a paper in his pocket signed by the Finance Minister instructing him what he can tell the people when he goes there for the next election—I hope it is something tangible and that the people can depend upon it. No doubt the Finance Minister has told him that another supplementary estimates will be brought down covering the sum required to build this road. However, the hon. member has not told the House how many miles he expects to get built, whether 60 or 160. I suppose he has told the Government privately. I suppose that Senator Ferguson, as a member of the Cabinet, knows how many miles are required. He was very busy with the hon. member for King's, when we were supposed to be on the eve of the elections, in February last. The Government in a moment of weakness, however, did not think it proper to hold the elections in March or April, and they have not yet held them. Therefore all the agitation and preparations have been futile, and the Government have done nothing. That the people have a claim for the construction of a southern branch is indisputable. They have a right to a railway, not as a claim for favours, but as a claim for what is due them. I am satisfied from what I know of that part of the country that it is prosperous, that it is well and thickly settled and has perhaps a more numerous population to the same extent of territory than prevails in any other part of the Dominion outside the suburbs of cities. I believe they can grow as much, and more farm produce than in any other part of the Dominion of Canada. It is also a very fine country for fishing and the shores of Belfast are swarming with fish. The peole are entitled to have that branch railway. They have waited for it for twenty years and the strange thing to me is that the scales never fall off the eyes of my hon. friend (Mr. McDonald) nor off the eyes of the Minister from Prince Edward Island who is now in the Cabinet, until the eve of the election in February last. Was it done for an election dodge ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. PERRY. No Tory will believe that but everybody else will believe it. We know that we must have an election within the next few months, and I suppose that is the reason this motion of my hon. friend has remained so long on the Order paper before he had the courage and the hardihood to bring the question before the House. Now, like my friend from Queen's (Mr. Welsh), I say : let us have no more humbugging. Let the Government tell us whether they are going to build that railway or not, and let them ascertain what length it will be. The people of Belfast are not the only people who are entitled to a branch of railway, but the people of New London and Rustico are entitled to one also. Three or four millions of dollars is the proportionate share of the people of Prince Edward Island for their taxes, on the amount expended for railways and canals in this country. What benefit is the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Welland Canal or the Sault Canal to the people of Prince Edward Island. An hon. gentleman here says "bore a hole." Well, I believe that somebody bored a hole in the Sault Canal and that it is now leaking. In 1885, I had the honour of a seat in the local parliament of Prince Edward Island, and abler men than my hon. friend from King's (Mr. McDonald) stated then, that Canada owed us $5,000,000 on account of the non-fulfilment of the terms of confederation with the island. My hon. friend (Mr. McDonald) says "Don't give it to the Liberal Government of Prince Edward Island, because they are not to be trusted with the money." They are thieves, he says. I cast back in his teeth that he cannot prove that the Liberal Government of Prince Edward Island has stolen money, but I can prove, and the country knows it, that under the administration of his friend, in the land office once under the care of a gentleman who holds a seat in the Senate and the Cabinet, $5,000,000 were stolen.

An hon. MEMBER. You are all wrong.

Mr. PERRY. It was $5,000.

An hon. MEMBER. Is that all ?

Mr. PERRY. Well, that was a lapsus linguae and my hon. friend is guilty of a good many of them if he knows what they mean. I can tell him that in 1879, when the government of which he was a supporter, and his brother, a member of the local

cabinet, took office, the Liberal treasurer handed over $49,000 to the Tory treasurer that came into power at that time. What took place after that. They used for three years the assessment tax passed by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), which they denounced and upon which they got into power, and they collected $72,000 out of that tax, and they collected $87,000 as a refund from the Dominion Government on account of the piers of Prince Edward Island, and they drew $200,000 from Ottawa, robbing the province of a revenue of $10,000 a year; they did all that, and then left the province in debt by $400,000. Is that a good record? Is that the party my hon. friends wants to entrust the money to? The hon. gentleman says the Liberal Government have sucked every drop of milk out of the land office. Well, dear knows the cow's bag was very small when the Liberals got into power, for the Conservatives stole all they could get out of it. Let my hon. friend, or any other man who represents the other side of politics, deny that if he dare. I hope that my hon. friend from King's (Mr. McDonald) will have better success with the Minister of Finance than I have had with him in relation to the tunnel. I hope he will be able to approach him in a moment of weakness, so weak that he will yield to his wishes. I would like to know now if the Minister of Finance has yet commenced boring holes in the straits. What is he doing down there? Let us have one job done first, and then we will look out for the others. We have been agitating the tunnel for the last twelve years, and let us get that under way. I would like to see that branch railway built, not for the personal accommodation of my hon. friend from King's (Mr. McDonald), or to give him strength to carry his election, because I think it would be only money wasted for that purpose, for I am sure he has no chance of coming back here. I would like to have the railway built for the benefit of a portion of his constituents who have to drag their products to market with carts or wagons, or sleighs, and perhaps some of them on their backs. They have to do that to pay the taxes which this Government has placed on their shoulders. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDonald) has not told us whether this branch railway would commence at South Port on the east side of Charlottetown harbour, and go through Belfast down to Murray harbour. He thought it would be well to build a railway from Emerald Junction on to Stanley, but he did not tell us about the other part. I know where Stanley is, and I doubt if my hon. friend does. Stanley is in West Queen's and would be something like twenty miles from Emerald Junction.

Mr. WELSH. Not so far I think.

Mr. PERRY. Well, it is fifteen miles anyway. I have been canvassing around there, and I generally measure the miles pretty well. If this line went from Stanley down to Rustico where the great breakwater is, then I would say that the people of Prince Edward Island would have fair inland railway accommodation. If we had that, together with the tunnel there would be something done for us. Now, we have had beautiful weather down there for the last two months and there have been no storms, and yet I am told that the Finance Minister has not even signed the contract nor done anything with regard to the boring. He should go on with it at once now. I have some hope that the Government of Canada assisted by Senator Ferguson from the island, who has a seat in the Cabinet, will certainly grant the request of the people in the island for this railway. We have had a delegation of three gentlemen here from the island. They were not fortunate enough to be members of Parliament and have free passes in their pockets like Senator Ferguson; and as they spent four or five days here, I suppose it cost them $100 apiece. They went home, and I would like to know what answer they took home in their pockets. I would like to know what the Finance Minister, and the Minister of Railways told them they might expect. We have not heard yet. Even the "Examiner," the mouthpiece of the Government in Prince Edward Island, which does not always stick to the truth, but often tells what is untrue, did not dare to say that the returning delegates had a word of comfort to tell the electors in regard to a branch railway for that part of the island. I know that my hon. friend himself does not expect the Government to build one. I know that he expects the Government to give some kind of a delusive answer that the people may believe. Unless the people are very wise, the Government will entrap them by making some kind of a promise that will probably never be carried out. But that is not what ought to be done. It would be a shame and a scandal to use the people in that way. Let the Government say at once: We will vote the money required to build a branch railway from Emerald Junction to Stanley and Rustico—that beautiful settlement containing a remnant of the expariated Acadians. Let them not wait until the eve of an election. Let them act in such a way that the country will not accuse them of trying to bribe the people by offering them something on the eve of an election. Now, Sir, I have shown that the Government, in granting a sum of money to build that railway, would only be granting what is due to the people of Prince Edward Island. The people are not coming here to beg; they are coming here to ask for rights; and the Government should look at the matter in that light. To do justice to the people of Prince Edward Island the Government should build branch lines to Belfast, Murray Harbour, Stanley, and Rus-

tico, and put the people of those places in the same position as other people in Canada. I hope the Government intend to do justice to those people; and let me tell them that they will only get the support of those people by doing justice to them. I contend that outside of the offices which are at the disposal of the Government, and which must be given to their friends and supporters, everybody, whether Conservative or Liberal, is entitled to justice at their hands; but I am sorry to say that this is not always given. My colleague and myself have often asked the Minister of Public Works to make certain grants for public works on the island; but we have asked in vain, while others, who support the Government, have only to wink at the hon. Minister, and they get what they require. The people of Belfast and Murray Harbour are a mixed people, including both Tories and Liberals. They are an industrious people; they do not spend thousands of dollars to hire cabs to take them from their homes to their offices; they do not ask the Government to pay them $20 a day for living expenses; they do not ask them to pay for men to blacken their boots, they blacken their own boots; they do not ask the Government to pay for their wines and champagnes. They are too poor for these things—why? Because they are ground down by taxation imposed by the Government of Canada, and are handicapped for the want of railway accommodation to take their produce to market. I have a word to say to the senators. There are four of them representing Prince Edward Island, who are friends and supporters of the present Government, and if this matter has not arisen from them, they have a right to take up the cudgels in the other Chamber, and advocate the rights of the people they represent. What are they there for? Are they there only to re-echo the decisions of the Government? Is there nothing for the senators to do but to look after divorce Bills? I think the tax-payers of this country are not getting the worth of the money they pay these senators. In return for the $1,000 a year they receive, they are, in duty bound, to look after the business of the country. Let me repeat that I have some little faith that the Government will yet do justice to the people of that part of the country.

Mr. YEO. I am sure if the Government and this House were not convinced before of the justice of the claims of Prince Edward Island, they must now be by the strong arguments which have been advanced by the hon. member for Queen's, the hon. member for King's and my hon. colleague. I am sorry I could not hear where the mover of the motion asked that the proposed line should be constructed. But I understand it is through Belfast and Murray Harbour districts; and I can endorse all he has said with regard to these districts. I feel convinced that if a railway line were constructed, it would afford very great accommodation to those districts, and it would also be a large feeder to the main line. I can say the same with regard to the line from Emerald to Stanley. That line would pass through a fine section of country, and would receive a large amount of local support. I may say there are other parts of Prince Edward Island equally in want of branch lines. A branch line to Malpecque, which is a long distance from the railway line, and is the best harbour on the north side of the island, would be a great accommodation to the people, and I believe would pay. For some years there has been talk of constructing a short branch from Summerside to Richmond Bay, and I hope when the Government are taking steps to construct the proposed line through Murray Harbour and Belfast districts, the claims of this line will not be lost sight of. The line would be only three or four miles long, and it would enable the fishermen, who now have to haul their fish by road from Richmond Bay to Summerside, to ship them by rail. There are large quantities of oysters, as well as other fish, shipped from Summerside. Such a line would also enable the people who live along the shores of the bay to convey, by rail, large quantities of produce which they are now obliged to haul by teams. I may also say that in the western part of the island the people have agitated for a long time for the construction of a branch from O'Leary to the west shore, connecting the west shore with the main line. My colleague and myself have time and again impressed on the Government the necessity of constructing wharfs and piers in this locality, but so far without success, so that while the people are twelve or fifteen miles from the railway they have no means of shipping by water. I think they have a very strong claim for the construction of a branch in that direction which would give connection with Richibucto and other parts of New Brunswick, and afford them great facilities in this way. I may say I was very sorry indeed to hear my hon. friend from King's (Mr. McDonald) speak of the local government in the way he did. In fact, I have never heard him speak in this House of the local government except in the way he has to-day. I would suggest to him that while evidently he does not like a Liberal Government anywhere, especially in Prince Edward Island, he would do better to leave local matters to be fought out in Prince Edward Island. I am sure it cannot be interesting to this House to have to listen to a discussion of our local affairs. But if he does undertake to censure our local government, I would at least ask him to do so in a fair way. He has said he would be very sorry to see the Dominion Government put any money into the hands of the

local government. He had not the same objection to make when his friends were in power. It was all right for them to draw $200,000 from the Federal Government and to receive payment for their local works, which they handed over to the Federal Government. I do not want to say anything for or against the local government, but I would ask my hon. friend to think for a moment who compose that Government, and let him say whether they do not compare very favourably in every way with their predecessors, and whether they are not men who have just as much interest in the welfare of the island. I am sorry, Sir, he allowed his feelings to overcome him and that he spoke of the local government in the way he did. There is one thing I do not like in this railway discussion. I do not like the idea of anything of this kind being brought up just previous to a general election. My idea is this should be taken up on its merits and not be held up to the people, without any idea on the part of the Government of carrying out the promise. Reference has been made to the tunnel which was promised Prince Edward Island before the last Dominion elections and which has been hanging between wind and water ever since. I am afraid it is likely to keep in that position. I would not like to see the same thing done with reference to the Prince Edward Island Railway. If the Government are sincere and intend doing anything in that line, I hope they will come out frankly and say so. I wish I could say the same thing with regard to the tunnel, concerning which their conduct so far has been anything but sincere. If they had wished to complete the boring at the straits, they could have done so long ago, but they have made a pretense of doing so from 1892 to the present, and it is still uncompleted. I hope the Government will act differently with regard to this measure. There can be no doubt as to the justice of the claim put forward by the hon. member for King's, and I really hope the Government will deal seriously with it and give us the assurance that they intend constructing branch lines. I hope they will deal out equal justice to all and not select one particular spot and leave the others to suffer all the inconveniences under which they labour at present.

Mr. HAGGART. I have a good deal of sympathy with the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) in his complaint that large sums have been expended constructing the Intercolonial, Canadian Pacific Railway, the canals, and other public works in different parts of the Dominion, and that while these may be regarded as works for the benefit of Canada at large, still this little island receives, not even indirectly, very much benefit. On that account he claimed that there should be a larger expenditure in Prince Edward Island in return for the larger contributory share which she pays for the public works of the Dominion. There is a good deal in that argument. There is a good deal in the statement that although the whole Dominion is interested in these works, several parts of it receive no more benefit than what Prince Edward Island does. The whole heart of the island seems to be set on having more expenditure on railways. The Government have had petitions from the two senators representing that island, and from our friends supporting the Government, Messrs. McLean and Macdonald, to have certain works constructed there. We have had petitions from several of the inhabitants and other sources advocating a scheme by which, although there would be a large expenditure on capital account by extending railways in different directions throughout the island, the amount charged to income would not be increased. I may state for the information of the House in what direction the petitions are. They are in favour of a line of railway :

	Miles.
From O'Leary Station, westward.....	8
do Summerside, northward	3
do Emerald do	7
do North Wiltshire Station, southward..	19
do Royalty Junction, northerly.....	9
do Harmony, eastward	8
do Southport, south-eastward	60
Total.....	105

The last branch is intended to be a line starting from Southport going towards Murray Harbour and branching off a part of the distance towards Montague Bridge, making connection with New Perth. I was so much impressed with the scheme of the hon. gentlemen and the petitions, that I ordered inquiries to be made as to the proper expense of building these lines, amounting in the aggregate to 105 miles. My officer made an estimate of the probable cost of the construction and equipment of these roads. Not having any instrumental survey of them, he was only acting upon his judgment as to the contour of the island. He is of opinion that these roads will not be very costly. His estimate is as follows :—

Forty-seven miles of the six short branches at $8,000 per mile.....	$ 376,000
Three locomotives at $9,000 each, and five combined passenger and baggage-cars at $5,000.....	52,000
Sixty miles of Southport Road, including engine-houses and rolling stock at $11,000	660,000
Total estimated cost.....	$1,088,000

Or say $1,100,000. With respect to what result may be realized from the operation of these roads by using to a great extent the present rolling stock, and the staff as far as practicable, the following is the estimate of cost of operating and of the earnings :—

COST OF OPERATING.

Forty-seven miles of the six small branches, say a train to double the road each day, equals 29,432 train miles at 47c.	$13,828 34
Snow-plough train, say 1,000 train miles per year at 47c.	470 00
Sixty miles of South Port line, one train each day each way, 37,460 train miles at 95c.	35,587 00
Snow-plough train, say 2,500 train miles at 90c.	2,250 00
Estimated cost of operating per year..	$52,135 34

EARNINGS.

Six short branches at $250 per mile of railway, 47 miles.	$11,750 00
South Port line at $750 per mile of railway, 60 miles.	45,000 00
Estimated earnings.	$56,750 00

SUMMARY.

Working expenses	$52,135 34
Earnings	56,750 00
Estimated probable amount.	$ 4,614 56

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does that include the bridge ?

Mr. HAGGART. No ; it does not include a bridge ; this is from Stanley. On the other hand there is $1,100,000 at, say, 3½ per cent, $38,500. Deducting that from the profit in operating, there would be a total loss of $33,886. So that the only loss to the country, if these lines were completed, would be a little less than the interest on the cost of construction. The question then comes in whether Prince Edward Island has had its share in the expenditure of public works or whether they are entitled to this expenditure on the part of the Dominion. Speaking for myself and not for the Government ; I will say that I am inclined to think that when the time came, perhaps we would be in a position to subsidize railways in different parts of the province, and I think Prince Edward Island should be entitled to some additional expenditure for the purpose of constructing these works which the people of the island think would be so much to their benefit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The estimates which the hon. gentleman read showing the cost of constructing a large number of railways in Prince Edward Island may be approximately correct ; I have not sufficient information to be able to judge as to that. I assume that they are correct. The hon. Minister was also kind enough to say that when the time came he would be in favour of subsidizing some railways in Prince Edward Island. But when is that time to come, does he think ? Has it come now, or will it come next session, or ten years hence ? Last winter the hon. gentleman's colleague went to Prince Edward Island and held meetings through this district. He was supported by one of his Senators, one of the hon. gentlemen who support the Government in the other end of this building. And, while the member of the Government was shrewd enough to hold his tongue, he was shrewd enough to get resolutions passed advocating the construction of the railroads. Without committing himself he led the meetings and the people generally to believe that he was in favour of each of them, and that he would have the influence to secure its construction. But when he was asked : Are you in a position to say that you will get one dollar for the construction of these roads ? his colleague came to the rescue in a long letter saying that those who asked such a question wanted a man to be guilty of perjury by breaking his oath as a member of the Cabinet, that the Council's deliberations were secret and could not be disclosed. Here were members of the Government going all over Canada promising public works to be built ; but when it came to the case of Prince Edward Island we were told : Don't you dare to ask whether the Government will propose a dollar for these works, for the member of the Government dare not express himself for fear of breaking his oath. This kind of humbug does very well among a certain class of people ; but the large mass of the people of Prince Edward Island are beginning to understand that an agitation for the construction of a public work immediately preceding an election is not likely to be genuine. Now, in this matter, for years past, before every election we have had the question of the tunnel dangled before the people's eyes. Millions would be expended on the island. People were asked not to sell their farms, because the brick-clay upon them would be used to make brick. But, to use a significant expression for a time monopolized by a politician down there, the tunnel scheme has been consigned long since to the tomb of all the Capulets. None now so poor as to do it reverence. But the gentlemen from Prince Edward Island who support the Government in the Senate—there are hardly any in this House—now laugh at the tunnel, and they tell the people they are going to give them railways. I fear that these petitions—if that was the purpose of those who engineered them—has pretty well squelched the railway project in Prince Edward Island. The idea of proposing a scheme for eight or ten branch railways ! Why it reduces the whole thing to a farce. The agitation in Prince Edward Island for years has been for the construction of one railway. These other branch roads were subsidiary ; they were hoped for in time but not immediately. The only question which these gentlemen would have devoted themselves to, had they been honestly anxious to extend the railroad accommodation in Prince Edward Island was the Belfast and Murray Harbour road, which would serve this large

section containing a fifth of the population of the island having no railroad accommodation at present. When the main road was built it was hoped that this section would have accommodation in the near future. That was the railway that everybody was thinking about, and the hon. Minister now gets up and reads a list of railway lines all over the island. And for what purpose? For the purpose of killing out this scheme for the construction of the railway from Belfast to Murray Harbour. Then he tells us he is favourably inclined to these projects when the time comes. But he has not said that that time has come or will ever come. Now at the close of the session we start without a promise of any kind from the Government. The hon. member for King's has been like one riding a baulky horse. He has had this resolution on the paper for two months. He used to mount his steed every Monday and Wednesday and bring him to the hurdle, but then his heart would fail, and he would get the Government to allow the motion to stand. But when my hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Welsh) put a resolution dealing with the same subject on the paper, the hon. member for King's found that he had either to take the hurdle or get off the horse. And so he has decided at last to make the jump. If the hon. gentleman desired to impress the House favourably with the scheme which he has proposed, he would have done well to leave local party politics out of it. What in the world has this House or this country to do with some local squabble in Prince Edward Island, and above all, what has this House or this country to do with some feeling that the hon. gentleman entertains against a distinguished lawyer who leads the Government in Prince Edward Island. I am in hopes that that gentleman will sit in this House some day; and he would be, I can assure the hon. gentleman an ornament to this or any other House in which he might sit. But the hon. gentleman knows that he did not display, at any rate, a great amount of moral courage in threshing poor Mr. Peters 1,000 miles away, for the manner in which he carries on the local government; nor did he show a disposition to further the subject-matter which he professed to further in this House. Now, I regret that the hon. gentleman, in the larger part of his speech, was so inaudible that nobody could tell what he was saying. Although I sit nearly midway between the Minister of Railways and himself, he only spoke loud enough to be heard when he began to denounce the local government of Prince Edward Island, and to express the hope that the honest claims of Prince Edward Island never would be conceded to that Government while they remained in power. Sir, I think his constituents, and others down in King's County will take a note of the hon. gentleman's patriotism, and they will discover how far his patriotism and his party feelings are coincident, and how far they diverge. We have claims, he says, but don't pay them while the Liberal Premier——

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I did not say that they should not give this money to the Liberal Government, I said that they should complete the public works first.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman distinctly said that he hoped they would not give the money which was due to the island, to the local government while the Liberal Premier was in power, but that they would squander it in public works, the construction of which he would suggest; and I suppose he would suggest, in order to kill the Belfast railway, the construction of eight or ten little branches all over the island. He knows that such a proposition coming from him is well calculated to destroy that which the people of the island have much at heart. If he were sincerely desirous of promoting the construction of that road he would have had the courage to stand up here and to say: the scheme which the hon. member for Queen's suggested in 1890-91 is not large enough, and I propose another scheme. But he does not tell us where the road is to run, he does not hint what his views are upon that subject. When I brought this question before the House in 1890, I thought it was desirable, to put this matter before the Government in a business-like way. I had some consultation with a number of engineers, and I was assured by them that a branch line from Peak's Station might be built which would give the necessary accommodation and do away with the necessity of a bridge across the Hillsboro', which would cost half a million of money. I thought that line could be adopted, and the amount which would be asked for would not be a quarter of a million of money, or anything like it. But the people at large, being led by the politicians to suppose that they can get the larger road, are in favour of the larger road, and I need not say that if such a road can be obtained, it will have my hearty support from the word go. The people there have a right to it, I think. Now, I think myself that even if the construction of this road were asked upon the same grounds as the construction of other roads in different parts of the Dominion, that the Parliament of Canada would be slow to grant it. I think, just now, in view of the financial stringency of the country, with the enormous deficits we have to meet, that Parliament would be very slow to grant a large sum of money for the construction of the railway. We know that the Government have already announced their general policy to be not to subsidize or construct any public work during the present year; there are to be no railway subsidies asked for, and no sums voted for the construction of Government roads. We have not had the official announcement with respect to the

railway popularly known as the Hudson Bay, but I believe the general feeling existing in this House is that the Government have determined not to proceed with the construction of that road. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Boyd) shakes his head. Well, I frankly say I hope he is wrong, I hope the Government have made up their mind not to proceed with the construction of that road. I say that a proposition to expend two and a half millions in the construction of that road at the present time would be absolutely indefensible, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will find very many of the business men in this House, who are in touch with their constituents, who will venture to endorse that project if it is brought down. However, I want to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and the leader of the House to the fact that the construction of this road—and I decline to discuss the others at present—the construction of the Southern Railway through the districts of Belfast and Murray Harbour, does not stand on the same ground on which the House is asked to construct roads elsewhere. The question is rather one of plighted faith; the question is, whether Prince Edward Island and the Dominion did not make a bargain, one of the terms of which necessarily implies giving to the island, at the present time, and under present circumstances, a larger amount of public money than it is getting now. Hon. gentlemen will remember that when Prince Edward Island come into the Dominion, she came in on certain terms of union, one of which expressly stated that the Government had obtained authority to expend a certain sum of money in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway; and it was upon the basis of the money which was then authorized to be spent in the construction of these two great public works, that the amount allotted to Prince Edward Island, was largely, although not altogether, given. Now, if that is so, it comes down largely to a question of plighted faith and a question of contract. The construction of the road, therefore, in Prince Edward Island, would not altogether depend upon the fact that a stringency exists in the finances of Canada, or that we cannot build roads elsewhere. The question is, Have the people not got a right, a vested right, to the expenditure, if not in that form, then in some other form?—and I think this is the form which, at any rate, commends itself to the vast mass of the people of Prince Edward Island. Now, my hon. friend may have said—I did not hear all that he said, for he was perfectly inaudible where I sit—I dare say he may have said that they were authorized to expend an amount of money varying from forty-four to forty-five million dollars in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Intercolonial Railway, and the canals, and the financial terms made between the island and the Dominion were agreed to upon that basis. Now, the islanders say very fairly that that agreement has not been complied with. They do not complain that the development of the Dominion has necessitated the expenditure of larger amounts of money than were contemplated at the time of union; they are raising no cry against that. They do not complain of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the development and opening up of the North-west Territories; they do not complain even that the adjacent island of Cape Breton has had a railway constructed from one end of it to the other, and that the Eastern Extension road has been bought and paid for by the Government here. They are not raising these complaints at present, but they say: Inasmuch as you induced us to come into the confederation, representing explicitly that you were only authorized to spend 44 or 45 millions upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, upon the Intercolonial Railway, and upon your canals, and we came in upon that basis, if you have reorganized the whole basis upon which we came in, and if, instead of spending 44 or 45 millions you have spent 90 or 100 millions, as the case may be—I am using arbitrary figures—then surely that gives a claim, a contractural claim to compensation on the part of the island, which no honest man dare ignore. So that the question that meets us just upon the threshold of this inquiry is a question of figures, a question of facts—how much, if any, more than the sum that was originally contemplated, has been spent by the Dominion of Canada upon these three or four objects, namely, canals, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway? Now, I find by the Railway Report, page 27, that the Government expended on railways, on capital account, to the end of 1894, including 25 millions given to the Canadian Pacific Railway—and I put that on the same line as capital account,—the sum of $122,373,000. That expenditure embraces for the Intercolonial Railway, $47,500,000—I am speaking now in round figures. Then there are: Eastern Extension Railway, $1,324,042; Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, $1,945,497; Montreal and European Short Line Railway, $333,942; Cape Breton Railway, $3,859,884; Carleton Branch Railway, $88,410—which I think has been partly returned—Prince Edward Island Railway, $3,750,565; Canadian Pacific Railway, built by Government, $30,964,954; other expenditure on Canadian Pacific Railway surveys, explorations, telegraph lines, &c., $6,639,581; Annapolis and Digby Railway, $618,655. These items make a total of $97,077,014, to which must be added $25,000,000 as a subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway, making a total of $122,000,000. At the time Prince Edward Island came into confederation there had been expended of this amount $30,707,000, and it was estimated there would be spent $35,000,000 on railways. Those items make

$65,707,000, as an amount contemplated to be spent for great public works of interprovincial importance, which the people of the island were told it was the policy of the Government to construct, and which would involve in their construction the amounts I have mentioned. That was agreed upon, and no complaint was made. But we find there has been spent over and above the $30,000,000, which had been expended in 1873, and the $35,000,000 then contemplated to be expended, a sum amounting to $56,666,000. Well, there is no hon. member who agrees with me on the point at which I started out as to the construction of the terms of union, but must at once admit that if we made the terms of union on a certain basis and that basis has been entirely departed from and $56,000,000 expended more than was contemplated, the people of Prince Edward Island have an undoubted claim, which this Government cannot ignore. Then the expenditure of $56,000,000 was not all. In 1873 when we came into confederation, there had been expended on canals $21,266,574. There was authorized and estimated a further expenditure of $9,000,000, making a total amount of $30,266,574. While the additional amount agreed to be expended and the amount then actually expended were together $30,266,574, no less a sum than $62,237,296 has been expended up to the end of 1894, or $32,970,722 more than was contemplated at the time Prince Edward Island entered confederation, or the Government had authority to spend at the time it entered into terms of union with the island. What does that railway and canal expenditure represent? In round figures there was an over expenditure on railways and canals beyond what was authorized and estimated at confederation, of $90,000,000. The thing is as plain as a pike staff, and affords further proof of the right of the island to receive compensation. If the island was benefited by the expenditure on these great public works there would be something to be said on the other side, but every one knows that so far as regards the island, justifiable as this expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the canal system may be from a national standpoint, tht province receives little if any appreciable benefit from the expenditure, and never will. I have spoken so far of the actual expenditure on Government railways and Government canals; but everybody knows that in 1873 the policy of subsidizing railways throughout the Dominion was not entered upon, that in 1882, when Sir Charles Tupper brought down the new policy of subsidizing private roads to be constructed in different parts of Canada, not a dollar had been spent on those private company roads. Such a policy was not contemplated when the island came into confederation. We have the fact, as shown by a return brought down in 1891, that we had granted up to that time—I have moved for a return supplementary to this to bring the expenditure down to the present year, and hoped to have had it for this debate but I have not secured it—in railway subsidies no less than $23,971,491, and up to 1891 we had actually paid out $12,243,000 of that amount. There has been expended, up to the end of 1894, in rough figures, $25,000,000 in subsidies to railways, some of them desirable, defensible and justifiable, while others may not be; but as a fact the Dominion Government have never granted a subsidy for the construction of a railway in Prince Edward Island. I find in the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals for the preceding year that out of the subsidies granted there has been paid in cash on account of them $16,000,000. I say nothing of the subsidies granted in lands, rails and loans to different companies throughout the Dominion. I prefer not to complicate the account with any of those questions, because I am desirous that those who care to look into this question shall have it presented to them in as bold and bald a form as possible, without complicating it with side issues. Leaving out the subsidies on lands, rails and loans we have $16,026,300 already paid in subsidies, and there is a large amount to pay still. What have we still to pay? The liabilities on account of railway subsidies are $8,749,271, of which every dollar will have to be met. There is a balance on the Atlantic and North-western Railway of $2,700,000, and $6,000,000 has yet to be expended on the St. Lawrence canals, of which the House was officially informed the other day; these items making a total of $17,449,271. Adding this amount to $16,026,300, cash payments already made, gives a total of $33,465,571, as representing the railway and canal subsidies since the time of which I have spoken. I am not going to complicate this matter with the Hudson Bay Railway, the Chignecto Marine Railway, and the Trent Valley Canal—I have left them out purposely. Summarizing briefly what I have stated, the account of the island would stand in this way: The Dominion has expended on railways and canals beyond what it told the Island Government it would expend when it entered into the terms of union, 90,000,000; the Dominion Government has expended on railway subsidies $16,000,000, which was not taken into account at that time, and then there is railway and canal expenditure for which the Dominion has become liable of $17,500,000, making a total of $123,500,000. What have our people, numbering 110,000, to do with that expenditure? Practically they pay one-fortieth of the burden, which will amount to $3,000,000 odd. It may be asked, has not the Dominion Government done anything for the island? Certainly it has. Its claims so reasonable and palpable could not be resisted, and as

a matter of fact there has been an expenditure on the Island Railway, including that to carry the branch line down to Cape Traverse of $635,000 since we came into confederation, and in 1887, $500,000 were allowed on account of the island's claim; these amounts aggregate $1,135,000, which it has received out of $3,000,000 to which it is entitled. So the account would stand to-day if it were made up as between John Smith and John Brown, and these parties had entered into a union, so that one of the parties representing the island would have about $2,000,000 to his account. I want to put before the House the question as to what amount is fairly due to the island. It must be remembered that we were compelled to build our own railway at a cost of $3,200,000. You built railways down in Nova Scotia for the people. There was the Eastern Extension Railway at a cost of $1,324,042; there was the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, at a cost of $1,945,497; there was the Cape Breton Railway, at a cost of $3,859,884, and there was the Annapolis and Digby Railway, at a cost of $618,655. That was a total of $7,748,078 which were spent in constructing railways right within sight of the people of Prince Edward Island; and when they stand there and say: We have had to pay every dollar for our own railway, and the people across the strait in the Island of Cape Breton and the adjoining counties have had their railways built for them, I say it presents itself to the people of Prince Edward Island as an intolerable injustice, which rankles in their breasts. I submit to the House, Mr. Speaker, that this matter was recognized by this present Government. When Sir Charles Tupper was Minister in 1887, in moving to increase the subsidies to Prince Edward Island, he said:

> The attention of the Government was called to the fact, that in the arrangement for the admission of Prince Edward Island into the union, they were not in a position to derive the same advantages from the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway as the other portions of the Dominion which were in the mainland, and which were in immediate railway connection with these lands. The question was raised, that as the expenditure on both these railways was so greatly in excess of what was estimated at the time the Island was brought into the union, they ought to receive some corresponding consideration on that account. Then, there was the further question, that Parliament had adopted the policy of subsidizing lines of railway in the other provinces, that in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick there had been considerable expenditures in connection with the construction of railways, and the Island had not received any corresponding advantage. No subsidies had been granted for the construction of railways in Prince Edward Island, and on these two grounds it was claimed there should be additional consideration given to the island.

I have just one word to add, Sir, before it is six o'clock. The principle laid down by Sir Charles Tupper, in 1887, is what I ask the House to adopt. That principle is based upon justice, and it must be carried out to the extent of giving fair play to the people of Prince Edward Island. I pointed out to the hon. gentleman at the time, that adopting these two principles, Prince Edward Island was entitled to a compensating sum for the over-expenditure which had been incurred by the Dominion in every province, since confederation, and that there would be a million dollars, at least, to put to the credit of the Island, instead of half a million dollars. I said then: You are only postponing the day, because every representative of the Island must make the demand, for the demand is fair and just, and the terms of union show the people are entitled to it. I submit that while every province in the Domoinion has received millions in railway expenditure, that the basis on which Prince Edward Island came into the union was that which I have read here, and you have spent $122,000,000 since, and we are entitled to somewhat of a proportionate part. I do not think the thing ought to be figured down to a dollar, nor is there any disposition to ask that to be done. I say that on reasonable grounds, this Dominion should pay $1,000,000, at least, for railway construction in Prince Edward Island, and then, even that would not give the Island the fair share of expenditure which she is entitled to.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh), I have a few words to address to the House. In the course of his remarks the hon. gentleman said, that the Hon. Senator Ferguson had held twenty or thirty meetings in his riding, and promised the Belfast Railway; but the hon. the senior member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said, that Mr. Ferguson was too astute a man to promise a railway. He told us that Senator Ferguson had held his peace, and that others advocated and encouraged the people to pass resolutions in favour of that road. The fact is, Sir, that the people do not want any one to push them on to an advocacy of railways because they are in favour of it themselves, and the requirements of their district demand it. Mr. Ferguson was asked as a member of the Government to address these meetings on the public questions of the day, and at these meetings resolutions were passed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. (Davies) told us to-day, that it was improper to promise railways right before an election. Now, Sir, with reference to that, I may say that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) held a meeting in Murray Harbour, South, in the month of March last, which was addressed by himself, which was entirely a Liberal meeting, and at which

the following resolution was passed. I quote from the organ of the hon. gentleman, "The Patriot" newspaper, of 14th March, 1895:

The following resolution was moved by John E. Winsloe, seconded by Henry Brehaut, sen.:—

Whereas, there have been large expenditures of public money in the other provinces of the Dominion for railways and canals, in order to develop the commerce of the Dominion and to open up the North-west for settlers;

And whereas, the people of Belfast and Murray Harbour are badly in need of a branch railway to these important agricultural districts, in order to make it possible for them to ship their produce without so much inconvenience to themselves as at present exists.

And whereas, we are justly entitled to a proportionate share of the money expended in public works, and in view of the fact that the people of these districts are so seriously handicapped in trade, in travel under existing circumstances;

Therefore, resolved, that this meeting earnestly solicit the Hon. L. H. Davies and his colleagues in Parliament to urge upon the Government the necessity of this very desirable work, viz.: a branch road from Southport through Belfast to the deep water terminus at Murray Harbour South, thence to the main line, connecting at or near Cardigan.

We therefore see that while the hon. gentleman says it is improper to advocate the construction of a railway before an election, yet at a meeting of his own party, at which he was present, that resolution was adopted advocating a road. I might further add that at a meeting held in Caledonia just previous to the last election at which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was present, he advocated a railway and promised to support a railway if he was returned. But although he made the promise at that time, the hon. gentleman, so far as I know, has never opened his mouth on the railway question in Parliament until now, when I brought forward this resolution.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are walls of adamant against me, I had no chance.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Now, the hon. members representing the county of Prince (Mr. Perry and Mr. Yeo) advocated the construction of branch railways to Richmond Bay, Malpecque, Stanley, Rustico, Cape Wolfe, Elmira and Belfast; but the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said it was trifling with the Belfast Railway to advocate six or eight other branches. In saying this the hon. gentleman was pitching into his own friends. At the same time, he claimed that there was $2,000,000 due to the people of Prince Edward Island from the over expenditure that had taken place on public works of Canada that were not contemplated in 1873. Yet he thinks it is trifling with the Belfast Railway to advocate a number of other small branches that would not cost altogether more than $1,100,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From what the Minister said, that estimate does not include a bridge. I may remark that the railway from Southport to Murray Harbour would be useless without the construction of a bridge, and the cost of constructing a railway and foot passenger bridge would not cost over half a million. Without this the railway would be a mockery, a delusion and a snare.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) We will take the railway if we can get it, at any rate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Without the bridges? Very well, that is your policy.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's P.E.I.) The hon. member for Queen's also asked why the tunnel was not being advocated. Well, Sir, I suppose one reason is that the hon. member for Queen's almost frightened the people out of the idea of a tunnel by the exaggerated statements he put before the House with respect to its cost. The hon. gentleman set himself up as an engineer against Sir Douglas Fox and others, who estimated the cost of the tunnel at a moderate sum, while the hon. gentleman put up the cost to about $20,000,000. That was enough to frighten the people from advocating that work. Yet the hon. gentleman and his leader are as much committed to the tunnel as the hon. members on the Government side of the House. The hon. leader of the Opposition addressed the following letter to the editor of the "Guardian," in which paper it was printed:—

Dear Sir,—I have your favour of the 2nd February, instant. I hardly would have thought that an expression of opinion as to the construction of a tunnel to connect the Island of Prince Edward with the mainland should be required from me. Every man who has given any attention to the condition of things and the necessities involved by the entering of the Island into confederation, must admit that such a tunnel must be constructed, if the thing is reasonably practicable. The first requisite is to have an accurate survey and reliable estimates. I am only sorry that these were not obtained long ago.

W. LAURIER.

The Government, as we know, have placed a sum in the Estimates to test the practicability of that scheme. Borings have been conducted with more or less regularity, and with all possibile speed, so far as I can understand. Those that were more easily executed were carried out in the first season. In the next year the work was placed in other hands, and the borings, being in much deeper water, were not carried on. The contractor, however, has not received any payment for these borings, and he will not receive payment until he has completed them; so that there is no doubt that his attention will be given to the work at as early a day as possible. Now, Sir, with regard to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways, I am pleased to see that he has taken the trouble to get his officers to make an estimate of the cost of the proposed lines of railway. I am pleased also to see that his estimate of the results of the construction of these branches

is favourable as to the revenues to be derived; and although I am not an engineer, yet I am led to believe that they would show even better results than he estimates. I will with every confidence leave the matter in the hands of the Government, hoping trusting and believing that they will see that justice is done to the people of Prince Edward Island.

Motion agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. FLINT moved:

That in the opinion of this House, the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors in Canada, except for sacramental, scientific, manufacturing and medicinal purposes, should be prohibited by law.

He said: I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to occupy the time of the House at any great length this evening, in the observations I propose to make upon this subject. It is an important subject, viewed from any standpoint—important in its relation to the pecuniary interests of the people, to the good order of the state and the morals of the community, and to all other matters in which the interests of the state are to a greater or less degree bound up. The question how best to diminish the admitted evils connected with the traffic in intoxicating liquors has occupied the attention of every Parliament that has existed in Canada almost from the beginning down to the present time. Of course, in the early history of the country, before temperance principles as they are now generally recognized were encouraged by organized institutions, such as churches and temperance societies, and before the principle of prohibition itself was established as a political principle worthy of advocacy, the efforts of society through the legislature were directed towards diminishing the opportunities for the sale of intoxicating liquors. Consequently, those who have looked over the history of legislation on this subject will have seen that Parliament has always been engaged, wherever it had jurisdiction, in striving to minimise the evils of intemperance and the evils connected with the liquor traffic, by diminishing the opportunities for traffic. Side by side with this there has of course gone on, as an admittedly important part of the movement, the moral education of the people, particularly the young people, in the principles of total abstinence. If every person were a total abstainer, then legislation to any degree whatever would be unnecessary. But, unfortunately, in spite of the advances of society in that regard, a large proportion of the people have not been able to overcome the temptation to indulge in intoxicating liquors; and another large portion of the people, who handle considerable amounts of capital, have felt it to be to their interest to cater to that depraved taste. Consequently there has grown up a strong power in every province of the Dominion, strong in its material resources, strong in its claims and demands upon the sympathy of those who are connected with it, antagonistic to the moral education of the people in the principles I have alluded to, and to any legislative action whatever which looks towards the reduction of opportunities for the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. It would be unwise to occupy the time of the House with quotations from writings and speeches of leading men in religious, educational, philosophic or political life in Canada or elsewhere, dealing with the different phases of this question. They have been brought before Parliament almost every session since the inauguration of the Dominion, and have been enforced in very many able, earnest, and elaborate addresses, delivered to this House, or its predecessors, somewhat in the line of this resolution before you.

That the question has taken a deep hold upon the foremost minds of the Dominion I need scarcely add. I might read a few words from the lips of our late Premier, of whose ability we were all proud, and to whom many tributes, and just tributes, were paid recently on the occasion of his sudden decease—a man careful, as a rule, in his utterances, and not supposed to be moved by any of those notions which those who are opposed to prohibition might call fanatical. I allude to the Right Hon. Sir John Thompson. A friend handed me a report of an address delivered by him in Owen Sound, in October, 1893. In the course of a political address at that place, he was asked by members of the audience, his views upon the subject of prohibition, and as many hon. members in this House have not probably, at any time, had the opportunity of hearing the views of that distinguished man upon that particular subject, I will read an extract from his speech on that occasion. In answering a question, he said:

The report of the commission will certainly be demanded by the Government before the opening of the session so as to be ready for Parliament. (Cheers.) The point I cannot be explicit upon is, what I shall do upon the report of that commission, and what evidence the commission will report to the House of Parliament. I cannot do it, because I have not at this moment the slightest idea what the report will be, or even the nature of the evidence which these gentlemen have collected. I have seen scraps in the papers, but it is the first duty of every public man to inform himself of the contents of the report, of the evidence on which that report will be based, before he even makes up his own mind as to what his duty may be with regard to it. (Hear, hear.) The first question which has been asked me is this: "Are you in sympathy with the prohibition movement?" I declare I am in sympathy with it, inasmuch as it is a move for the furthering of temperance in this country, and to remedying the evils which the temperance community are endeavouring to abate in this country, and if prohibition can be adopted and enforced in this country, I am in sympathy with that movement. (Cheers.)

The rest of the hon. gentleman's address was taken up with allusions to the constitutional controversy which is now going on, and in regard to which, I may say, he stated, in the strongest possible terms, that, in his judgment, the Dominion Parliament had jurisdiction to pass a prohibitory law. That being the opinion of the latest leading statesman of this country, I think it is well worth the attention of all those hon. members who may have doubts as to the propriety of the action which this resolution invites. We have here the statement of one of the deepest thinkers of the Conservative party, one who felt the responsibility of his position, and this statement, though not in the identical terms or to the full extent of this resolution, is in accord with the principle underlying it. In other words, he believed the principle of legal prohibition to be a sound one, holding his mind in suspense upon only one or two points which all prohibitionists consider matters of detail. Going back over the history of the question, as it has been presented by Parliament from time to time, we find the strongest declarations from other men of high political position, or who held high political positions at the time. In 1877, the present Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, Sir John Schultz, stated in this House that:

> While it was true that he did not belong to any temperance organization, yet he would always remember with pleasure that the North-west Council, of which he had the honour to be a member, had passed, early in its existence, the first prohibitory law in Canada, and the result has been that in over one-half of the Dominion the manufacture and sale of liquor had been prohibited, and with effects so good that he would like to see the experiment tried in the other half.

Now, I am aware that the result of the application of the prohibitory liquor law in the North-west has been a failure. The efforts made by those who, like Governor Schultz, believe in prohibition, and saw good results derived from it while it was in operation—unfortunately, those same persons were pained to see the law evaded and weakened, and finally overborne by the influence of those to whom I have already alluded as the friends of the liquor traffic. To whatever extent prohibition was a failure in the North-west, it became a failure because the law was not enforced, because those whose duty it was to enforce the law permitted infractions and violations of the spirit of the law. One of the most important infractions of the spirit of the law was the permission to use permits for the introduction of liquor into the territory. That was probably started with the design of accomplishing that exception which, in the resolution before the House, refers to sacramental, scientific, and medicinal purposes, but it was carried so far in the North-west Territories that practically it rendered nugatory the intention of the law itself. At any rate, we have here a very strong, useful expression of opinion, showing that the law worked satisfactorily and that the benefits were apparent to all who had an opportunity of observing its working in the North-west. The subject received, in the Senate, an equally strong endorsement from the committee appointed in the Senate to consider this question. In 1875, the committee of the Senate reported that:

> In view of the facts recited, it seemed just and reasonable that the prayer of the petition should be granted.
>
> And that the time has now arrived when the attention of the Government should be given to this important question, with a view to the introduction of a Bill to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for mechanical and medicinal purposes throughout the Dominion at the earliest date compatible with the public interest.

Later the matter was brought before the House by the present Finance Minister, and, in a speech which is often quoted, expressed to the fullest limit the views of the ultra-prohibitionists. Among the sentences that might be selected from that speech, I have made one or two selections, in order to show that at that time—and I see no reason to believe that his views have changed—the present Finance Minister held views upon this question as strong as those expressed by the Dominion Alliance or any other organization in this country pledged to the advocacy of this movement. After referring to the large expenditure of the country for intoxicating liquors, which expenditure, he contended, was an absolute waste and worse than waste of the wealth and resources of the country, he said:

> I am within the mark when I say that the evils resulting from the liquor traffic in the Dominion have done more to retard the prosperity of the country and to sow the germs of disorder and discontent than any other probably with which this country is afflicted.

Later on, he said:

> We legislate to keep up the distillery, to keep up the brewery, to keep up the liquor shops of our country, which employ altogether some 11,000 or 12,000 persons. Now, there is another class in this country, and that is the 4,400,000 and over who do not make and sell liquor. The legislation we have at present is in favour of the 11,000, but against the interests of the 4,400,000. By the legislation I propose the good of the greater number is sought, and, if it is admitted that the good of the greatest number ought to prevail, then the interests of the smaller number ought to go down.

I think these sentences convey, in a few words, the sound economic doctrine upon which this legislation is based, and that is, that, even although the minority may be temporarily compelled by the state to make some sacrifice, yet, if that sacrifice is necessary in the interests of the community, the minority must endure it; and it is the duty of the state, as representing the people of the country at large, to demand that sacrifice. I am not attempting to quote all or any considerable number of the statements

or resolutions that have been passed by the House or brought before the House, but merely to select here and there what I consider to be of a representative character. In 1874, on the report of a commission, which was appointed some time previously, you yourself, Mr. Speaker, moved a resolution in these strong terms:

> That the traffic in intoxicating liquors is an evil for which the laws of the country provide no adequate remedy, and that it is desirable to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for medicinal and manufacturing purposes.

This resolution was discussed in the House with a great deal of earnestness, and amendments moved. But, for reasons which do not appear on the face of "Hansard," the motion did not come to a vote. It expressed the views you held at that time, Mr. Speaker, and I have no reason to doubt that it expresses the views you still hold upon this question. In a subsequent session the House referred a proposed resolution on this subject to a committee. And that committee (a Committee of the whole House) agreed that the most effective remedy for the evils of the liquor traffic was to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors. This was not adopted by the House, unfortunately, but by a committee of the House; and as it stands, it is, perhaps, as near a declaration on the subject as the House has ever reached. Unfortunately, on almost all occasions when the matter has been before the House it has been very difficult—in fact, it has been impossible—to induce Parliament to come to a straight resolution as to whether the prohibition of the liquor traffic was advisable or not. Hon. members representing various views, members who were afraid—who, although personally favourable to the principles of prohibition, were afraid the country would not support them—managed to induce the House to come to resolutions which did not speak upon the main question itself. Of course, the enormous evils of the liquor traffic are assumed as the basis of our argument. These have been demonstrated. They are admitted. The great questions which are now discussed are as to the competency of Parliament in some respects; as to the preparedness of the people to support such legislation; as to the difficulty of meeting the revenue requirements if the revenue from this source were taken away; and as to the collateral question as to compensation to those whose business may be destroyed in consequence of the enactment of such a law, and matters of that kind. I do not propose, in the short time I have allowed myself, to deal at any length with any of these subjects, but only to deal in a general way with one or two of them. The revenue question has always been treated, by our Finance Minister at any rate, as one of comparative unimportance. Those who are afraid of prohibition, or who object to prohibition, with greater or less sincerity, professed to fear that the revenue would suffer so severely as to make it a choice of evils. As I say, those who have been responsible for the financial administration of the country have always intimated that they looked upon that objection as one of trifling moment. Sir Alexander T. Galt, speaking upon this subject at Sherbrooke, said:

> After having a good deal to do with the question of revenue and the raising of taxation, I am quite prepared to assert before this audience tonight, that the Finance Minister who should succeed, by prohibiting the traffic in intoxicating liquors, in restoring $16,000,000 now lost to the people of this country, and wholly wasted—the Finance Minister who should succeed in doing that, and should also save the indirect loss that arises from the injury that is done to society by it—I say he will have no difficulty whatever in raising the sum of money which appears in the first instance to be lost to the revenue. There can be no doubt whatever about it.

Another Finance Minister, one held in high regard by hon. members, particularly on the other side of the House, and held in high regard throughout the country generally on account of his stand upon the liquor question for the first twenty or thirty years (Sir S. L. Tilley), speaking in London, is reported to have made this statement:

> It has been my misfortune, or fortune, having been a great many years in the Government of my native province of New Brunswick, and in the Government of the Dominion, to hold the post of Finance Minister in all these governments, and I have never heard but one opinion about the revenue question, namely, that it is of quite secondary importance, though it is, I admit, a more difficult thing with you. The revenue that we obtain in the Dominion of Canada is probably five or six millions of dollars a year, and it cost $20,000,000 to provide it for us. No Finance Minister would remain in office who would, in this day, propose a scheme for raising a revenue of $5,000,000 that would cost $20,000,000 to collect.

The figures of revenue and cost are somewhat changed from those of the year in which this speech was made, but the principle remains the same. The present Finance Minister, speaking on this question and referring to the speech I have just quoted, said:

> I do not believe that there are a great many people in this country who would not be prepared for the statement that the hon. Minister of Finance then made. There are not a great many people in this country who would not fully understand that, although direct receipts from this traffic would certainly be expunged from our revenue, still the improvement in the general commerce of the country, the improvement in the general welfare and well-being of our community would be so great that the receipts in all other branches of our revenue would be increased correspondingly, and there would, practically, after the first year or so, not be any diminution whatever in our revenue from our taxpayers.

This, then, sums up far more completely than I would be able to do, the whole situation as regards revenue. The direct loss to the people is estimated by the most conservative valuators at from 32 to 35 millions per

annum. The revenue from this source is about 7 millions per annum. But the enormous indirect loss has been calculated at from 135 to 140 million dollars per annum. Certainly, if any considerable portion of this could be saved to the people by the enactment and enforcement of a prohibitory measure, the small amount of revenue the country receives could be, in the language of this hon. gentleman, easily dispensed with. I have here a quotation from another eminent statesman in the same line as the one I have just read. Speaking in the legislature of Ontario, the present Chief Justice Meredith, referring to this matter, said :

> You recollect that in 1893 a Bill was introduced by Mr. Marter, a member of the Opposition, which proposed to abolish the sale by retail of intoxicating liquors throughout the province. That proposition was made when it was doubtful whether the Government had the power, and the Government said that it would be unwise to do anything until the question of jurisdiction was determined, and they proposed a vote of the people as to whether prohibition of the liquor traffic should be enacted.
>
> Pending action looking to the ultimate determination of the jurisdiction, a vote was taken, a considerable majority favouring prohibition, and as a public man, I deem it my duty and the duty of every one to bow to the voice of the people, when the majority of the people are determined.
>
> I say it is the duty of the legislature to do this; that, when it shall have been determined where the jurisdiction rests to deal with this question, it will be the duty of the Government in power in Ontario to bring in a Bill looking to the carrying into effect of prohibition.

In other words, that hon. gentleman was favourable to the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law, provided the people of the province expressed in an unmistakable manner their sympathy with the movement. This question was discussed in the various local legislatures, and all, I believe, except Quebec, asked the opinion of the people upon that point, and without any exception those opinions were given in favour of a prohibitory liquor law. I know of no other way except one in which the opinion of the people could be given upon that subject, and that way of course is the more familiar one of electing representatives to this House, or to the legislature which they ask to discuss the measure, favourable to its promotion. There are these two principles, the one of allowing each candidate before the people to express his views upon the matter, and to receive support from the people accordingly as they are in sympathy with his views, relying upon his action in Parliament to represent those views ; the other way is that of taking a direct plebiscite of the people. Now, we have never been able to ascertain to what extent the prohibition sentiment is reflected in this Parliament, but we have had abundant opportunity of knowing how prohibition sentiment is reflected among the people of all the provinces, except the province of Quebec ; and I need hardly say, in face of the figures with which the House is familiar, that that verdict was uncompromisingly strong in favour of prohibition, and that so far as the opportunity of realizing the sentiments of the people is concerned, the House has every encouragement to go forward and express its opinion in accord with the opinion of the people of those provinces. As to the feeling of the people of Quebec, we, of course, are not fully informed ; but all the opportunities that I have had of looking into the state of public opinion in that province, lead me to believe that there is a strong feeling there favourable to as complete a suppression of the liquor traffic as legislation can possibly effect. At any rate, some of the profoundest minds of the church to which the majority of the people of Quebec belong, have expressed themselves strongly in favour of the suppression of the liquor traffic by every moral and legal means within the power of the state to employ. In an article published in the "North American Review," Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, Minn., discusses at great length the question of the liquor traffic, and supports in strong and eloquent language the opinion of the Holy See, as expressed through Mgr. Satolli, the Papal legate, in opposition to the members of his church dealing in intoxicating liquors. I will not read the quotation, because it is very long, but I have seen in no literature upon this subject a more forcible denunciation of the evils of the liquor traffic, its demoralizing influences, and the determination of the leaders of that great church to suppress it by all the moral means within their power, than in the article by Archbishop Ireland. A great many who, in their own lines, are not bitterly opposed to the principle of prohibition, many who profess in a mild way to favour it, nevertheless fear that it would not be a practical success if put in operation. Practically speaking, they say, your position is sound ; by a priori reasoning you seem to have come to a right conclusion, yet after all we do not believe that the practical results of a prohibitory liquor law would be such as you anticipate, and such as you are seeking for. Unfortunately there have not been many communities in the world in which the experiment has been fully, and fairly and thoroughly tried, but it has been tried to a greater or less degree. The state of Maine is considered the pivotal point of attack and defence in connection with this matter. In that state the principle has been applied as fully, perhaps, as it was possible to apply it in any state, except one governed under the constitution of this Dominion. The state of Maine has very large jurisdiction over the liquor traffic, yet that jurisdiction is in many ways interfered with by the superior jurisdiction of the federal authorities. But struggling with these difficulties of a higher jurisdiction in the enforcement of the law, the state of Maine has succeeded very largely in wiping out the liquor traffic within its borders and in

showing the beneficial results accruing from the operation of a prohibitory liquor law. In the first place, I think it will be admitted by every hon. gentleman present that the sentiment of the state, after an experience of some forty years of prohibition, is still strongly and unmistakably in favour of its continuance. Now, that shows the views which the people themselves, having the operation of the law under their own eyes, hold as to its success or non-success. Wherever an attempt has been made to repeal the law, it has failed; wherever attempts have been made to strengthen the law, they have succeeded, and the practical results are before the country for its consideration. Without attempting to go into these, in extenso, I call the attention of the House to one or two salient features of success that have followed the prohibitory law in the state of Maine. Maine had a population of 661,000 in 1891, a much smaller population than that of the maritime provinces, which was 880,000; and yet the savings bank deposits in Maine in 1891-92 exceeded, largely, all the savings bank deposits of the whole Dominion of Canada. And certainly if this is the case with a state like Maine, having, by no means the enormous resources which Providence has given to the maritime provinces, it speaks well for the operation of the prohibitory law or the series of causes which produced that great result. Maine, compared with the maritime provinces, has made a great demonstration of its wealth and prosperity. Comparing Maine, however, not with the maritime provinces, in that particular, but with other states of the union, we find that while, in the order of population, Maine stands No. 30, yet, in the order of wealth, it stands No. 22; in the order of crime—another index of the results of the absence of the use of intoxicating liquors—it stands No. 36. The average number of criminals to the million in the United States, is 722. In the North Atlantic division of states, the number is 832, in the South Atlantic disivion, 730, in the north central division, 491; in the south central division, 842; in the western division, 1,341, whilst in the state of Maine the number is only 257, showing that compared with any group of states as divided up for the purpose of the last census, Maine is immeasurably below any as regards the criminal record. It has the smallest number of criminals per thousand in the union, except the state of Wyoming. A prohibitory liquor law does not tend to increase crime or poverty. Take the growth of wealth in the state of Maine. In 1850, the year prohibition was adopted generally, the wealth of the state of Maine was estimated at $100,000,000. It was increased in 1860 to $160,000,000; in 1870, to $224,000,000; and in 1880 to $236,000,000; and in 1890 to $309,000,000, an enormous increase, a greater increase, I believe, than occurred in any section of this Dominion, or any section of the United States, covering the same period. The state of Maine possess none of those great and varied resources which many of the other states possess. It has no mineral resources to any great extent. Its lumber and agricultural wealth, and manufacturing advantages are, perhaps, the main sources of wealth and prosperity in the state. But these figures tend to show very strongly that a great increase of wealth must be attributed to the savings and thrift of the population, encouraged largely by the enforcement of a prohibitory measure, which has prevented that waste, disorder, and loss that have been alluded to by all speakers on the subject of temperance. That loss in Canada represents $30,000,000 per annum, directly, and, indirectly probably $140,000,000. I take the state of Maine merely as a powerful illustration of the benefits of a prohibitory liquor law as enforced in that state. Of course, I am perfectly aware that every writer who objects to prohibition, professes to find numerous instances of the violation of the law in Maine. This may be perfectly true. It is a law, perhaps, which can never be absolutely and completely enforced in any community, but in this particular it stands on precisely the same basis as every law on our statute-book. There are violaters of law in every country, and probably so long as human nature remains as it is there will be such individuals; the most we can expect, or this House can ask, for from any law is to reduce the opportunities for violation to a minimum. I believe this law could be enforced and would be enforced in this country as well as any other law on the statute-book. The fact of its enactment would imply that the people would obey it. We are a law-abiding people, and once a prohibitory law were on the statute-book, properly guarded and reserving rights as we understand them, it would be enforced and observed to the same extent as any other law. I trust this House will join with the majority of the people, as expressed by the plebiscites which have been taken, will join with the representatives of what we consider to be the great moral element of the community, will join with the opinion expressed by the eminent men of whose speeches and writings I have spoken, and will say that, in its opinion, the best remedy and the only remedy for the great evils of intemperance is the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law. If this House can be induced to come to that conclusion, there will be ample time to consider the details of such legislation as might be deemed advisable to carry out the opinion of the House, and I believe that the country would support the legislature in that opinion, and would support the majority in any incoming Parliament in enacting legislation based upon this principle; and the results would be the same as they have been everywhere else and to the same extent as they

have been where restrictive or prohibitory laws have been adopted—a decrease in crime, an increase in the savings of the people, a decrease in the disorder of the community, and increase in opportunities for development of the country in all its varied interests. The revenue consideration would, in a very short time, pass out of sight in face of the great prosperity that must inevitably follow the striking off of an annual waste of from $30,000,000 to $35,000,000. I leave this matter in the hands of the House, with the earnest hope that it will be considered apart from party feeling—I have endeavoured to keep this resolution aloof from all partisan feeling whatever—and that the House will consider the question on its merits, having in view only the general interests of the country and looking to the future of the Dominion in the light of the past. If we could have the past history of the country brought before us and could have portrayed the loss, the suffering, the crime and disaster which have been caused by intemperance, and if we could look forward to the day when intemperance should be banished from the country, and when liquor should cease to be the power it has been, and unfortunately may be to-day, I believe we could have the strongest hope for the future strength and greatness of this country.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to second this resolution, and I do so with great pleasure, not only because the subject is a most important one—I think we all admit that—but because I am in entire sympathy with the resolution itself. It may be said that there is no need of speeches on this question, because it has been so often discussed in this House, but I may answer, that there are many subjects which have been discussed in this House over and over again, and which are still brought before our notice. It is necessary that this subject should be discussed, because, I think, it is of equal importance with any that can come before us. I have no intention to-night to elaborate on this question of temperance or prohibition. My discussion on the subject, I trust, will be moderate and fair, and I have no doubt that the members of this House will give it just and impartial consideration. I have often felt that some who advocate prohibition and temperance injure their cause by being too extreme and by denouncing those who do not agree with them. For myself, I have never indulged in denunciation of those who differ from me on the question, because I think they have a perfect right to their opinions, and if I myself am sincere in advocating prohibition, I have no reason to doubt the sincerity of those who do not agree with me. I shall ask the attention of the House for a short time to the resolution which has been brought to our notice, and, in the first place, I shall consider what is meant by prohibition. There are some who say that they have no faith in prohibition, because where it has been tried it does not absolutely prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors. Now, I wish to say for those whom I represent here, those who asked me to second this resolution, that they make no such claim. But they do claim that a prohibitory law passed by this Parliament, and enforced in good faith by the Government in power, would reduce the drinking in this country by at least three-fourths. I have no doubt that if the law could accomplish that we would consider it very satisfactory indeed. Let me ask what is the object of this resolution? To my mind, its object, is to ascertain what members of this House are in favour of prohibition, and on this ground I think the resolution is fair. The people of this country who are in favour of prohibition have a perfect right to know what members of this House are in sympathy with their views, and this resolution has been brought before Parliament with that object in view. It has been said by some that if this resolution carries, then it would be necessary for the Government to pass a Bill at this session of Parliament. I do not entertain any such idea, and I may say that members of the Dominion Alliance who advocate this resolution, and wish to bring it before this House, have no idea of any such thing either. They do not think, and they do not ask that in case of the resolution passing the House, a Bill should be introduced and passed this session. They know that that would be impossible. They know that in the time that remains of this session, it would be impossible to frame and pass such a Bill as would be requisite. Then, Sir, it is said by some that if a prohibitory law were passed, it must come into force at once, and that is made one of the objections. Well, I differ from that view also. I hold that if a prohibitory law were passed, it could be arranged to come into force at a certain date. It might be at the end of one year, or two years, or perhaps four years, so as to allow the country to arrange everything for the coming into force of this law. A great deal of criticism has been devoted to the Royal Commission by some who advocate prohibition. In my opinion, the Royal Commission is good for one thing at least, and that is, to show the objections and difficulties of a prohibitory law, and to serve as a guide in framing such a law. We must all admit, I am sure, that the Parliament or the Government would have no easy task who sat down to frame a prohibitory act. There are a great many defects in the prohibitory Acts which operate in other countries, the United States, for instance, and there are some good points in these Acts also. I hold that the Royal Commission gives information on this, shows the defects and shows the good points of these laws, and gives the reasons why they have failed, if they have failed. For my own part, I do not shut my eyes to the difficulties that would

beset such a prohibitory Act, and I want the country and Parliament to know these. I would not wish for one moment that Parliament should pass a prohibitory Bill blindly, without considering the difficulties which exist. Nothing could be worse for the cause of prohibition, and nothing could give it a greater setback than action of that kind. I shall briefly consider some of the objections to a prohibitory law. Some say the time has not come for its passage. I admit that objection has a great deal of force, but I might answer it by asking, Will the time ever come? I suppose that those who are entirely opposed to prohibition on principle and from self-interest, feel that the time will never come. There are some who are very mildly in favour of prohibition, and who would like to see it put in force, if it could be done without difficulty, and they may think, and think sincerely, that the time has not come. There are some who say, that we should not be asked to vote on this question until we have had time to study the evidence brought together in the report of the Royal Commission. Well, Sir, I may safely say that if we waited until all the members of this House read all the evidence of the Royal Commission, the time never would come. But, Sir, the question now is: When will the time come, or has the time arrived to-day? There are a great many, those who are asking for prohibition, who say the time has come and that the country to-day is ripe for the measure. For my own part, I think I may say this, and say it safely—and I think all the members of this House will agree with me—that the time will have come when we find in this House a majority of the members who will vote for the passage of a prohibitory Act. If the people of this country who are in favour of prohibition remember that, and see that they send men here who are in favour of prohibition, then the time will have arrived. Another difficulty urged is the expense and impossibility, it is said, of enforcing this law. I admit that sometimes that is overlooked by those who advocate prohibition. I know that there are some in this country who have not given this subject a great deal of thought, and who yet are strongly in favour of prohibition. There are some who think that everything that is necessary is for this Parliament to pass a prohibitory Act, and that if that were done, everything would be done. But, Sir, I hold that that would only be the beginning, that there would have to be a continual effort on the part of those in favour of prohibition to have the law enforced; that the law would not enforce itself, and that the Government, unless backed up strongly by public opinion, would not be able to make the law effective. One reason why it would be difficult to enforce this law—and it is a difficulty which no doubt exists very strongly in the minds of some—is that it is an interference with individual rights. There are some who hold that Parliament has no right to say what a man shall drink any more than it has to say what he shall eat. But I contend that we are not saying anything about what a man shall drink at all. In this resolution we are speaking of the importation, the manufacture and sale; and I think we are justified in doing that, as much as we are justified in limiting the liberty of the individual in many other respects. Then, it is said that the Scott Act was not enforced. One reason for that was that the Scott Act did not stop the manufacture, which went on just as if the Scott Act did not exist. Then, that Act was confined to limited areas. While one county adopted the Scott Act, it was not in existence in the next county, and that made it extremely difficult to enforce the Act in the county where it was in force. Then, it has been said, and I think with some truth, that it was not enforced on political grounds—that the Scott Act was an Act of the Dominion Parliament, it had to be enforced by the provincial government, and, as they did not wish to make themselves obnoxious to those who dealt in liquor, they were not very strict in enforcing the Scott Act. It is also urged that we have a long frontier, and that it would be almost impossible to stop smuggling. I have no doubt that it would be difficult, but I do not think it would be impossible. To-day there is no doubt some smuggling, but we do not find it wholly impossible to stop it, and while there might be some smuggling of liquor under a prohibitory law, I think it could be prevented to a great extent. When we have a Government and a Parliament who are in earnest in passing a law of this kind, there will be no difficulty in enforcing it. Another objection urged is the loss of revenue that would result. It is said that we would lose about $7,000,000 of revenue. Well, Sir, this is a fact that must be faced by those who advocate prohibition. I believe some overlook this fact altogether, but I hold that it should not be overlooked. Those who advocate prohibition must realize that some way must be found of making up this deficiency. I believe that in a short time a great deal of that loss would be made up by the money which is now expended on liquor being expended in the purchase of useful articles, the duties on which would go a great way to restore the deficiency in the revenue. Whether it would make it all up I am not able to say. Another important consideration to my mind, in framing a Bill of this kind, is the question of compensation. Now, I know that some who advocate prohibition utterly scout the idea of compensation. They argue that the men engaged in this business are men who are doing damage to the country, that they have been doing this constantly, and that they have no rights which we should respect. They, therefore, repudiate altogether the

idea of compensation. There are other men, more reasonable, who, while in favour of prohibition, yet realize that the men who have invested all they have in this business have some rights which we are bound to respect, and that if a law is passed, legislating away their property or making it almost worthless, they should be given some reasonable compensation. For myself, I may say that I entertain that opinion; and whatever our views may be, if a prohibitory liquor law comes before this Parliament for consideration, I know that the question of compensation will be one of the points which will have to be considered. I have mentioned some of the objections urged against this measure, because I think it is only right that we should look them squarely in the face. I intend now to look at some of the benefits which would accrue to this country from prohibition. In the first place, I say it would be a great saving to the country. I hold that most of the drinking is absolute waste, and worse than absolute waste. Not only is the liquor consumed of no benefit to the man who drinks it, but it has a bad effect upon him in a great many cases. I do not say that all who drink liquor are injuriously affected by it; but I do say that there are a sufficient number injuriously affected by it to justify me in saying that the liquor consumed is not only wasted, but worse than wasted. I believe that the amount of money expended on intoxicating liquors in this country is at least $35,000,000 a year; and I hold that a great deal of this liquor would be far better taken and poured into the sewer than used as it is used. So, from my point of view, if grain were not made into liquor, and no labour were expended in making it, a great saving would be effected by the country. Another advantage is that it would lessen crime. I do not think I need argue that point at all. It is admitted by all who have studied criminal statistics that drinking is a great cause of crime. I do not say that it is the only cause of crime; I do not say that if we had a prohibitory liquor law and it were enforced strictly, there would be no crime in the country; but I hold that the amount of crime would be greatly diminished. I have seen it stated on good authority that at least 60 per cent of existing crime results from the drinking of intoxicating liquors. The expense of our jails, penitentiaries and reformatories would be very much reduced, and this saving would go against the loss in the revenue. Another advantage is that it would lessen accidents. A great many of the accidents that we read of in the papers, not only to life, but to property, result from the use of intoxicating liquors. I am glad to know that our two great railways in this country, and I have no doubt all the railways, take strong ground on this question, and insist that the men in their employ shall not use intoxicating liquors, and they are perfectly right in doing so, because of the large number of accidents which may be directly traced to that cause. Another advantage I claim for prohibition is that it would lessen pauperism. That is a point which needs no argument. If we trace the causes of pauperism in our cities and in many of our towns, we shall find that those who are dependent upon the assistance of their neighbours to get through the winter, and very often to get through the summer as well, are reduced to that condition by the use of intoxicating liquors; and I believe that if we had a prohibitory law, there would be a great deal less pauperism in this country. But another reason, and to my mind one of the strongest reasons, in favour of an Act of this kind is, that it would remove temptation from our young men and boys, and from weak men of all ages. Now it is said by some that there is no need of this because a man ought to be able to take a drink and then stop. No doubt there are men who can do that. No doubt there are many men all over the country who can take a drink when they feel like it and then leave it alone, but we cannot disguise the fact that there are many who cannot do that, and I wish to protect those from the temptations which are constantly thrown in their way as they walk up and down the street. Some men of this kind cannot go to their business without passing three or four saloons, standing there, inviting them to enter; and because this drinking habit is so common in the country because of the number of saloons waiting for customers, we have the treating habit which is the cause of a great deal of evil. If for no other reason, if there was no other benefit to be reaped from the passing of a prohibitory law, I would vote for this resolution, because if we had such an Act it would remove the temptations of drink from our young men and boys. I need not say, because I have said it already, in speaking about the increase of pauperism, that it would tend to make many wives and children in this country happier than they are to-day. We all of us know what misery has been inflicted on families by the passion for strong drink. We all know that many women suffer because their husbands are the victims of intemperance. Why do I support this resolution? First, to show on what side I am. While I do not know that I can be called a temperance crank, as some are called, because I do not denounce those who do not agree with me on this question, at the same time I can say that I am not on the liquor side but on the side of temperance always and everywhere. It is therefore only consistent that I should support a resolution of this kind. I support this resolution in response to the appeal of thousands of mothers, wives and sisters throughout the country. Many a woman looks anxiously to this Parliament for relief on this question. They ask us by petitions to give them relief. They have no vote and cannot influence

us by the ballot, or perhaps we would be more attentive to their appeal: but to my mind the fact that they have no vote makes their appeal to us all the stronger. For myself, I have resolved that I shall not turn a deaf ear to this appeal; and while the women have not the right to vote for the election of members to this Parliament, they shall have my vote on this question. I support this resolution because I hold that intoxicating liquors are the greatest enemy of religion and morality. Many a young man who would otherwise lead a moral, and perhaps a religious life, can trace his first downward step to the taking of a glass of intoxicating liquor. If we look at the records of the police court, we shall find that many who are convicted of other crimes, that many who are found in a great many disreputable places, would not have committed these crimes if it had not been for the influence of intoxicating liquors. I am not a fanatic on this question, but I find no fault with those who are. I think if one might be a fanatic on any question, it would be on this; and I can well excuse those who have suffered from the evil influence of intoxicating liquors on their children or parents or brothers or sisters or friends, being fanatics. I have expressed my views with studied moderation. I did not elaborate them because I do not think it necessary, and I simply wish to place them on record. I find that those who have studied all the effects of the liquor traffic are in favour of prohibition. It may be said that drinking has decreased and that the drinking habit is not what it was some years ago; but I ask, who deserve credit for that? Is it not those men and women who have devoted themselves to the cause of temperance? And those are the very men and women who are asking this House to pass a prohibitory Act. If it be urged that you cannot stop all drinking, I reply that we want our boys to grow up without incurring this habit. I believe we have some men so thoroughly slaves to this vice that even under a prohibitory law they would find some means of gratifying their appetite. But I believe that our boys and our young men would be saved from the habit; and in a few years you would have people all over the country who would have no desire to break the law. I do not know, as the mover of the resolution said, any politics in this question. If I were to consult my political interests, I would be silent, because some of my strongest supporters do not agree with me on this question at all. I advocate this principle, not from political motives, but because I believe in it. To my mind this is a question which should rise above politics. It may be said that I have great faith and great hope, but I do hope to see the day when a prohibitory law will be passed with the assistance of both parties, and then I have no doubt such a law will be effectually enforced.

Mr. CHRISTIE. It is not my intention to take up the time of the House at any length. I simply desire to say that I heartily approve of this resolution and shall have much pleasure in voting for it. I believe the time has come when this House should take some decided action on this important question. To my mind it is one of the most important now pending before the country. It is evident from the large number of petitions which have been presented to this House from time to time and from the decisive votes which have been taken in most of the provinces, that there is a strong public sentiment in favour of prohibition. In five out of seven provinces this principle was carried by a large majority. If I recollect aright, it was carried in Ontario by something like 85,000; in Nova Scotia by 30,000 to 40,000; in Manitoba by 11,000; in Prince Edward Island by 7,000; and in New Brunswick by a unanimous vote of the legislature, making altogether about 130,000 of a majority. Now, that is decisive, at least so far as these provinces are concerned. It is true that the province of Quebec, and I think, British Columbia have not voted on this question; but it is equally true that from the province of Quebec very many petitions have been presented, time and again, in favour of prohibition. I think, in view of these facts, it is desirable that we should get a fair and square vote from this House, without any fencing or amending calculated to evade the real issue. It will be remembered that in 1891, a similar resolution was brought forward, but unfortunately it was side-tracked and defeated by the motion in favour of appointing a royal commission. And, since that time, four years ago, the royal commission has completely blocked the way, staved off the question, and prevented any action being taken in this House. But, now that that commission is cut of the way, I trust that there will be no further excuse for delay, and that the question will be pressed to an issue. I am fully convinced that if this principle is adopted and made the law of the land it will contribute immensely to the prosperity, well-being, and happiness of the Dominion.

Sir JAMES GRANT. As this question is doubtless near a vote, I desire, before that vote is taken, to express a very brief opinion upon it. In my humble opinion this is one of the most important subjects that has been brought before the House for many a day. I listened to the observation of the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House (Mr. Flint) who is the great temperance champion of this country, and also to the hon. gentleman to my left (Mr. Craig), who has also spoken fairly and squarely upon the subject of temperance. This is a matter that concerns the public generally: it is one to which every sensible and fair-minded man ought to give care-

ful consideration. Those who have lived for the last forty years in the Ottawa Valley, are aware of the important changes that have taken place in the habits of the people in that time. Twenty-five years ago, drinking was a habit among our people, and, undoubtedly, whether from not understanding the subject, or from having a greater desire to indulge in alcoholic beverages than the present generation, there was certainly far more alcohol used than is used to-day. I think a great deal of good has been accomplished by the works of such men as Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson, whose work has become a text-book in many of the best educational institutions of our country, teaching the young the effect of alcoholic beverages upon the system. People are becoming educated on this subject. They are commencing to understand that alcoholic beverages have a deleterious effect upon the constitution, and to believe that they will be far better off if they do not use alcohol at all, but content themselves with the ordinary beverages instead. We know very well that the Scriptures say "Take a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and for thine often infirmities." But people are not content with taking a little, and to overcome their infirmities. They are not satisfied unless they are taking it all the time. I am convinced that no legislation of this character, coming suddenly upon our people, without their understanding it in the widest and most comprehensive sense, would be advantageous to the people themselves. When I consider the legislation in the temperance states of the United States, and when I examine the condition of affairs there, I find large quantities of alcoholic liquor are being used and this in spite of a prohibitory law. For my part, I believe that education will accomplish more than legislation. Let us educate our people gradually to a full understanding of the subject. Let us make it popular not to drink; and they will get rid of the evils of intemperance more rapidly than under the influence of such legislation as is now proposed to be inaugurated. This is a temperance age, Sir, and the people drink far less than they did twenty years ago; and when we find this radical change going on through the influence of education, why should we, by sudden legislation of this character, attempt to do away with the use of liquor altogether, as if we were going to accomplish a permanent good in that way. I do not believe that that would be the result; I doubt if there would not be more drinking than there is to-day. The falling off in the drinking habits of the people is shown in many ways. In many places where liquor was formerly sold they are closing up their bars because they cannot make money out of them any longer. In some of our largest institutions there are millions of gallons of whisky that cannot be disposed of. And if we find all this to be the case without any prohibitory enactment adopted, we ought to consider very seriously before taking the step proposed. Many people think that it is necessary, in a cold climate like that of Canada to take whisky in order to keep warm. But, as a matter of fact, the effect is actually to make them cold. The question has been so fully discussed that it is unnecessary for me to speak at length upon it. I rose only for the purpose of stating my belief that the operation of the principle of education will accomplish more than legislation at this time, and, therefore, I cannot vote for prohibition.

Mr. GUILLET. I do not desire to give a silent vote upon this question, as it has assumed a position of grave importance to the country, and I am quite convinced that it will not down, but will have to be settled. I desire to lay before the House a more practical way of dealing with this question. There is no doubt in any reasonable person's mind as to the evils of intemperance. Those evils exist to a very wide extent, and they are deeply to be deplored. But I declare my belief that those evils cannot be best met by the proposed legislation in this Parliament. I am quite convinced that there are sections of this vast Dominion that are prepared for legislation of this kind; but I think that the whole Dominion is not prepared, and that, in some sections a law such as is proposed even if enacted will not be enforced. And I hold that it would be a most deplorable thing to place upon the statute-book an Act that would not be enforced. It is well known that the Scott Act when it was adopted within limited areas, soon became a dead letter; that it was not enforced. Though it was the manifest duty of the local government to enforce that Act there was a conflict of opinion on the subject. Some claimed that the Dominion Government should enforce the law, and some that it was the duty of the provincial government to enforce it. But we know that it was the duty of the local government to administer the law. But the local government in Ontario were not in sympathy with the Act. They were deriving large revenues from the licenses for the sale of liquors in other counties, but were deprived of the revenues they had formerly enjoyed in those counties in which the Scott Act had been adopted. I think the local legislature must be ready and willing to enforce these prohibitory laws, or it is not worth the while for the Parliament of Canada to adopt them. In fact, this subject should be handed over if possible, to the local legislatures. If we find, when the decision is given in the case which is now before the judicial committee of the Privy Council that the local legislatures have not the power to deal with this question, my opinion is—and I believe it has become the opinion of many practical

men who look upon this question in a common sense way, and not from a sentimental point of view—that it would be wise and in the interests of prohibition for Parliament to confer upon the local legislatures the power to deal with the question, or, if that is not possible, to obtain from the Imperial Parliament such an amendment to the British North America Act as should give Parliament that power. I think that would be a practical way of dealing with a question of this kind. Then, if the legislatures of those provinces, the people of which are prepared for the adoption of a prohibitory law, containing a majority of men who are in favour of prohibition, that same majority will see that the law is enforced. As soon as the state of public sentiment in any province demands the enactment of a prohibitory law, the same public sentiment will demand its enforcement, and the question will be entirely in the hands of the people of each province when they have arrived at that conviction. But to pass an Act here now, as this resolution proposes, to extend prohibition over this vast Dominion, I think would be unwise. It would simply place upon the statute-book a law that would soon become a dead letter, and would soon have to be repealed, and the temperance cause would be forced back many years, instead of being promoted. I think a wise course to pursue would be to adopt a resolution to-night deferring consideration of this matter until we have a decision of the Imperial Privy Council. I do not see that we can make satisfactory progress in any other way. As I said before, I think it is a most visionary proposition to ask this House to pass a resolution to-night upon which we must immediately base a prohibitory enactment for the whole Dominion. I do not think the friends of temperance who are supporting this proposition, have fully considered the consequences. If it is to be decided to-night that we must adopt such a measure, there is a revolution before this country which it is not, I am sure, prepared for, and which will involve the passing of an Act which cannot be enforced, and for which public sentiment is not prepared. I beg, therefore, to move the following amendment:

That all the words after "That" in the proposed motion be struck out and the following inserted instead thereof:—"Whereas there is now before the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council the appeal against the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures, to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors; the further consideration of this question be deferred until this appeal shall have been decided and the report of the Judicial Committee thereon received."

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the vote is taken on the main motion, or the amendment, I desire to say a few words and to move another amendment. The main motion before the House, if carried, in my opinion would necessitate the Government passing immediately prohibitory legislation. At this late date of the session, and in this last session, probably, of the present Parliament, to enact a prohibitory law, in my opinion, would be unwise. The legislature of Ontario, two years ago, passed an Act to provide for taking the voice of the electors of the province as to the advisability of prohibiting the liquor traffic in that province. The people pronounced in favour of prohibition by a large majority, yet the legislation which was promised was not introduced, but, instead, the question was relegated to the courts in order to ascertain whether the province had authority to enact prohibition. That question is yet before the courts, and until it is decided I think it would be inadvisable for this Parliament to pass a resolution saying that we will enact prohibition. I think it would be unwise, in the interests of temperance, for this Parliament to undertake to pass any such legislation at the present time. I am as strong an advocate of temperance and of prohibition as the hon. gentleman who has introduced this motion, but I do not believe in voting for resolutions simply for the purpose of making political capital out of them. When we grapple with that question, we should grapple with it in such a way as that it will promote the cause of temperance. I think, with my hon. friend who moved the amendment, that if this House were to undertake to pass prohibitory legislation now, we would injure the cause of temperance very materially. I believe that the best thing to do is to wait until the courts have decided whether this Parliament or the provincial legislatures have a right to pass a prohibitory law. The question has been in litigation long enough, and it would enter once more into litigation if this Parliament passed an Act to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors. The question would again be thrown into the courts to decide whether we had jurisdiction to pass such an Act. Then it is to be remembered that this Government appointed a commission to investigate this whole question, from every standpoint. That commission devoted a great deal of time, and at great expense to the country, in investigating this whole question. The evidence of that commission has been laid before the House. I do not presume many members have read the evidence, or the report. I have not yet seen the report, but until that report has been presented to the House, and the members of this House and the people of this country have had an opportunity or studying it, and of examining the evidence, I think it would be unwise for us to deal with the question in the manner proposed by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). Therefore, I beg leave to move in amendment to the amendment:

That all the words in the proposed motion after the word "That," and all the words in the amendment be struck out and the following inserted instead thereof :—" this House, while reaffirming the position taken in 1884 and 1889 upon the question of prohibition, is of the opinion that it is inadvisable at the present time, until the results of the commission which has recently reported, have been made available for examination and until the appeals now before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, involving the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures and the Dominion Parliament in the matter have been decided, to further legislate with respect to the importation, sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors."

House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Taylor) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Henderson,
Bain (Soulanges),	Hutchins,
Béchard,	Ingram,
Bergeron,	Jeannotte,
Bowman,	Lachapelle,
Cameron,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Cargill,	Leclair,
Carling (Sir John),	Lippé,
Chesley,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Corbould,	McDougald (Pictou),
Costigan,	McKay,
Curran,	McLennan,
Daly,	Madill,
Davis (Alberta),	Mara,
Denison,	Marshall,
Dupont,	Masson,
Earle,	Miller,
Fairbairn,	Montague,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),	Northrup,
Gillies,	Ouimet,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Patterson (Colchester),
Grandbois,	Prior,
Grant (Sir James),	Robillard,
Haslam,	Taylor,
Hazen,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert), and
	White (Shelburne.—51.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adams,	Guay,
Allan,	Guillet,
Bain (Wentworth),	Harwood,
Beith,	Hodgins,
Belley,	Innes,
Bergin,	Langelier,
Bernier,	Laurier,
Blanchard,	Macdonald (Huron),
Borden,	Macdonald (King's),
Boston,	McAlister,
Bourassa,	McInerney,
Bowers,	McMillan,
Boyd,	Mills (Annapolis),
Brown,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bruneau,	Mulock,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Paterson (Brant),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Perry,
Casey,	Pridham,
Christie,	Rinfret,
Coatsworth,	Roome,
Colter,	Ross (Lisgar),
Craig,	Sanborn,
Davies (P.E.I.),	Scriver,
Davin,	Semple,
Davis (Alberta),	Somerville,
Dawson,	Stevenson,
Dickey,	Sutherland,
Dyer,	Tarte,
Edgar,	Tisdale,
Edwards,	Vaillancourt,
Featherston,	Wallace,
Flint,	Weldon,
Forbes,	Wilmot,
Foster,	Wilson, and
Gillmor,	Yeo.—70.
Grieve,	

PAIR :

For.	Against.
Carroll,	McMullen.

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may say, Mr. Speaker, that if there was no appeal pending at the present moment, I would be prepared to support the motion moved by my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), a motion in favour of prohibition. But as the mover and seconder have stated that it is not proposed to interfere with the existing state of things by legislation proposed this session, that in fact no legislation is to be proposed this session, but it is merely voting on the abstract proposition, it does not seem to me seemly to vote for that proposition with the suit pending at the present time before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. That being so, I am prepared to support the amendment.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do so because I think it would be an unseemly proceeding on our part to vote for an original proposition in favour of prohibition and at the same time be carrying on the suit upon the question as to whether we have the right to legislate on the subject or not. Whenever we do come to legislate on the subject, if the jurisdiction is found to be with us here, I think we shall have along with that subject a number of important questions to deal with, but these will be rather for the consideration of the Finance Minister than for a private member of the House. I say, therefore, that without abandoning my views at all in favour of the principle of prohibition, if it is found we have here a right to legislate, I am at the present moment disposed to support the amendment.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Guillet):

YEAS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Haslam,
Bain (Soulanges),	Hazen,
Béchard,	Hutchins,
Belley,	Jeannotte,
Bennett,	Lachapelle,
Bergeron,	Langelier,
Bergin,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bernier,	Laurier,

Bowman,
Bruneau,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Casey,
Chesley,
Corbould,
Costigan,
Curran,
Daly,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Davis (Alberta),
Denison,
Dupont,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Gillies,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grandbois,
Grant (Sir James),
Guay,
Guillet,
Harwood,
Leclair,
Lippé,
Macdonell (Algoma),
McDougald (Pictou),
McKay,
McLennan,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Bothwell),
Montague,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Prior,
Reid,
Rinfret,
Robillard,
Ross (Lisgar),
Tarte,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Vaillancourt, and
White (Shelburne).—68.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adams,
Allan,
Bain (Wentworth),
Beith,
Blanchard,
Borden,
Boston,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Boyd,
Brown,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Christie,
Coatsworth,
Colter,
Craig,
Davin,
Dawson,
Dickey,
Dyer,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Foster,
Gillmor,
Grieve,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Ingram,
Innes,
Kaulbach,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonald (King's),
McAlister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McInerney,
McMillan,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mulock,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Pridham,
Roome,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Stevenson,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Wallace,
Weldon,
Wilmot,
Wilson, and
Yeo.—57

PAIR :

For.	Against.
Carroll.	McMullen.

Amendment agreed to.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to on same division.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he proposes to take up to-morrow ?

Mr. FOSTER. I propose that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means, in order to get a Supply Bill passed covering the items the House passed the other night, and afterwards take up supply, and I suppose the motion of the hon. gentleman will be moved on going into supply.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to ascertain from the Secretary of State when he intends to comply with the order of the House to which I have called his attention on more than one occasion this session, in regard to the industries of the county of York. I began almost at the commencement of the session to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the default, and he has promised me, without reservation, on each occasion that at an early date this order would be complied with. I think I have been more than reasonable with him, and I rise on this occasion simply to say that if I have again to call attention to it I think he will excuse me if I do so in language not so moderate as I am adopting to-night.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that a number of these returns have been moved for, and since the matter was brought up in the House a week or so ago, I have been bringing down almost every day some returns of that kind. While I have no definite knowledge as to his return, I will let him know what condition it is in and when it will be brought down.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 18th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Report of the Commissioner of the North-west Mounted Police Force, 1894.—(Mr. Foster.)

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask when the return showing the allowances to Mr. Hayter Reed will be presented ? The resolution ordering this return was passed on the 25th April,—a long time ago. I would also draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the return relating to the super-

annuation, ordered on the 26th April last, is not yet down. Are these returns likely to be laid on the Table of the House in a day or two?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not catch the subject of the first return referred to by the hon. gentleman. The second is being proceeded with, with all possible speed. In my department I have two of my best men working upon it continuously. This return, of course, calls for work from other departments besides my own, and the other departments have been asked to prepare their portion. The return will certainly not be brought down this week.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could it not be brought down in instalments—what my hon. friend wanted first and what the leader of the House wanted afterwards?

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps we had better have all the facts at once.

Mr. BORDEN. I would ask the Minister of Public Works whether the return ordered by the House, I think a year ago, relating to Kemptville post office, will be brought down soon?

Mr. OUIMET. It was brought down nearly a week ago—the very day the hon. gentleman last asked for it.

Mr. BORDEN. I beg pardon, I was not aware of that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has any return been brought down in reference to the manufacture of binding twine under the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to allow that to stand over, as the Minister is not present.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1895, the sum of $1,143,054.28 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution reported.

SUPPLY—LACHINE CANAL BRIDGE CONTRACT.

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

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Parliament, the Public Accounts Committee was engaged at nearly all of its sittings in taking evidence in relation to the alleged frauds perpetrated on the Government in connection with what is popularly known as the Curran Bridge Contract. That evidence was reported to the House at a very late period of the session. There was also an investigation before the Exchequer Court relating to the same subject in which a great quantity of evidence was collected; and there was an investigation made into the subject by the commission appointed by the Government to investigate these matters in the summer of 1893. That evidence was before the Commission on Public Accounts in type-written form, though I believe it has never been printed in full. Towards the close of the session the House undertook to discuss the evidence which had been given before the Public Accounts Committee; but, as was very well remarked by some members who took part in the debate, sufficient time had not elapsed to enable the members of the House thoroughly to master the effect of that evidence. It seems right and proper, in view of the admitted fact that enormous frauds have been committed upon the Government, that the attention of the House should again be invited to the subject-matter, with a view to determining, in the first place to what extent these frauds have been perpetrated, in the second place the cause through which they were allowed to be perpetrated, and, in the third place, whether the guilty parties have been punished or whether any attempt has been made to insure their punishment. Now, I do not think it is necessary to enter into a minute investigation of the larger portion of the facts connected with these frauds. Sufficient for us, and for our present purposes is it, I think, to take a general bird's-eye view of the situation, and I think it will be found that not only have the subordinates who have been engaged in the construction of these works been guilty of fraudulent conduct, but that the department, and the Minister of the department, are, and ought to be, held responsible by this House for these frauds.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we were about to build a bridge over the canal in the city of Montreal, known as the Lachine Canal, of a breadth of from 225 to 250 feet, and, in the session of 1892, the Minister of Railways came down to the House and made us a statement as to the necessity of this public work. Having first stated to the House that elaborate estimates had been made by the department, he asked the House to vote $170,000 for the construction of these works, and the House took him at his word, and voted the money. Now, as a matter of fact, at the end of 1893 we found ourselves billed for accounts in connection with the work, toting up the respectable sum of about $500,000, of which about $400,000 have been paid, in actual figures, $394,000. The mere recital of the facts on their face is startling, and calls for the earnest attention of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. The Minister of Railways admits—and that part

of the case being conceded, a large number of references which otherwise would have to be made, are become unnecessary—that huge frauds were perpetrated upon the Government. I have before me the speech which the hon. gentleman delivered last session, in which, among other things, he says:

> The whole business seems to have been one of fraud and collusion.

And, further on, he says:

> So far as the department is concerned, there was nothing in the information as to the material furnished on the works, to lead the department to believe that the amount to be expended in the construction of the work would reach such an alarming sum, for I say that this amount of $394,000 is an alarming sum, and I have no hesitation in saying that a large portion of that money is money fraudulently obtained by parties employed in the construction of the work.

So that we stand here to-day at the threshhold of this inquiry, with the official statement made by the Minister that in a contract of $175,000 to be carried out in the construction of two small bridges over the Lachine Canal, within telephonic communication with the department at Ottawa, and within a hundred miles or so of the capital, $394,000 have been actually paid, of which the greater part, as the Minister says, has been stolen, or fraudulently obtained from the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think "the greater part" are the words.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, I think the hon. gentleman has a right to have it accurate, and if I have in any way misrepresented the language used, I will correct it. The language is:

> I have no hesitation in saying that a large portion of that money is money fraudulently obtained by parties employed in the construction of the work.

And, previously he had said, "the whole business seems to have been one of fraud and collusion." Now, that being the case, I say we have a right to look to see, not only who were the parties who committed these frauds, but how far the Government were responsible; and if we find that the Government are directly responsible by having opened the door and permitted the frauds to be committed by their negligent conduct, then they have a right to be severely censured. Now, let us see, shortly, what the nature of the work was, because we have to eliminate from the discussion the whole cost of constructing the superstructures. There is no dispute about the construction of the steel superstructures, the whole cost, and the whole fraud has arisen out of the construction of the substructures. These were originally estimated to cost $82,000, and by the additional depth which the department afterwards determined to make the substructures of the bridges that was increased by an estimate of $40,000, making $122,000. Well, Sir, the excess in the accounts rendered over what was estimated, was $312,000; and on the whole work, as I said, including the superstructures, there have been paid $394,000, of which $60,000 was for the superstructures, which I do not intend to go into very much. So here we have $334,000 paid on a small work which was estimated to cost $122,000. Now, we know very well that these estimates were very liberal. We had the opinion of Mr. Hannaford, a gentleman connected with the Grand Trunk Railway, who said that on the 24th September, he and his officials on the Grand Trunk Railway had made careful estimates upon this matter, and they estimated that the cost of the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway substructure, would be about $35,000 to the contractor, and he went on to say that if he had the contract at $35,000, he would expect to make $10,000 out of it.

Well, now we come to the straight question: How was the work carried out, and how far was the Government responsible? Now, Mr. Speaker, right at the threshold, I say that $170,000 was voted to construct a public work of this kind, and that the Government has paid $394,000; and the first inquiry is, What authority had they to pay the money? The House did not vote the money. Where did they get the authority? I say they acted unconstitutionally, and illegally. What has been the law with respect to the construction of all these public works by contract? The Act lays down explicitly that these public contracts shall be given after tenders have been called for, public tenders invited by the Minister, and that except in cases of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, these tenders have to be called. Now, we find the hon. gentleman, in the beginning of the construction of this work, deliberately ignoring the policy which Parliament has laid down for his guidance. He was bound to call for public tenders for the construction of that work, unless he did violence to the policy of the Government, as embodied in the several Acts of Parliament we have. The Acts of Parliament went on further to declare that not only should public tenders be called for, but in order that the public interest might be sufficiently safeguarded, the lowest tender could only be passed by on the authority of the Governor in Council, being obtained to pass it by, on good grounds shown. No expenditure is authorized by law unless that expenditure has been sanctioned by Parliament, except in one case, and that is a case which has been flagrantly abused by the present Government, not only in this contract, but in others. I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact, because it is owing to persistent and flagrant abuse of a power which they really have

not, and which they claim, that they have been enabled to squander public money, from time to time, in these contracts. The law has laid down explicitly :

If, when Parliament is not in session, any accident happens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair thereof, or any other occasion arises when any expenditure, unforeseen or provided for by Parliament, is urgently and immediately required for the public good, then, upon report of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General that there is no parliamentary provision, and of the Minister having charge of the service in question, that the necessity is urgent, the Governor in Council may issue his special warrant.

Well, Sir, there is no man who would be bold enough to stand up here and declare that the facts of this case come within the purview of that provision. The Governor General's warrant in this case was issued, I say, illegally. The circumstances which could justify its issue, did not exist. There was a parliamentary grant given. That parliamentary grant was given after careful estimates had been prepared by the officers of the Railway Department, after those estimates had been endorsed by the Minister, after the Minister had laid them before this House, after he had obtained the sanction of the House to his request, and the specific sum of $170,000 was voted for the specific purpose of building these two bridges, or rebuilding them, because they were there before. So that the department started by acting in a most unconstitutional and improper manner, thereby aiding so far as they could the wrong-doing and the misappropriation of public money. This matter has been brought before the House time and time again by the Opposition, and we have time and again pointed out that the Government improperly made use of Governor General's warrants to obtain money which they dare not ask Parliament for, and hon. gentlemen know well that if they had followed the law and come to Parliament and asked for this money they never would have obtained the sum they demanded.

But having violated the law in that respect, what did they do next ? I charge the department that they violated the law, the policy of the law, in undertaking to do the work in the way they did. They were bound by law to call for tenders. They were to build two little bridges, each about 235 feet long. One would suppose that this was not a work to tax the engineering ability of the officials of the department, and as a matter of fact we have the statement made that previous to the work being given out most careful estimates had been made as to its cost. The moment the Minister dispensed with the calling of tenders and began the work by days' work, that moment he began to open the door through which fraud could be perpetrated. Political influence then began to be brought to bear. Hon. gentlemen who wished to give employment to political friends and who found they could not give this employment if tenders were called, found the door opened wide by the Minister himself by which they could pass through as many political proteges and friends as they liked, not tens or dozens, but hundreds of the political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite could be employed under this system of days' labour to an almost unlimited extent. As a matter of fact we have evidence, not disputed but admitted on all sides that this result did follow, that no sooner was the law violated, no sooner were tenders dispensed with, and the work begun to be carried out by days' labour than hundreds of men were employed who otherwise would not have been employed, and the public treasury was wronged to that extent. We have the facts embodied in the commission's report, and we have the reasons there given why the Government undertook to build this structure by days' work, and they are the most silly and futile reasons to which I ever listened. The statement was made by the chief superintendent of the canal, and the statement which the department adopted to show that it was better to build the structure by days' work, was, to use the chief superintendent's own language, "owing to the uncertainty of the mode of execution which circumstances will command." For my part I fail to understand what the meaning of that sentence is : but that is the reason given for departing from the law and building the work by days' labour, instead of by tender, as the Government is bound by law to do. I am reading from the third page of the commissioners' report, where there is this quotation from Mr. Parent's advice to the Government. I compared it with the document itself, and I found it a literal transcript. There was no uncertainty as to the mode of execution. The hon. gentleman stated deliberately and plainly the mode of execution. It was well understood. This was not a large work ; two substructures were to be built, on which steel bridges were to be placed ; the work was clearly and well understood, and the most accurate estimates were made before the Government came to Parliament and asked any vote whatever for the work.

What was the next step taken by the Government ? The next step was that, instead of hiring the men themselves on days' labour and keeping some check over them, they gave a private contract to a labour contractor to supply labour. If the door was not sufficiently wide open to permit fraud to be perpetrated before, the Government were determined to open it wide enough this time, and so on 10th January, Mr. Parent advised the department that the system of employing a contractor to supply labour was adopted, and the department at once accepted and adopted the suggestion. What do we find ? As a matter of fact, instead of

public tenders being called for they obtained private tenders from three or four parties only. Those tenders were put in ; and the House stands in this position to-day, that we do not know whether there was more than one bona fide tender or not. I have in my hands the report of the hon. gentleman's own commissioners on that point who after hearing the evidence, which I will not weary the House by repeating, came to the conclusion that " There is considerable doubt whether those tenders were bona fide ; the competition may not have been genuine, and in reality there may have been only one tender." No one can read the evidence without coming to the conclusion that there was only one tender, and that it was intended from the first that there should be only one tender. The commissioner put this in very diplomatic language ; they will not condemn their own employers, the Government, out and out, but they say that there is considerable doubt from the evidence as to whether in reality there was more than one tender. So that not only did the Minister dispense with tenders, not only did he determine to do the work by days' work, but he determined to give all the labour to a contractor and that by private tender. The hon. Minister, I believe, intimated that he did not know all about it ; but I say in this matter at all events the Minister is as responsible as his deputy or anybody else, and any one who turns up the hon. gentleman's speech delivered on 18th July last year, will find that he admitted explicitly, without any reservation, that he had full knowledge of all the facts. The hon. gentleman felt there was something wrong about the transaction. He stated himself that he hesitated some time before he came to the conclusion that in the public interest a contract should be let in that way, but after proper pressure had been brought to bear he decided to do so, and it was done by his advice, and he therefore must be held responsible by the House and by the country. And what was the first step taken ? They did not plunge into this thing, they approached it gradually ; first only skilled labour was to be supplied by the contractor, not common labour. But no sooner had they made one breach of the law, no sooner had they overcome and violated the law than they extended the contract to cover not only skilled labour but also ordinary labour, and as I shall show, that extension is one of the main causes through which enormous frauds were perpetrated, and this extension was made after the Minister had positive and direct knowledge that the work was being carried on in a fraudulent manner. I give the House the dates. On 14th March, as I shall show afterwards, full knowledge had been brought home to the department of the disgraceful manner in which that work was being carried on, and the fact that the Government were being robbed by an enormous number of fictitious names being put upon the pay-list. They determined on the 14th of March to extend St. Louis' contract to ordinary labour, and at that very time Mr. Kennedy, their superintendent, had written a letter in which he declared, that it was an outrageous thing, that he could obtain any quantity of labour in the city of Montreal at that time of the year for a very much less sum than they were paying, and he waxed very pathetic about the conduct of the Government in that regard. In reference to that branch of the case the commissioners say :

> The large excess of cost above the estimate is partly due to the labour contract. The contractor obtained his labour for night and overtime at about the same rate as day prices.

We find by their own report that the excess which we complain of was caused chiefly by this labour contract. Let us see what the result on that point has been. Hon. gentlemen will remember that there was a prosecution begun against Mr. St. Louis in the city of Montreal for obtaining $175,000 under false pretenses. The judge who heard the evidence, made a summary of the facts which I have carefully compared with the evidence, and I found it to be correct. I beg the indulgence of the House to read from the judge's remarks. He says :

> As stated above, I believe, after studying this record, that there have been frauds committed to the detriment of the Federal Government, but I do not think that they were as large as alleged. Mr. St. Louis' contract was extremely favourable to him. He was allowed $4 a day for a foreman stonecutter, day time, and $6 a day for the same foreman for night or overtime ; $8 for the same foreman on Sundays, and at the rate of $12 for the same foreman for Sunday overtime. He was allowed $5 a day for a double team, and $10 a day for the same double team on Sundays. He was allowed $2.50 a day for the use of a derrick, day time, $3.75 for the use of the same derrick, night or overtime, and at the rate of $7.50 a day for the same derrick for Sunday overtime, and so forth on the same scale for stonemasons, stonesetters and skilled labourers. It is no wonder that Mr. St. Louis' bills must have been tremendous, when it is remembered that the job lasted about four months and that there were at times as many as two thousand men at work in the day time and one thousand five hundred men at work at night time. The men were paid alternately every week. Mr. Michaud tells us that some of the pays amounted to $34,000, some $10,000, some $15,000, and some $20,000. In my opinion, the main causes of all the trouble in this matter are :
>
> 1. The exorbitant prices stipulated for labour in Mr. St. Louis' contract ; and,
> 2. The almost unlimited number of men allowed on the said work, so numerous that they were in one another's way, and Mr. St. Louis cannot be held criminally responsible for these causes.

Now, that statement of fact is an abstract of the evidence simply. It is not the judge's opinion. It is merely an abstract of the evidence, and I have carefully compared the evidence with the judge's statement, and I found it to be correct.

But, Sir, what I want to ask the House is: Was that wrongful contract made by some subordinate in the department for whom the Minister could hardly be held personally responsible, or, was it made by the Minister himself? The hon. the Minister felt that it was wrong. As he said himself, in his speech last session, he objected to it for a long time. He called his deputy and talked it over with him; he called Mr. St. Louis and talked it over with him, and then not only did the Minister agree to the contract, but he agreed to it after full reflection and after full discussion. Therefore, he must be held to be personally responsible. Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we then find? Who is this man to whom the Government gave the contract? The evidence has proved conclusively that he is a very strong partisan of the present Government, and has been accustomed for years to contribute to their election expenses. This man, as it appears, destroyed his books, because, as he swears himself, if he had produced the books, they would have shown how much money he has contributed from time to time towards the election expenses of gentlemen supporting the Government. During the very time this contract was under way, and when he was receiving these extravagant sums for labour he was supplying, he (St. Louis) swears that he contributed an amount which he won't mention, but which his books would have shown had they been produced, towards an election contest in Vaudreuil.

Now, what did the Government do next? They had a gentleman in connection with that work, who was connected with it from its inception, and whose name was Desbarats. Mr. Desbarats, as the report shows, was sent to Montreal in September, 1892, to examine the site of the bridges. The first plan was prepared by Mr. Desbarats under Mr. Trudeau, late Deputy Minister, and the second and third plans were prepared in Montreal by Mr. Desbarats and Mr. Parent. Mr. Desbarats remained in Montreal from November till the 1st of March. Mr. Desbarats was dismissed, and why? There was no living public official in a position so thoroughly to understand those works as Mr. Desbarats. He had prepared the original plans, he had prepared the extensions, he was in a position to check them, but Mr. Desbarats had done that which was an unpardonable sin; he had interfered with the politicians who were connected with the construction of this bridge. We had here a Mr. Kennedy, a political supporter of the Government, a protege and friend of the Solicitor General, a gentleman who was appointed to his position as superintendent of the canal at the instance of the Solicitor General and Mr. Ogilvie, and a Senator whose name I forget.

An hon. MEMBER. Senator Drummond.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, Senator Drummond, Mr. Ogilvie and Solicitor General Curran had Kennedy appointed to the position. Mr. Kennedy thought he was going to have a free hand, to run matters as he liked, to spend what he liked, and to distribute the ill-gotten gains which were to come out of that bridge as he liked; and Mr. Desbarats, as I say, committed the unpardonable sin of attempting to keep a check upon Mr. Kennedy. What are the facts? We find in the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee that on the 4th February, 1893, Mr. Kennedy, superintendent of the canal, writes a letter to the chief engineer, warning him that he (Kennedy) is in no way to be interfered with, warning him that Desbarats, the local engineer in charge, had been keeping the time of the men, and going to the time-keepers to get the time so that he might compare it with his own time and see if it was correct. And Mr. Kennedy wanted no check kept upon the time. He was going to be the absolute and uncontrolled ruler, or, as he termed it himself, "boss of that job." In this letter, which he writes on this date to the chief engineer, he said:

> I will also call your attention to the fact that the resident engineer, Mr. Desbarats, solicits his information personally from foremen or others appointed by me, in their different capacities. I here now inform you, that from this date, when he requires any information, or has any orders to give or issue, they will have to be given or come direct through me, who have up to the present mapped out the programme of the work. Furthermore, I will issue orders to my men that any information or any orders received, save through me directly, will mean instant dismissal.

Now, we must remember, in that connection, that the only check which the Government had at all upon the time of the men which was being kept in connection with this work up to that date, was the check by Mr. Desbarats himself. No sooner had Mr. Desbarats made himself objectionable to the political superintendent of the work, than within two days afterwards he received his dismissal from the department. On the 6th of February, two days following the attempt made to check the men employed, Mr. Schreiber writes to Mr. Parent a letter intimating that the subject of the payrolls has been under consideration; that the Minister has given no authority for Mr. Desbarats' salary to be increased from $105 to $150, and that he is to be dismissed. Parent writes back, protesting in the most vigorous language against Desbarats' dismissal, and pointing out reasons why he should not be dismissed. But he receives scant courtesy at the hads of the department, and Mr. Desbarats' dismissal, which was intimated on the 6th, is authoritatively announced on the 14th, and at the end of the month he leaves the work. From the date he attempted to keep a check, he was ordered off the works by Superintendent Kennedy; and from the date the department endorsed Kennedy's action as against Desbarats, from

that date Desbarats continued to perform his duties perfunctorily. Of course, he interfered no more. He was rapped over the knuckles by his superior officer, and he left the work much against the protests of the resident engineer, Mr. Parent, whose letter will be found on page 206 of the report. He said :

I consider Mr. Desbarats' services should be retained until the work has been completed, for the following reasons :—

When the question of building the new bridges was under consideration, the ex-deputy minister and chief engineer, desirous of having the plans studied under his own supervision, entrusted Mr. Desbarats with the working of those plans. Various methods were suggested and discussed between the chief engineer and myself, with Mr. Desbarats assisting. Finally the present plan was adopted as the best suited to meet the requirements.

So that Mr. Desbarats, being thoroughly posted on the details of these plans, this circumstance makes of him a most valuable assistant.

Do not lose sight, that we are at present labouring under great difficulties to accomplish the task imposed upon us.

The question of extra cost, as regards the office boy alluded to in your letter, can be done away with, if so desired, as the office can be looked after by the bridge-master, who is close by.

Sir, the prudence and care with which the department looked after the officials down there can be judged by the fact that they objected to the pay of a small office boy—they stopped up the spigot and opened the bung. On the 13th of February, Mr. Schreiber writes to Mr. Parent in reply, stating that his arguments had no weight, and that Mr. Desbarats was to remain no longer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will you read that ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes :

Ottawa, 13th February, 1893.

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 7th instant with reference to the staff pay-list in connection with the Wellington Street bridge for January, and covering a copy of a letter signed by the late chief engineer of canals, placing Mr. Desbarats in charge of the construction of the new Wellington Street bridge, at a salary of $150 during the execution of the work.

The department does not take the same view of this matter as you do, and I quite agree that one engineer can readily attend to the giving of the lines and levels at the bridges in Montreal, and look after the Lachine drain matters, and one only can be kept, and that is Mr. Papineau.

Yours truly,

COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER,
Chief Engineer.

Mr. Desbarats was then and there dismissed absolutely, and he left on the last day of February ; so that however narrow the opening for fraud may have been before, it was then opened wide. Nobody was left to maintain any check whatever. Well, what took place next ? The contract so far made with Mr. St. Louis had been confined to the Wellington Street bridge ; but on the 24th of February that contract was extended by the department to the Grand Trunk bridge ; and on page 8 of their report, the commissioners say :

On the Grand Trunk bridge there has been every opportunity given whereby the contractor for labour, or any of his employees, if so inclined, could defraud the Government by fictitious pay-lists and accounts.

That is not my statement or my deduction from the evidence ; it is a statement from the deliberately formed judgment of the gentlemen whom the hon. gentleman himself appointed to investigate this matter. Mr. St. Louis had first the contract to provide the labour for the Wellington Street bridge. That contract was afterwards extended to the Grand Trunk bridge ; and subsequent to that extension, the contract, which heretofore had been for skilled labour, was made to cover common labour as well ; so that Mr. St. Louis had the contract to supply both skilled and common labour for both bridges. That brings us down to the 1st of March. Mr. Desbarats has been dismissed ; the door has been widely opened for the commission of fraud ; and not more than one week afterwards we find 1,300 men employed by Mr. St. Louis in tumbling over one another. The "Star," of Montreal, published an article calling the attention of the department to this outrage. It pointed out that the works were being built in a lavish and extravagant manner, that 1,300 men were being employed, and that it was a matter which the Government should look into at once. What happened ? The Minister and the deputy had a consultation, the result of which was that Mr. Douglas, an employee of the Department of Railways, was sent down.

Mr. HAGGART. Did the "Star" say that the work was being carried on in a lavish and extravagant manner, and that the Minister should inquire into the facts at once ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The "Star" said that it was carried on in a lavish and extravagant manner——

Mr. HAGGART. Have you the "Star" ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No ; I have an extract. The Minister himself says in his statement either that he called the deputy's attention to the Montreal "Star's" article, or that the deputy called his attention to it. In either event his attention was called to the facts, and he sent Mr. Douglas down. On the 10th of March, two days afterwards, Mr. Douglas reports, confirming in a general way, without going into details, the statements made by the "Star." Hon. gentlemen will find his report at page 132 of the blue-book. He states :

The number of men employed upon the work is very great, and the work is being done in a very expensive manner.

So that on the 10th of March, Mr. Douglas confirmed the "Star's" report, and gave the Minister absolute knowledge of what was taking place, and the hon. gentleman telegraphed down to Mr. Parent to bring up the pay-rolls—Why? Why, he had noticed then that wrong was being done and very properly wanted to see the pay-rolls. What took place? Parent came up without the pay-rolls and informed the Minister that he could not get them. He said that he could not get the time from Kennedy or the pay-rolls from St. Louis. The Minister should therefore have been doubly on the alert, when his chief engineer came here, after a charge of that kind had been made by the newspapers and affirmed by the special officer he sent down to examine. When he knew that unbounded extravagance was going on, it was his duty to stop payment at once if he could not get the pay-rolls. But not a thing was done. Mr. Douglas was sent for by the Deputy Minister. Mr. Douglas was told that Mr. Parent said that the "Star" article was exaggerated, but he orally confirmed the report that the work was being carried on in a very expensive manner and that large numbers of men were employed who were not on the work. On page 134, you will see that Mr. Schreiber gave evidence in answer to questions put by one of the Government themselves, to which I will take this opportunity of calling the attention of the House:

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper asked the question: Did you, or did you not, consider that it would be in the interests of the department and the public for you to go down and settle this question between Mr. Parent and Mr. Douglas relating to the excessive number of men employed?—A. I thought Mr. Parent would reduce it to the proper proportions.

Q. You relied on Mr. Parent?—A. I did rely upon him, certainly.

Q. What is the relative position of Mr. Parent and Mr. Douglas in the department?—A. Mr. Douglas has nothing whatever in the world to do with these works.

Q. Was he not instructed to make this special inquiry?—A. I only asked him to look over things and let me know.

Q. Because you had seen an alarming rumour?—A. Exactly.

Q. And having done that, you paid no more attention to his statements, after you had got the visit from the local superintendent? That is your position?—A. No, the understanding was, when Mr. Parent was up here, that he would see that there were not more men employed than were required.

Q. You are three hours away from those works; you have telephonic communication with them: you see an alarming report; you send a special officer. What is his work? Is he a man of ability, equal to Mr. Parent as an engineer?—A. Oh, as an engineer, I don't know that he has had control of works, but for scientific work he is decidedly his superior.

Q. What is his position in your department?—A. He is bridge engineer. He makes the calculations of the strains of bridges to see whether the bridges on the various railways are up to the requirements of the Government specifications.

Q. He was one of the commissioners appointed by the Government to inquire into this whole subject?—A. He was.

Q. You sent him down to make an investigation?—A. He did not go down for that purpose. He had been down before.

Q. He was plainly instructed for this purpose, was he not?—A. Yes.

Q. My difficulty is this: you sent him and got an official report from him. You find there is a contradiction between these two men, Mr. Douglas and Mr. Parent. You say you did not consider it your duty, when he was contradicted, to examine into this work, which was done by yourself personally?—A. I did not go down directly, but Mr. Parent was up here and saw me.

Q. When did you first get the pay-rolls which would throw some light on the question?—A. We will see later on in the correspondence.

Q. Have you any idea of the number of men?—A. No, I could not tell.

Q. Did you ever attempt to consider or find out?—A. I asked for the pay-rolls several times.

Q. But, when your officers were in dispute, did you take any means to settle what would be the proper number and what was the actual number?—A. No, I should say not.

There we have a statement of what was done, and we have pretty well too the opinion given by the head of another department as to what ought to have been done. There was gross negligence on the part of the Minister of the department and his deputy—a negligence which cannot be defended. As a matter of fact, the Minister knew all about this. He says himself he knew all about it. Mr. Schreiber swears that he was in constant communication with the Minister at the time. Everything done or omitted to be done was done or omitted to be done with the knowledge and consent of the Minister himself. At the very time that this "Star" article appeared, we find a letter written by Mr. Kennedy to the Solicitor General upon this subject, which will be found on page 140 of the report. Mr. Kennedy was very much troubled about the extravagance that was going on and the scandalous manner in which the work was being conducted, and he wrote to the Solicitor General as follows:—

I beg leave to acquaint you of the scandalous manner how certain things are being conducted on the Lachine Canal, in reference to the construction of works in connection with the new Wellington and Grand Trunk Railway bridges, as well as the renewal of the masonry of old Lock No. 1.

Then he speaks about Mr. St. Louis' tender, and proceeds to say:

Now, I can get all the above by the thousands at an average day's pay, without any discontent; we have also supplied ourselves with the necessary derricks capable of running the work of construction of Wellington bridge; they now want to turn all those engaged on to their list, which would increase the cost of the work 75 per cent. Imagine their trying to place pick and shovel labourers, whom I employ for $1.25 per day, at $1.87½ on his (E. St. Louis') list.

As you are, no doubt, aware, I am, and have been, working night and day, to push the work

forward, and it will be too bad, when completed, to have the press crying out against the department and Government, the enormous amount of money this bridge has cost. If the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals is cognizant of these facts, and endorses them, why, I shall accept in humble silence.

Well, the Minister was cognizant because the Solicitor General, immediately after he got this letter, waited upon the Minister and informed him of Kennedy's statement, as I gather——

Mr. HAGGART. Where is there any evidence of that?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let me finish the sentence—as I gather from the Solicitor General's reply, because Mr. Solicitor General writes the following day in reply to that same letter:

My dear Kennedy,—I have seen the Minister of Railways and Canals, and found that all has been tendered for, including labour for the carrying out of the work of the bridge.

Mr. CURRAN. Read on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is nothing more on this point. I will give the hon. gentleman the page and need not lengthen my speech by reading the rest of the letter.

Mr. CURRAN. It is a very short letter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman is anxious that I should read it, I certainly shall. The point I referred to was that Mr. Solicitor General received a letter from Kennedy, the superintendent of the canal, pointing out the outrageous character of his contract and the discontent sure to arise if the work was carried on in the same manner. He pointed out that it was being conducted in a scandalous manner, and the Solicitor General, on the very day he received the letter, went to see the Minister of Railways and Canals, and wrote the next day to Mr. Kennedy that he had seen the Minister. The remainder of the letter reads as follows:—

As superintendent of the canal, you will, of course, have to certify to the accounts, and it will then become your duty to see that nothing is certified to that is not, in your judgment, absolutely correct. In the event of disagreement with any of the contractors as to the classification of work or the prices to be paid for it, you will, of course, have the matter referred at once to the Minister at Ottawa, so that you may not be held responsible in the future for the application of any false principle in connection with the nature of the work done. A question may arise as to what is skilled labour, and here you may have some conflict with the contractor; but your plan is to refer the matter to the department and guided by their decision, in which case you will not be responsible.

Mr. CURRAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman sees that while the Minister of Railways denied that he had knowledge of the facts contained in Kennedy's letter, we have the letter of the Solicitor General saying that he had seen the Minister, and it is inconceivable that the Solicitor General could have written that reply unless he had shown Kennedy's letter to the Minister.

Mr. CURRAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I would explain that I got that letter and came to Ottawa with it, but when I found that the contract had been extended, I thought the letter was too strong and that it would injure Mr. Kennedy if I were to read it to the Minister. I got the information from the Minister that the contract had been extended, and I wrote to Kennedy to be careful how he carried out the work and not to certify to anything that was not absolutely correct, but I did not read Kennedy's letter to the Minister.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman deny that he went to see the Minister after he got Kennedy's letter.

Mr. CURRAN. Not at all, I have just said that I did.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was all I was trying to prove, so that there was no occasion for the interruption. What will the House think when I tell them that the day after Kennedy wrote that letter, St. Louis and Emard came to Ottawa to settle this matter with the Minister; and as a matter of fact, on that very day, the 13th March, the contract with St. Louis was actually extended to ordinary labour. It was not until the 13th March—the day after Kennedy wrote that letter—that they extended St. Louis' contract from skilled labour to ordinary labour, and that was the cause of all the trouble. That was the thing which enabled these men to perpetrate this fraud. That threw the door wide open to fraud, and we have the letter from the Solicitor General to Kennedy telling Kennedy to be careful how he certified and to throw all the blame upon the department. I believe it came out in evidence that Mr. Emard is a gentleman who had more than ordinary influence with the Government of the day. Nobody would imagine that such a contract as Mr. St. Louis had could possibly be extended from skilled to ordinary labour unless special influence was brought to bear. It was sworn that Mr. Emard was in close relationship with the Minister of Public Works—a partner, I believe—and therefore a gentleman who naturally would have a great deal of influence with the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to hurry on. On the 25th April, the department began to be somewhat startled at the enormous sums which they were being called upon to pay for the construction of these works. A letter was written on that date—and I ask the attention of the House particularly to that fact—by Mr. Schreiber, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, to the Minister. I quote from page 151 of the evidence:

Dear Mr. Haggart,—As I mentioned to you, I was not a little startled upon receiving from Mr. Parent the pay-rolls and accounts for the month of March in connection with the Wellington Street bridges, which summed up to an enormous figure. I at once despatched Mr. R. C. Douglas off to Montreal to look into the matter and ferret out all the information he could, and report to me the position of matters. The information he gives me is as follows :—

December, January and February pay-rolls, &c.	$ 79,000
March	132,000
April	110,000
Contracts for superstructure	61,000
	$382,000
Less materials, &c., to be credited to this work and to be debited to other appropriations, say	22,000
	$360,000

and this he considers is the minimum figure that the work is likely to cost.

He goes on to point out that the excessive expenditure requires some explanation and says :

We must look for other reasons to account for the enormous expenditure over and above the estimate.

The department was now—on the 25th April—thoroughly aroused to the fact that a huge fraud was being perpetrated upon them—and it is to the date that I wish particularly to call the attention of the House. On the 10th May, Mr. Schreiber makes a more formal report, calling the attention of the Minister to the letter of 25th April, and stating that since that date :

The investigations, then in progress, have been continued by Mr. R. C. Douglas, and the information he has gathered leads him to believe that the cost of the work will be in excess of that amount, which is a most unsatisfactory state of things, calling for the closest investigation. Another rather startling state of affairs has come to light in connection with the Lachine Canal. As I stated in my report to you above referred to——

He winds up by saying :

Everything in connection with the Lachine Canal is on an extravagant basis, if nothing more. I see no reason to change my views, and I suggest that some person or persons be appointed to thoroughly investigate all matters in connection with the expenditure during the last year.

Now, Sir, that startling state of affairs, as I have shown, was first called to the attention of the Minister of the 25th April. On the 10th May, his attention was formally called to it by his deputy, and a commission was recommended to issue. And a commission did issue ; I believe the Order in Council was passed on the 17th May. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that commission find ? I do not wish to weary the House with any long extracts from the report, but I will give just two or three to show what the state of matters was at that time. With reference to the timber and lumber, the report states, page 10 :

Mr. Henderson's tender was accepted on the 7th December, 1892. There has been charged for timber and lumber, at the contract prices, the amount of $30,914.50, and other timber and lumber, not at contract prices, to an amount of $29,-103.21, or a total of $60,017.71. Timber and lumber to this amount have been certified to by the cullers and by Messrs. Parent and Kennedy. The large amount of $45,992.46 has been purchased without calling for tenders and without arrangement or written requisition of either Mr. Parent or Mr. Kennedy.

* * * * * * * * *

By calculations made from the evidence and plans we estimate there could have been used of all kinds of timber and lumber about 2,594,800 feet, b.m. The total quantity charged to the bridges is about 3,613,600 feet, b.m., which leaves a shortage of some 1,018,800 feet, b.m. We cannot ascertain where this quantity of timber and lumber was used ; it is probable some of it never reached the works.

* * * * * * * * *

From the evidence, it appears that a certain quantity of new timber was broken up and taken away by workmen, or burnt to keep themselves warm ; also carted away or stolen.

With reference to the stone-cutting they reported :

The estimated cost of the stone-cutting, solely in cutters' hours for the bridges and Lock No. 1, taking the ordinary rate paid for piece-work, face measurement, would be about $6,000 ; the amounts rendered for wages, in cutters' hours, amounted to $39,896.04. * * * If we take double the rate, by piece-work, viz., $12,000, as an equivalent for men working by the day for the Government, and other circumstances, it still leaves an excess of cost of some——

$28,000—it is $18,000 here, but that is a clerical error——

—which cannot be accounted for, which sum would be increased by the profit to the labour contractor.

Upon the Wellington Street bridge, by the hours charged for stone-cutting at the rate of wages paid by the contractor, the cost of stone-cutting is $12,-516 ; the amount charged to the Government, including contractor's profit, is $16,715. The cost by piece-work would be some $3,000.

The Grand Trunk and Lock No. 1 being mixed in time-keeping, are taken together, and the cost, at the rate of wages paid by the contractor, is $17,548. The amount charged the Government, including contractor's profit, is $23,180. The cost by piece-work would be some $3,000.

I quote now from page 13 :

Taking the entire labour account, the Wellington bridge cost $3.80 per cubic yard, and the Grand Trunk $8.50 per cubic yard, by comparing the entire number of yards on each bridge of work built and excavation removed.

Then again on page 15, we find $200,000 given as the amount the Government has been practically robbed of through the excessive cost of the works beyond what they should have cost even making allowance for the work done at that time of year and for the Government—and I must say that their allowances are extremely liberal. Then the report goes on, page 16 :

The Wellington bridge structure should have cost $144,000. The pay-lists for labour alone without taking into account materials and supplies, plant and false works, amount to $151,645.

Grand Trunk bridge substructure should have cost $56,000. The pay-list for labour alone without taking into account materials, supplies, plant and false works, amounts to $139,622.

Now, Sir, they wind up their report with a summary of their findings from which, with the indulgence of the House, I will give an extract or two :

An excessive quantity of materials and supplies was purchased. The plant was unnecessarily expensive and extensive. The temporary works, or false works, were too costly, even considering the method adopted in construction, which appears more expensive than might have been other methods of execution. The temporary works, &c., were on a scale for works ten times the magnitude of this.

Every effort appears to have been made to consume and utilize as much timber and lumber as possible, so as not to interfere with its being continually dumped on the canal bank.

The labour force, carters, &c., was unnecessarily large and not fully occupied.

On the Grand Trunk bridge there was a large expenditure in cartage charged to the works, hauling timber and lumber long distances to the private yards of those connected with the works and others, even men paid by the Government were sent to unload and pile the stuff.

Carters and men were hidden, so that the number unoccupied would not be too conspicuous. Forty or fifty men, doing nothing in a lumber yard, their time taken by a time-keeper in the yard, were sent with carts for lumber which should have been loaded and hauled by the contractor. An unnecessary night force seems to have been employed, to obtain the increased profit over day work.

There was a wholesale classification of skilled labour, whereby the most common and cheapest class of labour was charged as skilled. These are some of the reasons for the excessive cost of the work. Other reasons may be adduced which are not so fully supported by evidence. In the time-keeping, the sheets of unbroken days of the pay-lists excite surprise. * * * For this condition of affairs and the results now known the Department of Railways and Canals holds the local officers responsible, as occurring under their supervision, recommendations and reports. On the other hand, the local officers hold the department equally responsible.

Now, this House will have to determine whether the department has not to share with the local officers in this responsibility. There is no doubt at this time of day as to the truthfulness of the report of these commissioners made on the one point of the stuffing of the pay-lists, and the hundred and thousands of men who were returned as employed but were not employed at all. We have the evidence since which was given before the Public Accounts Committee, and in the investigation before the judge. We have the evidence of Doheny, on page 459, and we have the evidence of Frigon, on page 307 ; and on these two points the facts are put beyond doubt. I need not take up the time of the House with reading the evidence, but it is amusing to look at the returns made by Doheny of the number of men which he checked as being employed on the works, and the number of men which St. Louis claimed for in his pay-lists. You will find them varying. Where he reports forty-eight, a charge will be made for 108 ; where he reports none, a charge will be made for sixty-three ; where he reports eight, a charge will be made for sixteen, &c. The same evidence was given by Doheny, but I need not trouble the House by reading that. Frigon's evidence you will find tabulated on page 307, but you will have to go through the evidence for half an hour to get what is there tabulated. When I speak of Doheny's evidence as being found at page 459, I also speak of it as being tabulated on that page. On this point, I will read the conclusion of the Minister himself, from Hansard of 1894 :

I obtained information that the Government had been defrauded in the pay-rolls—that numbers of men who had no existence, were put upon the pay-rolls ; that 50 or 60 men, or perhaps double the number actually at work, were returned on the pay-rolls by Mr. St. Louis, when, in fact, Mr. Doheny stated the number actually employed was far less than the number he returned, and it was only in the Public Accounts Committee the other day that I was able to get from Mr. Frigon's evidence, that the return made by the contractor to the Government for the horses and carts employed on the work was far in excess of the quantity and time actually employed on the work.

So that there cannot be the shadow of a doubt as to the facts reported upon by the commissioners themselves in reference to the labour, and the timber, and the masonry ; nor can there be the shadow of a doubt as to the fact of the returns having been stuffed, and that hundreds and hundreds of men have been charged for that never worked there at all. But if that is so, there can be no doubt where the responsibility should rest. The question I am now asking is, how far the Ministry are responsible for the money they have lost.

Now, I ask the House whether the Department of Railways, having the means of knowledge clearly placed before them of the existence of these frauds, acted in a way to conserve and preserve the public interests ? What did they do ? If you turn to page 451 of the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee, you will see a tabulated statement showing the dates when the pay-lists were returned to the Government, and the dates they were certified by the chief engineer. The March pay-rolls were certified on 24th April, and 28th April. The April pay-rolls were certified on 24th August. But I am concerned chiefly with the pay-rolls for March, the fraudulent pay-rolls—the pay-rolls which are now admitted to be fraudulent —the pay-rolls which the Minister himself admits, in his speech made last year, and about which there can be no possibility of doubt, were stuffed, and were

false, and were fraudulent. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Minister authorized the payment of these pay-rolls at a date when there can be no possibility of doubt that he had the means of knowledge that they were fraudulent. On the 24th April, a cheque issued for $74,777 in payment of the March pay-rolls. Well, Sir, as a matter of fact, that is the very day, I believe, before Mr. Schreiber had reported to the Minister that the thing was being carried on in this disgraceful way, and that an investigation must be held. This cheque for $74,777 was issued on the 24th April, and I charge the evidence is beyond peradventure that the department were at that time in full possession of information given to them by Mr. Douglas, their special appointee. He had made an investigation, he had reported from time to time, and the situation was so very grave and so very serious that the Deputy Minister was calling the attention of the Minister to it, and demanding a royal commission. Now, what defence has the hon. gentleman got to that? Some days afterwards, on the 29th April, five days after the letter was written, they issue another cheque for $9,000; and on the 8th May, just two days before the Minister applied for the royal commission was issued, and I think two days before Mr. Schreiber's official letter was written, demanding the appointment of a commission, they paid out $8,393. Well, what possible excuse can be offered for that? Why should this amount, figuring up about $90,000 odd, have been paid to this man? The Government were then thoroughly apprised of the fact that wrong had been done there, that frauds had been perpetrated, that they would have to appoint a commission to ascertain their extent, and who was responsible for them: and I say it was indefensible in the Minister, at that time, to have authorized and sanctioned the payment of this money.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman would be astonished to learn that the Minister never sanctioned anything of the kind.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman, of course, is entitled to his explanation, and I suppose he will give it. I am calling his attention to the fact that on pages 451, 452, and 454, are the identical cheques with the dates and amounts, which were issued by his department in payment of these pay-rolls. I call his attention to the fact that on the 25th April, he had been notified by his deputy——

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must not beat around the question. The hon. gentleman was saying that the Minister authorized the payments of these amounts at these particulars dates.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course, I do not know the working of the department, but I would assume that if there was a public work being done under the direction of the hon. gentleman, and if information from a special officer appointed to examine into the work, had brought to his knowledge the fact that the work was being carried on in an extravagant and fraudulent way, the hon. gentleman would have stopped all further payments. I will assume that common business rules would have dictated that. I should have thought the department would have said in the meantime: A large sum of money is claimed by these people, but, after what we have seen of the way they have been doing the work, there is reason to believe that frauds have been committed, and the best thing we can do is to stay our hand until we find out. But I was leading up, when the hon. gentleman interrupted me, to the fact that on 10th May the report to Council in favour of the appointment of a royal commission was issued. Surely, on the 25th May the Minister should have stayed his hand and not made any more payments on these contracts. The hon. gentleman nods his head in assent. Then how can he defend his action, when I find that on 27th May there was a cheque issued to Mr. St. Louis for $66,000? Here is a royal commission issued on the report of the Minister demanding an inquiry into huge frauds that were apparent on the face of the pay-lists, and were brought to the attention of the Minister, and an official is seat down to investigate; and yet, even after a royal commission has been issued his deputy pays $66,000, and on 6th June, nearly a month after the Order in Council for a royal commission had been issued, there was a further payment made of $39,000. So here is $99,000 in cash paid to fraudulent contractors after a royal commission had been issued to ascertain the extent of their frauds. I do not think you can parallel that in the history of responsible government in this or any other country. The hon. Minister practically says that because he has not personally handled the money or benefited by it, or been a party to the frauds, he is not responsible. If that is the case, then we do not want responsible government or responsible Ministers. For what purpose do we want Ministers? Parliament votes money in order that it may be spent under the supervision and direction of responsible Ministers and departments, and if Parliament acknowledges the plea that Ministers can keep clear of responsibility by merely saying that the action was taken by the deputy, if this plea will hold after the fact of negligence has been shown and acknowledged, we might as well bid farewell to responsible government altogether. Without going into the details and facts admitted on all sides, without going into an explanation of the changes made in the contract, I affirm that from 8th March, when the "Star" newspaper published the article calling the Minister's attention to the facts, from that day the Minister was bound to

exercise unceasing vigilance. When he sent down Mr. Douglas to make a report, and he made a report confirming, in general terms, the "Star's" published charges, the Minister was doubly bound to exercise supervision. When, on 25th April, his own deputy reported in the terms I have read, that the condition of affairs in Montreal was such as demanded a public inquiry by a royal commission, the hon. Minister was bound by every rule which guides men in public life, to exercise unceasing vigilance with respect to the expenditure of public money, and to determine that those men who were accused of fraudulent practices should not dip their hands any further in the public treasury till the charges were investigated. I have shown that the hon. Minister abandoned all business rules which should characterize the action of the department in connection with this work, and I have shown enough to justify the charge made by his own commissioner, "that the door was open wide to give the contractor for labour or any of his employees, if so inclined, opportunity to defraud the Government by fictitious pay-lists and accounts." I cannot put it any stronger, I need not put it any stronger—it is the severest language of condemnation which can be used. In summing up this matter, we find that for work which should have cost $122,000, accounts were rendered to the amount of $430,000, being an excess of $312,000, and on this claim, $394,000 were actually paid, of which $334,000 was on substructure. The vote of Parliament for $170,000 was evaded by the device of a Governor General's warrant, and while authority of Parliament had been obtained to spend on that special work $170,000, the Government illegally and unconstitutionally used the Governor General's warrant, by which means they expended $394,000. We find that the Public Works Act was ignored deliberately so far as tendering was concerned. We find that the contract, which, in the first instance, was loose and against the public interest, was afterwards extended to the Grand Trunk Railway, at a time when the Minister knew the contract was a bad one for the country. We find the door was opened wide for the perpetration of frauds, as the Minister's own commissioner reports. We find a superintendent was appointed by political influence, who threatened all who stood in his way with instant dismissal; that other officials engaged in the work stood in hourly dread of the superintendent, on account, as they expressed it, of his political influence with the Solicitor General and other supporters of the Government. We find that false pay-rolls were certified, whereby enormous sums of money were stolen. We find that men appropriated money wrongfully to their own use, as was reported in the commissioner's report, and that those men had gone scot free. We find that an honest engineer, Desbarats, who attempted to stop this carnival of extravagance was immediately removed from his position by this political superintendent, Kennedy. We find $170,000 was obtained from the Government by false pretenses, and paid out after the Government was so satisfied about the frauds that they had issued a royal commission. Under these circumstances, Parliament had a right to assume from these two facts that the Government should have done something to punish the perpetrators of these wrongs. Last year we had some of the Government supporters acting upon the statement with which the Minister closed his speech setting forth the intentions of the Government. "Let us hew to the line, let the chips fall where they may," said the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). He was going to prosecute all parties to the fraud; he did not care how high they might be, or who they might be; he demanded that criminal prosecutions be instituted against all these persons. And the Minister wound up his speech by saying:

The evidence is hardly printed yet. I intend to bring the whole matter under the consideration of my colleagues, when they have time to consider it, so that we may see what is to be done for the purpose of punishing those who have been guilty of frauds which I have not the slightest doubt have been perpetrated on the Government.

What have the hon. gentlemen done? With the exception of one prosecution instituted against Mr. St. Louis, which has fizzled out, not an attempt has been made to punish any one of those men who have been engaged, I regret to say successfully engaged, in a huge conspiracy to defraud this Government. We have lost our money, we have lost it under circumstances for which I hold the Minister must be held politically responsible in this House. He was bound to exercise twenty times the vigilance he did, he was bound to exercise the same business knowledge and tact he would have used if he had been carrying this out as a private contract, and he did nothing of the kind, but he threw the door wide open for the perpetration of these crimes, which he now admits and condemns, but which, if he had exercised proper vigilance at the proper time he might have stopped. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move in amendment:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"it appears from the report of the commissioners appointed to investigate the facts connected with the construction in the year 1893, of the two bridges at Montreal across the Lachine Canal, that in the building of the substructures for these bridges the estimates for which were $122,000, the Government has been already actually defrauded of about $160,000, while claims for large amounts for labour and materials alleged to have been supplied are still unpaid.

That the construction of such substructures was carried out by the Department of Railways without calling for public tenders, without proper

supervision or check, and with a reckless abandonment of business rules which invited and encouraged fraud and wrong-doing.

That after knowledge had been brought home to the Minister and department of the reckless extravagance which prevailed in the construction of these bridges, no real or effective attempt was made to ensure an honest carrying on of the work, but on the contrary enormous sums of money were, after such knowledge, improperly paid to contractors and others, and the door was left wide open for the perpetration of fraud upon the Government.

That although the evidence discloses the names of many persons who were parties to these frauds, no attempt has been made to punish any of them criminally except St. Louis.

That under these circumstances the Minister of Railways is responsible, and deserves the severest censure of this House, for negligence, inefficiency and gross mismanagement in connection with these works, and for the losses the country has sustained."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Davies), as is usually his wont has been very vigorous in his declamation and very eccentric in his facts. However, long usage has accustomed him to that, as it has likewise accustomed the House. Before Parliament met there were rumours that a general election was to be brought on, and in the province of Ontario particularly, Reform orators from every platform promised, aye, not only promised, scandals if the Government called the House together, a carnival of corruption—if I may cull that term from the vituperative vocabulary of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—a carnival of corruption never before known in the annals of any other country. Now, Sir, sixty days have elapsed since the commencement of the session and from the first day until now, this is the first, of what may be known as a scandal against the Government. It is quite true that hon. gentlemen opposite have whistled to keep up their courage. It is quite true that upon one occasion they introduced an innocent lamb from the fold in the person of the Auditor General, but, I think, after being made the scapegoat of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the prayer of the Auditor General from this out will be: Save me from my friends. The other day in committee, they thought they started a hornet's nest, and they made an attack on a reverend gentleman in the person of Mr Benson.

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

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot refer to anything which took place in a committee, the proceedings of which have not been reported to the House.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I think if I am debarred from referring to it, I am quite certain we will never hear of it in this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been out gunning, but they have succeeded in bringing down only very small game, and so to-day the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has laboured very hard, and it must indeed be a labour, in endeavouring to dress up anew this matter for the House. He has served up as a cold joint what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) gave last year as a hot roast, and consequently it has fallen very flat. Then, Sir, there has been such a paucity and such a dearth of scandals, that the Liberal party in western Ontario are openly declaring that the Opposition are going to pieces, and so, a week ago the managing editor of the "Globe" was despatched to Ottawa, and that gentleman in a very long editorial has endeavoured to prove to the satisfaction of his readers, that the Government is actually departing into evil again, and he rehashes a number of charges that some hon. gentlemen must have heard of probably in their boyhood, and it is promised that these shall be the startling questions to be submitted to the electorate. Now, Sir, some of these charges are very venerable with age; some of them are hoary-headed. There is the Langevin Block scandal, whatever that was, for I must confess myself to be in ignorance of it although I have heard it referred to here once or twice. There is their old friend, the seizure of the provincial licensing system. I hardly know what that refers to unless it was a Bill introduced about twenty years ago, by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy. Then, there is the Rykert timber limit scandal, so ancient that most hon. gentlemen have doubtless forgotten it, and then they refer to the North-west rebellion. And so the members of the Opposition have gone through this category, and have found at the bottom of the list, the Lachine bridge scandal, which has been resurrected once again and made to do duty for them. Now, I never heard it contended by the Minister of Railways, or by any person on behalf of the Government, that in this matter everything was right or proper. Last year I spoke on the question, and I then stated my opinion, and I believe it still, that wrongdoing has been committed, but that in this connection the Minister of Railways is not guilty or responsible. It will be necessary to give a history of the facts in connection with the matter, because of necessity we must not rely upon what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has stated, inasmuch as he has not at all adhered to the record. It is true, as he tells us, that $170,000 was in the first instance voted by Parliament for the erecting of these two bridges. That is a well-known fact, but it is equally within the information of the House that later on it was decided by the Department of Railways and Canals, to increase the depth of water in the canal which necessitated a largely increased expenditure for the bridges. It was announced here in the House last year—and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) knows very well—that it was never contemplated that

these bridges could have been built for $170,000; but on the contrary, that it had been decided to increase the depth of navigation from 14 to 24 feet, and then the estimate was made that the bridges would cost in the neighbourhood of $230,000. At first it was contemplated that the works should be carried on in the fall of the year, and for obvious reasons it is plain that the work could have been done cheaper at that time than during the period it was afterwards carried out. However, owing to representations made by the mill-owners, and the large interests along the line of the canal, it was decided that, instead of proceeding with the work in the fall of the year, it should be postponed until a later period; and so in the month of March following the work was undertaken. At the outset a great difficulty was met with, and one not contemplated when the specifications were drawn up, and the estimate cost put at $235,000, that was, the necessity of removing a large quantity of ice from the Lachine Canal. That, according to the evidence of Mr. Desbarats, involved an expenditure of some $40,000. So that, taking the two bridges together, their cost, according to the evidence of Mr. Desbarats, who was a trained official of the department, should have been at least some $270,000. Now, the hon. gentleman insinuates that from the outset of the whole transaction there was fraud and evidences of fraud; and as a proof of this he states that Mr. Desbarats was removed from the works. If the hon. gentleman confined himself to the facts of the case, and did not wander off so freely into the regions of imagination, he would find in the first place that the whole charge of the works was committed to Mr. Parent. We find that on the 23rd of December, 1892, instructions were addressed to Mr. Parent for his guidance; and these instructions say: that he had full charge of the staff, and was held responsible for the economical and efficient conduct of the work; that all orders in regard to the work should be given through him; and that he was to be careful to report frequently to the department as to the manner in which the work was being carried on. Now, the hon. member is in this position: he has either stated what he knew was not consistent with the facts, or he has placed a version of the facts before the House not knowing the whole truth. Half truths are very dangerous things; and while the hon. gentleman has led the House to believe that Mr. Kennedy was in full charge of the work, the fact is that Mr. Parent was in charge of the work and continued in charge of it until his suspension. The hon. gentleman afterwards insinuated that Mr. Desbarats was removed from the works for political reasons, and said that he was an efficient officer. Nobody contends, so far as I know, that Mr. Desbarats was not an efficient officer; but the statement of the hon. gentleman that he was removed for political reasons falls to the ground when I state the fact that Mr. Desbarats was not dismissed from the service, but was simply transferred from that work to another. This is a sample of how the simple facts compare with the distorted statements the hon. gentleman submits to the House. The hon. gentleman goes on and tells us that this man Kennedy was, in common English, a thief from first to last; yet when you read the letter of Kennedy, it is plain that from the outset he was acting in every possible way to secure the exercise of economy and to protect the rights of the department. Then, the hon. gentleman turns round on another tack and says that when Kennedy does tell the truth to the department, the department sets all his remonstrances at naught. Let us read this letter of Kennedy, and see what his complaints were; and the reading of the letter will, I think, convince any reasonable person that instead of his representations being disregarded, they were fully attended to. Kennedy's complaint, which is to be found in his letter of the 12th of March, printed on page 140 of the evidence, is in reference to a matter that had been disposed of by the Minister, and in a manner which, when the facts of the case are known to the House, will be seen to be quite satisfactory. The principal points in that letter of Kennedy are these:

> Without consulting any one, and for what motive I consider a mystery, he (Mr. Parent) issues specifications, asking for rates for the supplying of foremen, derricks, stonecutters, stonemasons, double and single teams and skilled labour, from Mr. E. St. Louis, the successful tenderer.

Now, I see nothing wrong in this in the man who was in charge of the works, who had written instructions from the department to issue the specifications in reference to the hiring of labour. Then, the hon. gentleman says that the labour was hired privately, public tenders not being invited. That is not in accord with the evidence, a reference to which will show that in the first instance tenders were asked for the labour, but that the prices, for reasons best known to the acting engineer, were not considered satisfactory, and tenders were called a second time. Then, some four persons put in tenders, with the result that the tender of Mr. St. Louis, being the lowest, was accepted. It may seem strange that there should be this tendering for labour, because the hon. gentleman insinuates that that was part of a deep-laid plan to work wrong-doing. To my mind, the explanation of the Minister given last year was not far-fetched or unfair. In a large city like Montreal, there is more or less danger of strikes—that organized labour will make its power felt; and it is not infrequent that railway contractors, having large contracts on hand, hire from one person a large number of men for employment on their works. In one case, which was referred to before

the committee, 6,000 men were employed in that way. When Mr. Parent, the acting engineer, represented to the Minister that labour was being hired in that way, the Minister was not at first favourable; but when Mr. Parent pointed out that there was a liability of strikes occurring, that the work was to be pushed on with the greatest possible despatch, and that a great many men were to be placed on the work at one time, he agreed that the labour should be hired in the manner in which it was. A scale of prices was adopted. Mr. Kennedy, in his letter, a portion of which, I believe, was quoted by the hon. gentleman, speaks of the prices paid as being unduly high. The hon. gentleman would lead the House to believe that unskilled labour was paid $1.89 a day. That is not the fact. It is quite true that Mr. Emard came to Ottawa and saw the Minister in reference to a dispute as to the price paid for labour. It had been agreed that axe men and pick men were to be paid at the rate of $1.89 a day. To that the Minister demurred, and a compromise was effected at $1.50 a day. Now, I do not think that any one will object to that as a fair rate of wages to be paid to men who had often to be at work in water. So that from the outset there was a strict surveillance kept by the Minister over the matter. On the 8th of March the work was commenced. At first it was not contemplated that it should be completed in forty days. However, as there had been one postponement of the work, and as it was necessary in the interest of the shipping that it should be completed at an early day, forty days was fixed as the time within which it should be completed. As a consequence, a larger number of men were employed than was originally contemplated. It is quite true that on the 9th March the attention of the Minister was drawn to the matter. It is quite true that on the 12th March, Parent, who was in charge of the work, was summoned to Ottawa, and saw the Minister, and on inquiry being made, some 400 men were dismissed, and some hundred teams. Then Mr. Emard came to Ottawa and the new arrangement was made. The work was then progressing and Mr. Parent was in charge. It is quite true that Mr. Desbarats had been sent to another work, but Mr. Kennedy was acting in a subordinate position, and with the assistance of five or six time-keepers, the Government thought they were perfectly secure in their position. Not only had there been very little money spent on the work then, but the major portion of the material was on the ground, and ready to be used; and so we find on the 1st April the sum of $170,000 had been spent on the work which was well under way. On the 14th April, Mr. Douglas went to Montreal and made a report. He reported that another $100,000 would be required, in addition to the $170,000 then expended, to complete the work. That would bring it up to the cost, as originally estimated, when the expense of clearing the canal of ice is taken into consideration. On the 1st May, further bills were placed before the department, which brought the costs over $300,000. The Minister of Railways then went down and personally inspected the work. That was on the 12th April. Up to that time, the work had been progressing, and progressing favourably, and on the 19th April, when the Minister saw the work himself, it was pretty well under way. Afterwards, on the 25th April, Mr. Douglas, still acting under the advice of the Minister, still closely watching the work, had other bills presented to him. It is true that the work has cost over $360,000. The hon. gentleman urges that the Minister of Railways should not then have paid the bills. That is for the Minister himself to explain, but this I do believe, that, in the view of subsequent events, in the view of matters afterwards to be dealt with, owing to the increased cost of what is known as the coffer-dam, and other works which Mr. Desbarats, in his evidence, said would cost $6,000, and which cost some $60,000, in view of some thousands of dollars expended in removing ice—in view of all this expenditure, not contemplated, there was a legitimate and honest expenditure in the work of over $300,000. The hon. gentleman dwelt at great length on the point that the Grand Trunk Railway had offered to build this bridge for $70,000, from which he argued that the two should have been built for $140,000. But the hon. gentleman failed to tell the House that the Wellington is a much larger and wider bridge than the Grand Trunk bridge, and that the Grand Trunk Railway never offered to build a bridge for $70,000. There is not a tittle of evidence to prove that they ever made such an offer, but there is evidence to show that the Government, time and again, asked the Grand Trunk people if they would build the bridge. In proof of that, let me refer the House, not to the hon. gentleman's own statements, but to the statement of Mr. Hannaford, the engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway, as shown in Mr. Schreiber's evidence:

> Therefore, the two amounts together would be $70,000 for building the railroad bridge complete; but he suggested, that, as it was then so late in the season, the fact being, that the quarries were all closed and derricks dismantled and everything in a state of repose for the winter——

It was then on the 28th December.

> —Mr. Hannaford suggested, that the Grand Trunk Railway, if they undertook it, should do it for the Government by day's work, so to speak; that they were to show their expenditure, the pay-rolls, the name of every man, and also the cost of all the materials they used, and that, in addition a reasonable sum was to be put on for the cost of superintending, the use of plants, steam derricks, and tools of that kind.

And when the last application was made to Mr. Hannaford, his reply came in these words:

No, the season is so far advanced that we hesitate to do it; but we will do it for you, and we will charge you what it costs.

Now, there is the statement of Mr. Hannaford himself—not offering, as the hon. gentleman alleges, to do the work for $70,000, but, on the contrary, positively refusing to do it at any price, except on the terms that the Grand Trunk Railway should be permitted to go on with the work, to hire their men, that the Government should pay the men, and the bills as placed before them, and that the Grand Trunk Railway should then have, in addition, a profit of 15 per cent on the amount. That is vastly different, so that their contention that $70,000 was what the railway bridge should have cost remains outside the question altogether. As I have said before, the Wellington bridge was much more expensive, and the cost was greatly enhanced by the season of the year in which the work was done. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, have seized upon this matter as they seized upon it last year, and I have little doubt that their reason for bringing it up before the House when they did was in order that it might have some effect in the prosecution instituted in Montreal against Mr. St. Louis. They knew that the first prosecution had ended, I regret to say, in the dismissal of the case by the Police Magistrate. They knew perfectly well that another prosecution was being brought before the Grand Jury, and they hoped to have the matter discussed in the House before that prosecution took place before the Grand Jury. They hoped to hear the statement from the Minister that the prosecution would be carried on to the bitter end, and they hoped to be able to go to Montreal and placard that statement, and in that way endeavour to excite a certain amount of animus against the Government, and a feeling in favour of St. Louis. Not that they have any love for St. Louis, by any means. They cannot conceal to-day their mirth at St. Louis' dismissal. They live on political pabulum of this kind, and have brought this amendment forward as a matter of rejoicing and nothing more. They hoped to defeat the action of the Government in any respect or case. Why should not these hon. gentlemen do this? They have had an example. They know that in the Mercier case, their old friends were all acquitted by reason of the active part they took in the criminal proceedings. That is why this matter has been introduced in the House, and another reason is because of the perfect paucity, on their part, of anything to bring before the public. What is the position of the matter from the first? It is not, as the hon. gentleman has recapitulated, that the Minister of Railways did an unlawful, unauthorized, or illegal act. There had been authorized by the vote of Parliament, an expenditure of $170,000, on a basis of fourteen foot navigation. The principle had been affirmed by the House that two bridges should be built, and I say it was within the province of the Minister, when it was afterwards shown that it would be a mistake to build the bridges and have the substructure of such a depth that nothing drawing over fourteen feet could pass, to decide that a change should be made. The principle had been affirmed that the two bridges should be built, and that $170,000 should be expended, on the basis of fourteen feet navigation; and the only change was in making the substructure deeper to meet the requirements of navigation. Where is the wrong-doing in that? Hon. gentlemen opposite started out with the charge that from the outset every means had been employed to defeat the ends of justice, and that the Government had placed on the works men who were untrue and unfaithful. But Kennedy was never in charge of the work. Parent was in charge from the first, and the hon. gentleman should be fair to the Minister. If there has been any wrong-doing by Kennedy, he was not the man in charge of the work. As to the bugbear of Desbarats having been removed, there is nothing in that. If the hon. gentleman had taken time to read the letter, he would have seen that Desbarats was only transferred from one position in the department to another, and a man named Papineau engaged in his place. It is true that Desbarats had prepared the plans and specifications; but surely the hon. gentleman will not contend that the man who may act as draughtsman must, of necessity, act as clerk of works. So as to this removal nothing wrong is shown to exist. As to the material, there is no doubt that tenders were called for. As to the labour, a sufficient reason, I believe, had been alleged why it was hired as it was. As to the day labour being taken unfairly and dishonestly, denial is given to that from the fact that on the first occasion the tenders were sent in, the department, not believing them satisfactory, called for second tenders; and in open and fair competition, the lowest of four tenders was accepted. Now, Sir, I have gone over the points in the evidence to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and I have endeavoured to set him right. I do not contend, and no one in this House will contend, that there has not been a waste of public money. But this must be borne in mind that in every great work, and especially in this case in which the bridge was built at a time not at first contemplated—that is, in the winter instead of in the summer—there are often unexpected causes arising which enhance the cost. See how the great public works undertaken in Ontario have swollen in cost. The legislative assembly building in Toronto was at first expected to cost half a million, but before the completion of the building the

amount has been increased to $1,200,000, that increase being in great part owing to changes in the plans. I believe that in matters of this sort there should be strict supervision; and, so far as the Minister is concerned from first to last, I cannot see any other aim on his part than to have the work fairly constructed, to have the work honestly constructed and to keep within the limits of the original plans. I do admit, and it seems reasonable to admit, that these amounts were unduly swollen and should not have been paid. But the Minister was justified to a certain extent in the evidence of Mr. Desbarats, whose information was volunteered to the department. He makes the statement that owing to the manner in which the work was constructed; owing to the fact that it was undertaken in winter, at a time not originally contemplated, the cost was increased, in his opinion, to three times as much as originally estimated. I have no doubt he gave that as his opinion of the cost in order, perhaps, to palliate his own wrong-doing, if he had been doing wrong. But, if there is such a great difference of opinion as to what the work should have cost, when the whole facts are laid before the public, instead of this being a waste of $150,000, the amount will probably be found to be not much more than $100,000. I do hope and trust, despite the fact that it will be a cause of serious annoyance to hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Government may be successful in a civil action it has instituted. I regret that this man, St. Louis has escaped. The hon. gentleman for Queen's (Mr. Davies) appears to take much consolation out of it, and I suppose he and his friends should be tendered our congratulations on their satisfaction. This only I have to say: I am prepared to vote against the amendment offered, for it is manifest that the Minister of Railways was not cognizant of wrong-doing and that he was not guilty of gross dereliction of duty. Occupying as he does the position of head of one of the largest spending departments in the Government; being engaged, as he was, in the onerous duties thrown upon him by a session of Parliament, it was not to be expected that he should have given his undivided attention to that matter. In the administration of a great department a certain amount of trust must be reposed by the superior in his subordinates. Mr. Parent was an old officer of the department, a man who had grown old in the public service and who had a reputation to keep up. Mr. Kennedy, no doubt, came well recommended to the department. The instructions given as to how the work should be carried out were clear. Though there has been wrong-doing, and I admit that there has been, still the Minister is shown to have taken all the precautions he could and to have acted honestly and above board in all his doings: and he should not be blamed for any wrong-doing on the part of others.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has undoubtedly made the best that could be made of the brief that has been given him. But it is evident that he has no practical knowledge of the work; for if he had, I am sure he would never have made the speech he has made. He denies the statement made that Mr. Hannaford offered to do this work. He should have consulted the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee, when he would have found that Mr. Hannaford stated under oath, which statement I have under my hand, that he offered to do this work. So that disposes of the hon. gentleman's case, so far as Mr. Hannaford is concerned.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, there is not a word of truth in his statement.

Mr. GIBSON. If the hon. Minister will wait till I come to it——

Mr. HAGGART. But you made a statement which is not correct.

Mr. GIBSON. I will read the statement later if the hon. gentleman will have patience. Mr. Hannaford undertook to build the substructure of the Grand Trunk bridge for $35,000 and the superstructure for $35,000, in all $70,000. And, in the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee, Mr. Hannaford stated that he was willing to supply a bridge containing 15,000 pounds more of iron than the bridge built by the Dominion Bridge Company, and now in use by the Government, including that in his $35,000 estimate. At page 272 of the evidence you will find the statement made by Mr. Hannaford:

Estimated cost of erecting a new swing bridge for Grand Trunk Railway traffic at Wellington Street—275 feet over all—square ends, say 600,000 pounds, including gearing at 4 cents, erected.....	$27,000
Painting, false works, wooden superstructure, engines and machinery and sundries	7,000
	$34,000
Raising approaches, paving, &c.....	5,000
	$39,000
Less by present bridge.....	4,000
	$35,000

Exclusive of masonry, crib-work piers and protections.

E. P. HANNAFORD,
Chief Engineer.

Montreal, 25th October, 1892.

And the other estimate reads:

Montreal—Lachine Canal bridge, Wellington Street for Grand Trunk Railway traffic, approximate estimate:

Abutments—two at 250 cubic yards, 500 cubic yards at $30.....	$15,000
Concrete, 300 cubic yards at $15.....	4,500
Excavation, 600 cubic yards, say.....	500
Timber for foundation.....	2,000
Crib-work for piling	9,000
Taking down two piers and sundry work	4,000
	$35,000

Summary—

Say, masonry, &c.....	$35,000
Superstructure	35,000
	$70,000

E. P. HANNAFORD,
Chief Engineer.

Montreal, 24th December, 1892.

Now, Mr. Hannaford was asked by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, what was the depth of navigation, and Mr. Hannaford's answer was :

These estimates were made for 19 feet. That is Mr. Parent's plan.

The evidence goes on :

By Mr. Bergeron :

Q. Is that 19 feet navigation ?—A. 19 feet navigation. It was a Government plan.

By Mr. Gibson :

Q. So you arrived at that estimate from the Government plan, and you say that your estimate of $35,000 for masonry and $35,000 for superstructure, a total of $70,000, that when you made that estimate on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway, you were satisfied there was a profit of $10,000 for the Grand Trunk Railway Company ?—A. I was satisfied there was, if the season was decent.

Q. And the work could be done under those circumstances, providing they gave you sufficient time to work, for $60,000 ?—A. Yes, $60,000 or $70,000. It could have been done for my estimate. I felt that my estimate was a very high one for the substructure.

Q. Now, Mr. Hannaford, supposing that you had been obliged to go four feet further down, how much would that have added to the cost of the substructure ?—A. Another 4 feet in addition to the 19, well, I should have had to do pumping and all that. Altogether, I should say $8,000.

Q. $8,000 additional to have taken down to the depth the Government took it down themselves ?—A. I don't know that, sir. You see the Government and any government would do the same. You don't want to have 22 feet to pump ; you want to sheer off a little. Nineteen feet is as much as would carry one of the Allan line vessels.

Q. Supposing the Government had decided, after you had taken the work, to have gone down to the 22 feet, you still think that you could have done it for $8,000 additional, and that the Grand Trunk would not have lost anything ?—A. I think, as the matter turned out ; I think that the whole thing could have been done for $70,000. I made up my mind, after the work was done, in May, 1893, that the work would have been done, and that we should have done it at a saving of $10,000.

So you see that although the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, claimed that all this additional cost to the country was on account of the Government sinking the channel four feet deeper than was at first intended, here you have the evidence of Mr. Hannaford, who is quite competent to judge upon these facts, that so far as the Grand Trunk bridge was concerned, he was in a position as chief engineer to say that he would undertake the work for $8,000. And after he had seen the work done, he still says he could have done it for the $8,000 extra, and the country would have saved $10,000. My hon. friend to the left of me says it was a bigger bridge. Of course it was a bigger bridge. It weighed 15,000 pounds more, and was worth $6,000 more than the bridge the Government put in, and it was a bridge that was to be turned by steam, whereas the present bridge is turned by hand. Neither the present bridge nor the Wellington bridge are finished, and probably never will be. Now, my hon. friend spoke about the quantities that would be required on a large work of that kind, and the different kinds of material that would be required. Well, we have a statement made by Mr. Desbarats, who has been spoken of so highly to-day, that in the estimate made by him for the construction of these works, and he provided everything so far as he could foresee as an engineer, 550,000 feet board measure of all kinds of timber was all that was needed for that work. I would like that hon. gentleman, before he goes away, to explain to me how it comes about that according to the report of the Government's commissioners there was charged for 3,613,600 feet board measure, and the Government commissioners say in their report that there could have been used in that work only 2,594,800 feet board measure. Now, where are the 1,018,800 feet paid for and not used ?

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman say it was paid for ?

Mr. GIBSON. According to the Government's report. You will have a chance of explaining how much you paid for, and how much you have not paid for. There is one thing, however, that is clear. These men made up accounts for 3,600,000 feet of lumber, of which over a million feet cannot be found ; and it was given in evidence last year that 450 pieces of timber 12 inches by 12 inches, from 25 to 30 feet, were taken away or stolen in one night from the banks of the Lachine Canal, and has never been heard of since. I have not heard that the Minister of Railways nor the Solicitor General have been looking for the culprit who took that timber. The hon. gentleman spoke about tenders being applied for, and that all kinds of work were done under contract. Sir, the commissioners' report contradicts that statement to this extent. that $45,992.46 worth of timber was delivered and paid for that never was contracted for at all. That does not bear out the statement that everything was done under contract. You can see that in the report of the commissioners, page 11 :

A large amount, $45,992.46 worth, has been purchased without calling for tenders, and without demands or requisitions from either Mr. Parent or Mr. Kennedy.

Now, my hon. friend stated this afternoon that Mr. Kennedy was not in charge of the work. Sir, Mr. Kennedy was in charge of the work, as appears on page 327 of the evidence :

By Mr. Haggart :

Q. You went up to Ottawa ?—A. Yes.

Q. And why didn't you go to the department and make your complaint ?—A. Because I was stopped by Senator Drummond and Mr. Curran, and I said here on Friday that I was sorry often that I did not carry that out, and Senator Drummond expressed himself since that he was sorry I did not carry it out, which I hope the "Star" paper will put that in. If I had been discharged then, I should not have been in the position I am to-day. I should have been a free man.

If Mr. Kennedy was discharged, he must have been employed at one time or another, because on page 295 of the same evidence, we find :

Q. Would you kindly explain ; we want to have the truth, that is all we want ?—A. That is what I want to give, as far as possible. That interview was held between Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Ogilvie—Mr. Curran was also present—in Mr. Trudeau's office. What took place between them at the interview I don't know. Then Mr. Curran and Mr. Ogilvie came to me in an adjoining room, and Mr. Ogilvie informed me that Mr. Trudeau would be highly pleased if I would accept the appointment of overseer of the construction of the Wellington bridge. I said that I would, conditionally. He wanted to know what those conditions were, and I told him that the conditions should be, that if I was to be held responsible for the construction of the Wellington bridge, that I should have full charge, that is to say, having all the men employed directly under my charge, having full control of the men, the plant, material and everything else. That is to say, the placing of the plant in the proper place and having the material necessary to do the work. Mr. Ogilvie made the remark, "Never mind the conditions, it will be all right." I said, "It may be all right now. It is better to take precautions now. It will save trouble later on." Mr. Curran said, "Kennedy is right ; he should stipulate conditions, and they should be allowed him, or he should not take charge of the work ;" but Mr. Ogilvie overruled both Mr. Curran and I. He also stated that Mr. Trudeau did not see how Kennedy could be remunerated for taking such a position, which was outside his official duties, and they preferred doing it thus in order to ensure those interested in the waterways having double interest of getting it finished. I said I did not care anything about that.

That shows conclusively that the desire of these parties was not only to put Mr. Kennedy in a position of trust, but to put him over Mr. Parent, the engineer. It was quite evident throughout the whole investigation that Mr. Kennedy occupied the principal position, because he did what he pleased and carried out what he pleased, without consulting Mr. Desbarats or Mr. Parent in any way whatever. Then, my hon. friend spoke about the number of men employed. We were told that no one kept the time. That was evident. Thousands of hours were charged that were never put in. Some of the men were recommended, not for their fitness, but because of some political influence they could use in the neighbourhood of Montreal, where they lived, for we find that at one of the examinations conducted by Mr. Tarte, Mr. Kennedy said they were recommended by different parties, that quite a few were recommended by Mr. Ouimet, and that a number were put on, whether Mr. Desbarats or Mr. Parent required them or not, on the order of Mr. St. Louis himself. The Minister said there was no undertaking between Mr. St. Louis and himself regarding the change of pay made when employed by the Government and by the contractor, from $1.25 per day when in the Government employ to $1.50 when in the employ of Mr. St. Louis. I find in the evidence given by Mr. St. Louis, when under examination, he said :

Q. So that the official arrangement was, that all of these men could be paid $1.50, that you should get that for them ?—A. By an understanding with the Deputy Minister and Mr. Haggart, I was to get $1.50 a day for all labourers working with pick and shovel.

Four hundred men were employed by the Government at $1.25 per day, and these, the moment they were turned over to Mr. St. Louis, were considered to be worth $1.50 per day. The hon. member for Simcoe laid great stress upon the expense involved in removing ice from the canal basin. But it must be remembered that thousands of yards were removed unnecessarily, they were removed by horse and cart while machinery which was standing idle, although under pay, was on the work by which the ice could have been brought to the bank and the carts thus easily filled and they would have been able to take much larger loads than when filled at the prism of the canal. From the beginning to the end of this work there was nothing but extravagance. There was no order or system, and even no official time-keeper. The only time-keeper employed was one who was supposed to act for the Government, but he acted for Mr. St. Louis as well. In the matter of carting alone, we find that $12,700 were paid for which no work was done. The hon. member for Simcoe spoke about the Wellington Street bridge being a much larger structure than the Grand Trunk bridge. I tell the hon. gentleman that the Wellington Street bridge did not cost as large an amount, even though it is a more extensive work. Comparing labour hours charged to both bridges, from February 1st to May 6th, during which period the same class of work was executed, and during which period there was more than treble the work done upon the Wellington bridge :

Total hours of all labour, Wellington bridge	524,042
Total hours of all labour, Grand Trunk bridge	597,520
Total hours of stonecutters, Wellington bridge	50,063
Total hours of stonecutters, Grand Trunk bridge	57,190
Total hours of masons, Wellington bridge	12,070
Total hours of masons, Grand Trunk bridge	24,336
Total hours of skilled labour, Wellington bridge	107,747

Total hours of skilled labour, Grand Trunk bridge	142,258
Total hours of ordinary labour, Wellington bridge	278,253
Total hours of ordinary labour, Grand Trunk bridge	281,491
Total hours of single carters, Wellington bridge	46,358
Total hours of single carters, Grand Trunk bridge	75,940
Total hours of double carters, Wellington bridge	29,551
Total hours of double carters, Grand Trunk bridge	16,305

The overtime and night hours of the masons on the Wellington bridge is 28 per cent of the total hours charged; on the Grand Trunk bridge it is 48 per cent of the total hours charged. The night work of masons on the Wellington bridge terminated on the 1st of April; on the Grand Trunk it is charged until the 19th of April, while evidence shows that the masons worked at night at the commencement only of the laying of masonry on the Grand Trunk. An inducement to increase the night hours can be mentioned: the contractor paid the same wages for night as for day. The profit, according to the contractor's account, for a mason per day would be 82 cents, for the night $2, and if skilled and ordinary labourers are classed as masons, the profit would be much greater. For a rough comparison of cost, the total cubic yards of all classes of work built and removed on both bridges may be taken, and compare the cost of cartage relative to the work done on each bridge respectively. Although this comparison does not refer to the number of yards carted or to the actual cost of carting per cubic yard, still it answers the object in view. Upon the Wellington bridge the cost of cartage, per cubic yard, is approximately 78 cents, while on the Grand Trunk it is $1.80, or nearly 2½ times that on the Wellington. I might here say that, notwithstanding the fact that the whole of that stone could have been brought in by the Grand Trunk Railway from Terrebonne quarries, a distance of 22 miles, thereby saving the cost of teaming, simply because Mr. St. Louis could not make any profit out of railway transportation, he was given the privilege, or at all events assumed it, of carting the whole of the stone from these quarries. It was shown that $12,700 had been expended on teaming, when none of it was necessary. The evidence showed that teams were employed in the morning. A man came down with his team and entered his name as being at work for the day, then he went up town and resumed his regular avocation and returned on the following morning and entered his name again, and in this way the Government paid improperly thousands of dollars. The scandal eventually became so great that even political friends of hon. gentleman opposite called the Government's attention to it, and asked them to look into the facts, and then the Government were obliged to appoint a commission, and that commission, notwithstanding the fact that it was appointed by the Government, came to the conclusion that the work was carried on in a most extravagant manner, that carelessness was manifestly displayed in every department, that there was no practical supervision, that every man was allowed to do as he pleased, and men were put on where they were not required, that men were allowed to carry lumber from one side of the yard to the other and take it back the following day, that thousands of feet of lumber were brought from Henderson's yard at night without any supervision, and the only check exercised was that the men on the following day were asked who brought it down. In this way there was no practical check on the work, and the Government were obliged to accept the charges of the lumber dealers whether they were right or wrong. I cannot add anything to the report made by the Government's own commissioners. In conjunction with that I may say that this recklessness extended over all the other works upon the Lachine Canal. We found that these men were doing work for the mill-owners along the line of the canal; that timber was charged for in excessive quantities, and that in one case, a box drain was said to contain 356,000 feet of lumber, which was charged for, while the actual quantity in the work was less than 19,000 feet, board measure, or, to be more accurate, 18,714 feet. The commissioners say:

> A large amount of plank has been charged to the "box drain," 356,081 feet, b.m., of this only 18,714 feet, b.m., was used in the work. It is shown from the evidence of Mr. T. H. Trihey, that, of the plank above mentioned, 220,000 feet, b.m., was never purchased or delivered, though the account for this quantity of timber is certified to by Mr. Kennedy and other canal employees. The lumber purchased consisted of some pine deals, pine timber, and a number of pieces of oak. Not being able to charge the quantity of oak purchased to the box drain, a portion of it was invoiced as pine, to an amount equivalent to that originally charged for the oak. The account was originally rendered as oak, and, at the request of the superintendent of the canal, was changed to pine.
>
> In the account (A—1) there is charged 220,000 feet of pine plank, instead of 37,448 feet of oak which was delivered, and which is not yet used, and is a raft in the canal.
>
> So far as appears from the evidence, only the value of timber actually sold to the department was paid for; there does not appear to have been any necessity for buying the oak in the autumn of 1892. Besides this transaction, there is charged to the box drain an account of Henderson Brothers for 48,942 feet, b.m., of plank, which was delivered subsequent to the date on which the repairs to the box drain were made, and consequently could not have gone into that work. This system of management might lead to the fraudulent manipulation of accounts.
>
> The account made up for material and the work done amounts to $4,223.15; a much less sum, probably under $500, was expended upon the box drain, for which an appropriation of $5,000 had been voted.

I may say in this connection, that in the evidence of Mr. Desbarats, he states he ordered the following materials namely, bracing for piles, 44,160 feet, board measure; rear waling, 3,960 feet, board measure : oak waling, 19,167 feet. None of this timber was ever put on, and to-day the tops of the piles in the Lachine Canal is without waling, either outside or inside to protect the Government works from the vessels crowding against them. The Government, instead of claiming the work to have cost a certain sum of money, should have finished the work before they came to Parliament to state that it was complete. The work is not complete. We were to have a bridge opening and closing by electricity, but the day I went down there to examine it, instead of a motor being in use, I saw five or six men working at it, and taking five minutes to open it, and five minutes to close it. Instead of the work being of such a character that the Government of this country should feel proud of it, the Minister of Railways, his chief engineer, and every official of the department connected with it, ought to feel ashamed at leaving the work in such an unfinished condition. It does not speak well for the Minister or his chief engineer that they should squander $400,000 on these two bridges without having the decency to make the job complete. Unless I am greatly mistaken, it is as unfinished to-day as it was when the water was let into the Lachine Canal. I repeat, again, that this House ought to condemn the Minister and his department for allowing the work to remain in its present condition.

Mr. MASSON. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it is quite unnecessary to occupy the time of this House is going over the details of the expenditure on these bridges. We had them all before the House last session, and we have them all printed in the report, not only of the commissioners, but of the Public Accounts Committee of last year. It is admitted on all hands that the bridges cost a great deal more than they should have cost, and that the cost was largely increased by reason of frauds committed on the Government. The manner in which these frauds were committed has been thoroughly investigated in the courts. It has been shown that, to a certain extent, there were unquestionably stuffed pay-lists, and other frauds of that nature. It has also been clearly shown that the 1,018,000 feet of lumber, which the last speaker has so eloquently referred to, was delivered and in some way cannot be found. All these are admitted facts, were admitted by the Minister last year, and in the discussion of the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Davies) it is unnecessary to occupy the time of the House in gonig into the details. There is no question between the Minister and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) on that point. Both parties admit that there was large expenditure over and above what there should be. However, the amendment charges that the Minister and his colleagues are responsible for that loss. Now, in fixing responsibility upon the head of any department, whether it be a department of Government, or whether it be a department of any business or financial concern ; the circumstances connected with the fraud, the manner in which the fraud was perpetrated, and the duties that the person at the head of the department had to perform, have all to be taken into account. The circumstances under which this work was let were of a very exceptional character. The building of these bridges across the Lachine Canal had to be done in the winter time, so as to interfere, as little as possible, with navigation, and it had to be completed in a very short time, in order not to interfere with the mill-owners who took their power from the canal. For that reason, their construction was delayed until the winter. Some preliminary work was done before the close of navigation, but the real construction was all postponed until the winter time. That necessarily caused a largely increased cost. Any person will admit that work of that kind cannot be as cheaply carried on in the winter time as in the summer months. Now, as to the manner in which the work was done. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has charged that the law was broken, that the statute was over-ridden, that the rules which should govern public works were entirely set aside, that it should have been let by contract, and was not let by contract, and that the whole thing was a sham, done on purpose to aid political friends, and to get political capital. Whatever evidence the hon. gentleman has for this broad assertion, he did not favour the House by reading it. Such deductions as he draws are principally from his imagination. Now, what are the facts ? That the superstructure was let by tender, that the material was obtained by tender, that in each case the lowest tender was accepted, that the labour was obtained by tender.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not by tender.

Mr. MASSON. Yes ; there were four tenders, and the lowest was accepted.

Mr. MULOCK. Not for all the labour.

Mr. MASSON. First, for the skilled labour. Now, the hon. gentleman says there was no evidence that these were bona fide tenders. There is no evidence that they were other than bona fide tenders.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What does the commission report ?

Mr. MASSON. Tenders were obtained from parties likely to supply the labour, and these tenders ranged from 48 cents for day work, and 72 cents for overtime down to 40 cents for day work, and 60 cents for overtime, which were the rates of the tender that was accepted. The hon. member for North

York says it was not for all the work that tenders were asked. It was for skilled labour first. As to the manner in which the ordinary labour was subsequently obtained from the same party, that is a reasonable matter for comment by hon. gentlemen opposite. As the work progressed it was found desirable that it should be controlled in this way, and it was done. I do not think there is anything in the charge that there was overpayment for the ordinary labour. It is said that the rate was increased from $1.25 to $1.50. We have it in evidence that the superstructure was advertised for, that it was let by tender, and that the lowest tender was accepted. We have it also that the material was advertised for——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No.

Mr. MASSON—and that the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman persist in that statement that the material was advertised for? If he does, I challenge that statement. There were private tenders applied for to a few parties only.

Mr. MASSON. Well, put it that way, that private tenders were applied for; a large number of tenders were put in, and the lowest was accepted. The labour was called for by tender, four tenders were put in, and the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. MULOCK. I challenge the hon. gentleman there. Surely he must know that the report of the commissioners shows that no tenders were asked for the skilled labour for both bridges, but only for the one bridge.

Mr. MASSON. Tenders for skilled labour were asked for, and tenders were put in as follows:—

	Wellington Bridge.		Old Lock No. 1.	
	Days' work.	Overtime.	Days' work.	Overtime.
	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.
W. G. Turner & Co.....	0 45	0 65	0 40	0 65
Em. St. Louis.....	0 40	0 60	0 40	0 60
John B. Rose.....	0 48	0 72		
J. E. Trottier.....	0 45	0 70		

The tender of St. Louis, being the lowest, was accepted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is replying to the statement I made and is endeavouring to show that I was wrong; but he must know that there was no public or private call for tenders as regards the Grand Trunk Railway bridge.

Mr. MASSON. Tenders being called for the larger work, if they were extended to the smaller work, the hon. gentleman surely cannot object. The engineer recommended this method of employing day's labour instead of having the whole work done by contract, so that in having the work done in a hurried manner and at that particular time, there would be no loss to the mill-owners and no interference with navigation. Another reason that weighed with the Minister for obtaining the labour from one person instead of employing it generally, was that it would be easier in that way to contend with strikes which would be very apt to arise, owing to the large number of unemployed persons in the winter time. However, all these reasons operating on the minds of the Minister and his officers resulted in the arrangement being made. The work was commenced and proceeded without any excitement until it was almost entirely completed. The hon. gentleman has given the estimates of the work actually done in the various months. That hardly shows the matter as it would appear to the Minister from time to time. No doubt that was part of the scheme or conspiracy which was entered into to defraud the Government, and certainly that conspiracy was not the work of one man only, but there must of necessity have been a number of men engaged in it. Part of that conspiracy was to keep these statements back. In the various months the following progress estimates were sent in: August, 1892, $48.85; September, $29.10; October, $60.50; November, $117.11; December, $3,597.19; January, 1893, $10,118.24; February, $23,716.56; making a total up to the 1st of March, 1893, of $37,687.85. At that time a great deal of the work was reported done. On the 1st March, Mr. Parent reported:

> The cut stone for the centre pier of this bridge—the Wellington Street traffic bridge—may be considered on hand, there being only a few coping stones still required. The two abutment piers are also far advanced, there being over two-thirds of the stone ready to build with; 36 stonecutters, on an average, are at work for this bridge. Steam and hand derricks, pumps and temporary bridges are in position ready for work when the water is taken out of the canal on Saturday next. At the present moment the work of excavation for the abutment piers is commenced to water level on both sides.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY BRIDGE.

> The stone for the abutments of this bridge is coming in well. About 75 per cent of it is delivered and mostly cut. About 50 stonecutters are at work here. The surface excavation will begin to-morrow.
>
> From the above you can see that no anxiety need be felt about the masonry of these piers and abutments. As to the iron-work, or superstructure of these bridges, I do not feel so confident. So far, the Dominion Bridge Company has not commenced to work, but they seem satisfied that they will have all in good shape for the opening of navigation on the 1st May next.

Such was the report of the engineer, Mr. Parent, at that time. Now, ten days afterwards, some suspicion having been excited that the pay-rolls were too large, through

an article which appeared in the "Star." Mr. Douglas was sent down to make inquiries. On the 10th March, 1893, he reported as follows :—

On arriving in Montreal on the 5th instant, I found that the plate-girders at both ends of the swing bridge had been broken and carted away, the rails torn off the swing span. It appears that some of the officers of the Grand Trunk Railway had agreed to a suspension of traffic, expecting to be compensated by the Government for extra cartage. To this arrangement Mr. Hannaford was not a party. By a letter appended from the superintendent of the Grand Trunk Railway, it is stated that the probable extra cartage will amount to $384 per day ; the importance of establishing traffic at the earliest moment is manifest.

An arrangement, appended, was made with the Dominion Bridge Company to ship the present swing 22 feet or more east, erect the plate-girders, bolting together the bracking, the Government to pay one-half the expense. An agreement was made with Mr. Hannaford to shift the tracks to meet the new alignment, the Government to pay the expense. Before leaving, I saw the swing bridge packed up preparatory to moving, and expect the traffic to be resumed by next Monday.

The number of men employed upon the work is very great, and the work is being done in a very expensive manner.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. MASSON. The hon. gentleman read to the last line which I have just read, but he stopped there. I shall read a little further :

The water has been partially drawn off the levels ; the cofferdam is not yet finished. Progress has been made with the excavation of the four abutments. Derricks have been, and are being, erected. The work is being rushed ; the results may be satisfactory, but the bills will be large.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MASSON. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I had just read the report of Mr. Douglas, dated the 10th March, 1893. Before reading the same, I had shown that the progress receipts received to the 1st March, amounted only to the sum of $37,687.85, and that during the first week in March an article had appeared in the Montreal "Star" calling attention to the number of men apparently engaged on this work and to some alleged extravagance in connection therewith. I had called attention to the fact that the hon. Minister and his deputy sent Mr. Douglas to make inquiries, and I read the full report of Mr. Douglas except a few of his closing remarks to which I may refer later on, for the purpose of showing that according to that report, he did not find any fraudulent pay-rolls. He did not even hint at such a thing. I call attention to this particularly, because of the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) who, after referring to Mr. Douglas's report and to the date on which it was made and to the circumstances under which it was called for, alleged that the Minister had, in that report, knowledge of fraudulent pay-rolls, and yet had made several large payments. It is clear that in that report there is not even the suggestion of any attempt to defraud, much less of the existence of fraudulent pay-rolls. It is true that Mr. Douglas did say that the work was being rushed, that the result might be satisfactory but that the bills would be large. Now, every person connected with contracting or who has any knowledge of the carrying on of large contracts, knows that the necessary result of rushing work is to increase the size of the bill. The facts in the case justified the work being rushed. It was for the purpose of rushing the work that a departure was made in the manner of building the substructure ; and the amounts referred to by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) were based upon doing the work in a reasonable time and season and not upon doing it in mid-winter in the space of a few months, in order to meet the emergency so as not to interfere with navigation or the working of the mills. Now, while that report of Mr. Douglas is certainly one that should necessarily have put the officers of the department on their guard against the expense being increased too much through the rushing of the work, Mr. Douglas closed his report by saying that if no accident occurred the Grand Trunk bridge would be finished in time, but that he had his doubts about the road bridge, but he would be better able to judge in a fortnight. So far from that report being such as to necessarily cause alarm, it was calculated to allay alarm. If the reports were true the bills were going to be large because the work was being rushed, but he does not say that it was being rushed too fast because he closed by saying that while the one bridge would undoubtedly be ready he has his doubts about the other, and would be better able to tell within a fortnight. Therefore, so far from the report of Mr. Douglas being of a nature to excite alarm and to throw the responsibility of all payments made thereafter upon the Minister, it was calculated to quiet alarm. The hon. member for Queen's loves to roll these expressions under his tongue—hundreds and thousands of men not employed, but on the rolls. But the hon. gentleman speaks from information received more than a year afterwards, and certainly there is nothing to justify the suggestion that knowledge of the "hundreds and thousands of men not employed, but on the rolls," had come to the Minister. There is nothing to justify the conclusions to which the hon. member seeks to drive the House, that the Minister should be held responsible for all payments that were made after he received Mr. Douglas's report. I have called atten-

tion to the fact that up to 1st March, progress estimates had unquestionably been kept back. We find that shortly afterwards, during the first half of March—I do not see that the exact date has been given—another progress estimate, amounting to $29,826.26 came in. Now, that being but little larger than the one preceding it, even with the report of Mr. Douglas before them, there was nothing likely to cause alarm. But when, in the early part of April, another estimate came in for $102,000, and later, another, for $155.383.62, the fact that they were so large necessarily did cause alarm. The latter of these two was received in May: and on 17th May, shortly after the receipt of this latter progress estimate, an Order in Council was passed appointing a commission of investigation. Now, the hon. member for Queen's with the material obtained by that commission before him, nay, more, with the material obtained in the Exchequer Court, and with that obtained in the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee a year or more afterwards, seeks to condemn the Minister for not acting in accordance with that information on 10th March, when he had only Mr. Douglas's report before him. Now, this commission, acting under the Order in Council of 17th May, 1893, commenced their labours. They found it very difficult to obtain information. The evidence they took is before the House, and it fills a volume of nearly three hundred pages. But, in all that mass of evidence, what evidence is there of fraudulent pay-rolls, what direct evidence is there of any conspiracy to defraud the Government, or of any actual case of fraud? All the commissioners can report is a suspicion. They do not pretend to say that everything is all right; they report their suspicions, and they refer to the pay-rolls as being such as to lead one to believe that they had been stuffed. But it takes them a long time to get that evidence, and the report is not made to the Minister until the 19th January, 1894. But the hon. member for Queen's holds the Minister responsible as though he had had this information before him in all the payments that he made from April onwards. There was nothing in Mr. Douglas' report to justify the stopping of payments, there was nothing, until this report of 19th January, 1894, was laid before the Minister's mind, that would justify the stoppage of payment; and the only actual case of any importance, directly reported, is that of the 1,018,000 feet of lumber, referred to by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson). It is true that payments were made, that large payments were made; but the House must consider the circumstances under which they were made. This work had been rushed, it had been rushed for a purpose, and it was being finished within the time allowed. Labourers had been employed, and the Government would have assumed a grave responsibility by refusing to make the payments necessary for the payment of the wages of these men. There are hon. members of this House who contend that the Government must be held responsible for the payment of the wages of labourers engaged on public works, even when they are engaged under contractors. Would this House justify the Minister of Railways and Canals if he allowed these "hundreds and thousands of men," as the hon. member for Queen's says, to go unpaid? It was certainly necessary that the Government should see that at least sufficient money was paid, to pay the labourers who had been engaged upon the work. A large sum was retained long before the perpetration of these frauds had been ascertained. I have no wish to detain the House in going over the facts with which hon. members are well acquainted, but I would point out when these frauds were actually discovered. As I have said, they were not discovered by the commissioners—the commissioners only suspected that there was something wrong, and that there should be further investigation. The Minister employed detectives to assist the commission, and still nothing was discovered. Mr. St. Louis brings an action which is tried in the Exchequer Court, and there the fact is revealed that, for some reason or another, certainly imputing fraud, he had destroyed his books. That called for an adjournment and for further investigation there. And at that stage of the proceedings a letter was received from the person, Frigon, who writes to the Minister a private letter proposing to make revelations. On receiving that letter, the Minister of Public Works has Frigon subpoenaed before the Public Accounts Committee. And there starts a new inquiry, a new drift in the evidence; and there the real nature of the frauds is discovered. Now, that is after all the payments are made; that is after the Government has refused to pay any more; that is after action has been brought by this Mr. St. Louis for the balance he claims is due him; that is after the Government had set up a claim for money they had overpaid. All these things took place long after the payments, and it is not right to impute to the Minister of Railways and Canals, knowledge of these frauds at the time the payments were made. However, the Minister's suspicions had been roused, and he had taken every means in his power—appointing a commission, employing private detectives, and so on—for the purpose of finding out the facts; but it was not until this late date that the facts were discovered. As the hon. member for Queen's properly puts it, the question really is: How far is the Minister of Railways responsible? How far is the Government responsible? If you could bring to them knowledge of this fraud when they made the payments, if you could bring to them knowledge of the fact that the pay-rolls had been stuffed, that they

were fraudulent, and that after that knowledge came to them the payments were made. then there would be some excuse for the argument of my hon. friend that the Minister should be held responsible. Now, as I said before, with the knowledge we now have, the matter is certainly bad enough, but there is no excuse for making it worse than it is, no excuse for imputing motives, and no excuse for attaching more responsibility to the Minister than the circumstances of the case demand. I can make a reasonable excuse for hon. gentlemen opposite. They have been snapping at phantom baits so long, they have made so many mistakes snapping at something which they found to be only a shadow, that when they do get something that is tangible, something that they can close their teeth upon, I do not object to them taking all the pleasure out of it they possibly can, and rolling it over and over as a sweet morsel under their tongue. But I do ask them to be honest in setting forth the time and the circumstances under which the knowledge came to the Minister, and when responsibility should begin to attach to him. Now, a great deal has been said as to the amount. I do not think that so far as this question goes, the amount is at all material to the argument. Mr. McLeod, in his evidence before the Exchequer Court, makes his estimate at $225,000, of which $65,000 was then being sued for by Mr. St. Louis, and $160,000 the Government was then claiming to have repaid. Now, as to the action of the Government in prosecuting Mr. St. Louis, and the statement that other men should be prosecuted, I think the facts are too well-known to require repeating. The Government did strike at the man whom we all agree, I think, was the principal offender, the originator of the conspiracy, perhaps the one who profited most by the conspiracy. He has been sued for the recovery of the money in a civil action, he has been prosecuted before the courts, so far as this Government had power to prosecute him. As to the result of the prosecution, that is certainly one thing for which the Government cannot be held responsible. If the grand jury chooses to ignore a bill, that is a provincial matter, it is under the control of a provincial prosecutor, and if, either by a blunder of the provincial prosecutor, or by the perverseness of the grand jury, a bill is ignored, the Government certainly cannot be held responsible. Now as to the other parties who might be held responsible, I do not wish even to insinuate that any of the officers who have been named, are guilty of wilful misconduct. That there has been carelessness on the part of those immediately in charge, no person can deny. Mr. Kennedy gives his excuses, Mr. Parent gives his excuses, other men give their excuses, and from their own stories, they are all honourable men, innocent men, illused men. But while not wishing to insinuate, much less charge, direct and wilful corruption on the part of any ore of them, I do think that they all are responsible for a certain amount of carelessness. A good deal might be said in the way of throwing responsibility upon the Deputy Minister, or the chief engineer, but I, for one, object to making a scapegoat of any official. I think that the Minister has done an action worthy of praise when he has refused to let his chief engineer be made a scapegoat on this occasion. Before taking my seat, I will refer to some remarks that fell from the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson). I will not follow him in reading the report: I will not follow him in repeating what is well known, that there was an xcessive expenditure, that there were frauds perpetrated. That has been admitted from the first, was admitted last year by the Minister, although at the time the evidence was not as complete as it is now. But the hon. member for Lincoln attempted to make a point against the Minister of Railways by referring to the evidence of Mr. Hannaford. He made the assertion, an assertion made in this House last year and then refuted, an assertion that was not borne out by the evidence, that Mr. Hannaford had offered to build the bridge for $70,000 on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway. But Mr. Hannaford in his evidence is very particular to say that he did not make any such offer. and when the question was put to him if he did make the offer on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway, he said distinctly that he did not, and instead he produces the offer that was made. Now, the offer that was made is in the form of a letter. I will not trouble the House with reading that letter, for it speaks for itself. It is an offer to do the work according to the season of the year. They would do the work and charge for the labour; in other words, they would put themselves in the position of Mr. St. Louis, and they would employ the labour, they would keep the time, and they would charge 15 per cent for their trouble. That was really the offer, but it was not an offer to build the bridge for $70,000. It is quite true that Mr. Hannaford makes an estimate of $70,000 as the amount for which the bridge could be built. It is true that he says, after the thing is done, that he could have built the bridge for that sum. But it is no new thing after a contract is let, and after the work is done, for people to get up and say that they could have done it for a great deal less than it cost, and could have made a handsome profit out of it. That is a common thing, and for whatever the statement is worth, Mr. Hannaford made it. But he did not say that the Grand Trunk Railway had ever offered to do it. He would not offer to do it, because he knew Mr. Schreiber to be a hard man; he knew that Mr. Schreiber exacted that the work should be well done, that he was a man who would keep the contractor's nose down to the grindstone until the work was properly completed.

He would not enter into a contract, but he would undertake to build the bridge in a certain manner, keeping track of the time and the expenses, and adding 15 per cent for the trouble. That really is the essence of Mr. Hannaford's statement. The hon. gentleman has gone further, and said that it was for 19 feet navigation. He is justified in taking that position, because Mr. Hannaford uses the expression of 19 feet, but the real plan was for 18 feet, which means of course a little more on the sill. The engineer gave the estimates in detail for that work. Afterwards the advisability was considered of increasing the depth, and these estimates are given in the report: 18 feet navigation with old abutments partly taken down and rebuilt, $103,934; with superstructure, $168,-286, or in round figures, $170,000. Another estimate was made for 18 feet navigation with abutments carried down, and another estimate for 20 feet navigation. The cost for 20 feet navigation was estimated at $138,000. Then there is an estimate for 22 feet navigation, which was the one on which actual estimates were given, the amount being $151,648. There are other certain small matters, of which the details are given. These estimates show a very great difference, ranging from $170,000 to $250,000 for the work to be done including the superstructure. We have in contradiction of the carefully prepared estimate of the engineer-in-charge, the bald statement of Mr. Hannaford that he would have done the extra work for $8,000. The hon. gentleman enlarged and grew eloquent on the fact that 1,018,000 feet of lumber had disappeared, and he, following the line laid down by the hon. member for Queen's, sought to charge the Minister with having knowledge of that when Mr. Douglas made his report, although as a matter of fact, the first official notice he had was in January following, or over ten months after Mr. Douglas's report. I do not consider it necessary to consider the position of the various parties, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Parent and others in this matter. Mr. Parent was spoken of as overseer, and we find he objected to being overseer of the Grand Trunk Railway bridge. What were his reasons for wishing to be relieved of that position might be explained by him, but it showed that he suspected trouble, and on the recommendation of the engineer he was relieved. In closing, I would briefly resume the position I take, which is that the nature of the work, the time within which it was completed, the fact that it was not to interfere with navigation, that it was to interfere as little as possible with the use of the water-power, all these are points that must be taken into consideration as justifying the nature of the contract. In addition, we have the distinct recommendation which the Minister, as stated by the hon. member for Queen's, was apparently loath to act upon, that it should be done in this exceptional manner. These are the circumstances which, in the opinion of the officer, demanded that the work should be done in this exceptional way, and the recommendation of the officer, after being fully considered by the Minister, was adopted. Then in judging when the responsibility of the Minister began in regard to payments made on account of the contract, we must consider the manner in which the progress estimates came in. That is a very important feature of the case. To my mind it shows that in the very inception of the arrangement some person was there laying a plot to defraud the Government, to make unjust gain. We find the returns were kept back, as shown by the reports which came in of the amount of work done at certain times, and on 1st March when the "Star" article appeared, only $37,000 had been reported in progress estimates, and about the same time $29,000 more were reported. The smallness of those amounts justified the Minister in not attaching, perhaps, full weight to the "Star" complaint and exposure at the time. The Government are, of course, so accustomed to hear charges of corruption made against them and complaints as to the manner in which they are carrying out work, that comparatively little attention is often paid to newspaper articles. Then there is the fact that this House was in session, and the Minister engaged in his Parliamentary duties and extra duties connected with the session, so that he had little time for personal supervision of the duties of his office. But admitting the Minister's duty to look after the duties of his office and to scrutinize them and prevent any possibility of stuffing the pay-rolls or anything of that kind, what opportunity had the Minister up to that time to make even an investigation? Then the "Star" article appeared, and the Government took action appointing Mr. Douglas to make an investigation, and his report was duly made, which instead of inspiring alarm allayed it, for it shows that the work was being well done although expensively done. Further progress estimates were received, and the Minister refused to pay some of them because they were beyond the appropriation made, and then as the appointment of a commission appeared to be justified, a commission was duly appointed. As to the labour of that commission, the volumes published show the evidence taken, and that even with the aid of a detective the commissioners were unable to put their finger on any act of fraud except in regard to lumber, although they expressed suspicion as to the manner in which the pay-rolls had been made up, these facts certainly showing that there was nothing to prove that the Minister had knowledge of these frauds up to the time of that report. In considering the large amount of payments made, and especially those made to Mr. St. Louis, respecting which frauds were alleged, it must be remembered that those payments were made in a large measure to labouring men. It is certainly, I think, too much to ask that

the Government should take the responsibility of keeping these hundreds and thousands of labouring men out of their daily wage, until, by a long process of investigation, it could be found out whether the Government had actually been defrauded or not. I think, on the whole, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has failed to bring home any case of impeachment against the Minister of Railways and Canals. On the contrary, the prompt action taken by the Minister when the first article appeared in the "Star," and immediately upon the large monthly progress estimates coming in; his prompt action, I say, in appointing a commission, before any question was raised in Parliament, commands the respect of this House and of the country. The appointment of a commission of inquiry was a voluntary act on the part of the Minister before any political party in this House had brought the matter up, and the energetic manner in which he pressed that inquiry is something we ought to commend rather than to condemn.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, for the number of years that I have sat in this House I have never witnessed such a pitiable exhibition on the part of the Cabinet Ministers. One of their confreres is charged with a neglect of duty, and with a political disgrace, the equal of which has never been heard in this Chamber, and not one of them rises to defend it. I thought there might be some member of the Cabinet who had manliness enough or gratitude enough to defend the unfortunate position that the Minister of Railways has got into. If no one else, then the Secretary of State, who owes his position to the Minister of Railways, if he owes it to any man, should be willing to honour his progenitor to the extent of getting on his legs and saying a word in his defence. But no, the Secretary of State fights shy of this case, and does not defend the Minister of Railways. I presume that the Solicitor General is disposed to treat the Minister of Railways after the fashion that the Minster of Railways treated his own constituents. The Minister of Railways told us, with regard to the Tay Canal, that he had just as good a right to have public money spent in his constituency as any man in the House, and I suppose the Solicitor General now says to the Minister of Railways: My boy, I have you in a hole this time; I have got the money spent in my constituency; I have just as good a right to have the public money squandered there as you had to squander it in the county of Perth. The Solicitor General is prepared to justify the extravagance in connection with the Curran bridge on the same principle as the Minister of Railways justified the expenditure on the Tay Canal. I did expect that the Minister of Public Works might have something to say in defence of his colleague; but I suppose that that hon. gentleman has come to the conclusion that by the time he gets through defending his partner's and relations he will have enough to attend to. He will, no doubt, have to offer some explanation as to the manner in which he was mixed up both as to his partners and his relations in this Curran bridge affair; and he will have enough to answer for without attempting to defend the Minister of Railways. I surely thought the Minister of Finance, as leader of the House, would have said something in defence of the Minister of Railways, but I fancy he begins to think that he has a bridge of his own to defend in a little while, and that one bridge is enough for any man. So, when he is done defending his own bridge scandal, he also will have his hands full. The leader of the House has withdrawn from the scene, for he is not in his seat, and so the Minister of Railways is left largely alone without any man to take his part. They put up the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to defend him. That hon. gentleman told us of some things which the "Globe" had foreshadowed, but he said that he did not know anything about them. I am prepared to admit that confession of the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) to be quite true, but I am sure that, if everything he does not know were written, it would fill books. I contend, Sir, that this is a case which deserves the serious consideration of every member of this House, and if, on the eve of a general election, the majority of members are prepared to condone the scandalous extragavances and inexcusable neglect which has characterized this whole thing from start to finish, then they deserve that the electorate of this country should spew them out of their mouths. Are we going to allow Ministers of the Crown to quietly wink at and to allow extravagances of this kind to be perpetrated, and money stolen under their very eyes. The Minister of Railways knew that this work was going on in Montreal, three and a half hours' train journey from his office, but he did not attend to it. If there is a political meeting to be attended three or four hundred miles away, the special car is at the command of himself and his friends; but here within a short distance of Montreal, with his engineer at his elbow, with his full office staff at hand, and understanding the fact that he had reason to know that wrong-doing was going on, notwithstanding the announcement of the Montreal "Star" that the enormous number of 1,300 men were engaged on that work, he neither went down there or sent his engineer, nor any officer from his department to find out the facts. Then, Sir, when the judge came to deal with the whole case as to how the money had been stolen, he pointed out in his decision that the contract was so loosely drawn that the stealing was virtually provided for in the contract, and that there was no difficulty in the way of this fraud.

After full and careful investigation, the judge pointed out that these irregularities were actually invited by the terms of the contract. Now, Sir, any person who will read the decision of the judge and the report of the royal commission must come to the conclusion that from the beginning to the end of this whole transaction there has been gross neglect of duty on the part of the Minister of Railways. For him to attempt to saddle the responsibility upon the officers of his department would be unjust to those officers. The officers of every department are under the direction of the head of the department. If the head of the department commands them to pay attention to a certain contract, it is their duty to do it; if they are not instructed to attend to it, it is not their duty to do it. The Minister of Railways does not appear to have given instructions on one single occasion to look carefully on the progress of that contract, and the manner in which it was being carried out. The hon. gentleman who last spoke said there was no necessity for making the case worse than it is. Well, I question if any one could do that. I do not think it would be possible to show more clearly and distinctly the gross neglect and guilt of the Minister of Railways in connection with this case than it is shown by the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee, and by the finding of the royal commission. Still, hon. gentlemen opposite are evidently disposed to treat the matter lightly—to look at it as an incident in the political history of this country which will, in time, fade out of the public mind; and I suppose that some Minister will get up and give us an answer, quoting some ancient history. When it became necessary for the Secretary of State to defend the National Policy, he went back four hundred years; and, in this case, some Minister may go back and hunt up some little scandal like the Neebing Hotel, or the Fort Francis Lock, or the steel rail contract, and cite it as a kind of excuse for the Curran bridge, by trying to prove that two blacks make a white. We are accustomed to that kind of argument from hon. gentlemen opposite. When they get completely cornered, they always try to creep out of the difficulty in that way. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House said the Grand Trunk Company had never offered to construct the bridge for $70,000. Well, we have the sworn evidence of Mr. Hannaford as to that, and this is what he states:

By Mr. Lister:

Q. But $70,000 would have covered substructure, and superstructure, and everything else?—A. Yes, sir, and the only difference between us and the Government was this: I did feel, and feel to-day, that the estimate of $70,000 was too high. I wanted to clear myself of it; I put in the estimate the day before Christmas. It was a very large estimate. There were several large items in it, but I knew, being an old Montrealer, that these things might happen. When I made the estimate, I said to our people: There is going to be a margin of perhaps $10,000.

He would have taken the contract for $70,000, and would have made out of it, $10,000 for the company. The Minister of Railways, in the person of his chief engineer, waited upon Mr. Hannaford in his office, and asked him to make an offer. Mr. Hannaford did put in the estimate of $70,000, and there was no reply. The chief engineer never asked the Grand Trunk Company to go on with the construction of the work until months afterwards. That was in December. In February, when the canal was frozen, and the material for building the structure, and the superstructure, had been taken away, the department proposed to give the Grand Trunk Company the contract, and it was then that the Grand Trunk Company proposed to do the work by days' labour, and to keep a proper account of the number of men employed upon it. Now, when the statement appeared in the Montreal "Star," with regard to 1,300 men being employed, did the Minister go to Montreal, or send his chief engineer to find out what was wrong? No. They telephoned for the pay-rolls: but nobody went down or attempted to inspect the work in order to ascertain whether the statement made in the "Star" was correct or not. But the chief engineer admits that Mr. Stewart was going down to Montreal, not on that business, and he asked him to pass by the work and take a note of what he saw, as to the manner in which the work was proceeding, the number of hands employed, and so on. Well, he did that, and he conveyed his impression to the chief engineer on his return. But even then, neither the hon. Minister nor the chief engineer went down to look at the work. On the 25th April, the Minister signed a cheque for $74,777. It has been clearly proven that the department, at that time, had information that the work was being extravagantly done: but that did not deter the Minister from paying the money, or cause him to make any inquiry before signing that cheque, and hading it over to the contractor. Some time after the commission was appointed the Minister also sanctioned the payment of $99,000. Surely he must have known, when the commission was appointed that there was evidence of wrong-doing; there never would have been a commission if there has not been such evidence. But in the face of the revelations that had been made in the press, and otherwise, he was quite willing to pay over this $99,000. Now it appears that there was a dispute between Mr. Parent and Mr. Kennedy as to which of them was in charge of the work. Kennedy claimed absolute control and Parent was chief engineer in charge. However, Kennedy appears to have taken the leading part and to have challenged the right of Parent to interfere with him in the dis-

charge of his duties. I have looked over some of the items in connection with the report, signed by the commission that investigated the whole question, and in the face of all the points set out and substantiated in this report, I cannot understand how hon. gentleman opposite can have brass enough—even knowing their willingness to defend almost anything—to attempt to defend the extraordinary extravagance connected with this whole job from start to finish. In looking over the report, it is quite clear that irregularity after irregularity existed, that injustice after injustice was committed, and that extravagance upon extravagance was the rule. Men hired during the day and paid double during the night, and the contractor also making double rates. In this report I notice that in one of the clauses the commissioners say:

> There are a number of cheques remaining in the department unclaimed. The cheques cashed at the bank were endorsed by Kennedy, and the time-keepers witnessed the marks of the men in whose favour they were made.

Such transactions have been going on up to the present; and yet with all the evidences of irregularity from day to day, St. Louis is the only man who has been put under arrest. We have had the Government on several occasions declare that they would lay their hands on all the culprits and that punishment to the full extent of what these men deserve would be meted out to them. Up to the present, however, we have had none put under arrest, except St. Louis, and he has been relieved by the grand jury from the charge preferred against him by the Minister of Justice. Previous to that he had been relieved by the police magistrate from the same charge, so that to-day there is no one under arrest. A few years ago, when the Minister of Justice was stating to the House the condition of the proceedings in the criminal prosecution against St. Louis, he gave as a reason why no other men were arrested that he did not wish to proceed against men whom possibly he might require in another capacity, until such time as the case against St. Louis was disposed of, or in such a shape that justice would be meted out to him. St. Louis is now free, and there is nothing, I presume, that the Government intend doing with regard to him. Why is it some of the other culprits have not been arrested? Where are the men who are guilty of irregularities? Where are the men who professed to witness the marks to cheques of men who never had an existence? It has been shown that cheques were made out payable to men who never received either the cheques or the money, and those cheques were cashed through the pretended marks of these men being witnessed to. The marks of men who were able to sign their names were witnessed to on cheques, and the money drawn by others than those to whom the cheques were payable. I would like to know why the guilty parties in these cases have not been arrested. Again, when you take the number of hours of labour on these two bridges, which are only a few yards apart, you find that on the bridge which required the least labour the greatest number of hours is charged. The total number of hours charged on the Grand Trunk Railway bridge was 618,929, and on the Wellington bridge, which required the greatest amount of labour, the number of hours was 572,786. This clearly shows that the contractors took the greatest advantage of the looseness with which the Wellington Street bridge was managed during construction, in the first place, and then took every advantage that they possibly could in putting up the Grand Trunk Railway bridge. Had they another bridge to build they could have, under the looseness that characterized the whole inspection from beginning to end, doubled the amount. The commissioners again say:

> Time-keepers are charged as foremen or mechanics. Some of the clerks in Mr. St. Louis' private office are entered in the Government pay-sheets and received their wages out of the public money.

Men in the office of St. Louis, who were not engaged on the work at all, were entered on the Government pay-lists, and paid out of Government money as skilled labourers. I wonder if the men who sanctioned this gross piece of robbery can be found. Surely they can be detected and brought to justice. We have many other such evidences of recklessness. The commissioners report:

> On the Wellington bridge the cost of the cartage per cubic yard is, approximately, 78 cents, while on the Grand Trunk Railway bridge it is $1.80, or nearly 2½ times that on the Wellington.
>
> Then, the contract for labour, according to his accounts for the Grand Trunk, would have a profit of 50 cents a day upon a single cart, and $1.75 upon the same at night.

Again, the commissioners, say:

> If we calculate in like manner the cost of labour per cubic yard for work done, skilled labour on the Wellington bridge amounts to 57 cents per cubic yard; on the Grand Trunk Railway, $1.69; ordinary labour on the Wellington bridge, $1.20; Grand Trunk Railway, $2.80.

Again, the commissioners in their report, say:

> The percentage of night work for skilled labour is: on the Wellington bridge, 16 per cent; on the Grand Trunk Railway, 36 per cent. Of ordinary labour for night work on the Wellington bridge, 18 per cent; on the Grand Trunk Railway, 38 per cent. Of foremen for night work on the Wellington bridge, 20 per cent; on the Grand Trunk Railway, 44 per cent. The contractor for labour, paying $3 a day for a foreman and the same at night, would receive $1 profit for day work and $3 profit for night.

So that owing to the loose manner in which the contract was let, St. Louis was able in this way to take out of one man, working day and night, or two men, working twenty-

four hours, no less a sum than $4. This was the way the money went owing to the looseness in which the contract was let. I can very honestly commend to the serious consideration of hon. members before recording their vote, a careful perusal of this report of the royal commission. It is unquestionably a report that should be carefully considered, because hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to assume the responsibility of sustaining the Minister of Railways in this transaction which, in my opinion, is a most unforunate and indefensible one. I regret exceedingly, in the interests of the people, that this House should be called upon to pass upon a transaction of this kind, which bears from the start to the finish such evidence of recklessness and want of ability and disregard of the public interest. I believe that the people hold strongly the opinion that gentlemen opposite have not among them, men of the ability, the foresight, the extended experience and knowledge to enable them efficiently to conduct the affairs of the country. I contend that the Cabinet, as now constituted, has made more mistakes than any other Cabinet for many years. This affair of the Curran bridge is one of some years ago, but it does not stand alone; there are many affairs of a similar nature. Upon the Opposition is cast the responsibility of exposing these transactions. Hon. gentleman may think that it is pleasant for us to expose these wrongs; but I can assure them that it is most unpleasant. We would much prefer that such things did not exist; but as these scandals exist year after year, and session after session, we cannot but expose them, in order that the public may be informed, and that they may understand the incapacity and reckless disregard of the people's interest which characterize the administration of gentlemen opposite. We have had a good many of these scandals, and we earnestly hope that the day of better things will soon dawn, when public affairs will be handled by men under whose administration there will be no more Curran bridge scandals. The country is sick, and has reason to be sick, of these scandals, year after year, and session after session. The public Accounts Committee for years past has been no pleasant place for members of the Opposition and supporters of the Government to meet. In that committee, have been exposed many of the acts of extravagance of which the Government have been guilty—the Curran bridges, the Caraquet railways, and others—which have been the means of placing upon this country very serious financial burdens. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I notice, is looking very wisely at me. He was not in the House when I was drawing attention to the fact that no member of the Cabinet had been ready to rise and defend the Minister of Railawys. The hon. gentleman is evidently not ready to share the responsibility of this Curran bridge matter. The hon. Minister of Justice was not in either. We did expect him, at least, to rise and defend his colleague, because he has political stamina enough to defend anything. But, Sir, he has not risen. The Minister of Finance, as I said before, has his own bridge trouble, and that is quite enough for him. We have had a good many of these bridge scandals, but I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that it will take a stronger and a longer bridge than any they have built to carry them over the difficulties they will have to face when they go to the country. I notice the Controller of Customs appears to be amused, and claps his hands. No doubt he expects, after the next throw of the dice, to occupy a front place. I know that he has felt very uncomfortable in the chilly air outside the Council Chamber. He would feel much more comfortable to be inside and to be allowed to give his advice upon the handling of public matters. Well, I believe, honestly, notwithstanding, as I admit quite frankly, that I have no very exalted opinion of the hon. gentleman's abilities, that a Council consisting of men even of the very limited ability of the Controller of Customs would be able to do considerably better than the Cabinet now existing. I do not desire further to detain the House, but I say in closing that I hope every elector of this country will read for himself the debate upon this question, and will study the report of the commission on the Curran bridge, and I hope that every elector will go to the polls and record his vote under the convictions he is sure to come to after reading that report, and thus we shall get rid of bridge and other scandals.

Mr. McLENNAN. I have listened to a great deal about scandals since I have been in this House, and have been forced to the conclusion that if these scandals were taken away from the Opposition they would have very little left. The hon. gentleman who preceded me spoke of the other Ministers not supporting the hon. Minister of Railways. The Hon. Minister of Railways is quite able to take care of himself. So much is said about details that are not interesting that, as I have no wish to tire the House, I will deal with the matter as briefly as I can. Gentlemen opposite speak of the cost of the Curran bridge. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) told us that an estimate was made by Mr. Hannaford after the work was completed. We have often heard of these estimates made after the work is completed. The hon. member himself talked a good deal about the extravagance of the Government in connection with the Kingston Dry Dock, yet he himself put in a tender for that work amounting to $100,000 more than it actually cost. I think it ill-becomes him under such circumstances to make such charges. As I un-

derstand, the cost of the Curran bridge was about $430,000; and the estimated cost as it appears in the public records was about $250,000. In the first instance, it was a depth of 14 feet, then they wanted a depth of 18 feet, and finally a depth of 22 feet. Now, the excess of the amount over and above the $250,000, is somewhere in the neighbourhood of $180,000. $63,000 of that was never paid to Mr. St. Louis, he sued the Government in the Exchequer court, but failed, and this money has never been paid to him. Then the Government brought a criminal action against Mr. St. Louis in which, I understand, they have failed. But the Government are preferring a claim against him for $143,000, to be tried in the Exchequer Court, and there is every reason to believe that the Government will recover from Mr. St. Louis, any amount that he was paid over and above what was justly due him. If the Government could recover this $120,000, that will even things up, and will cover the amount of $180,000 which was the excess over the estimated cost of the bridge. Now, I am not going to pretend that no fraud has been perpetrated upon the Government; I am not going to try to screen any one. I think if a man does a wrong, he should be punished, and I believe that was the feeling of the Government. They wanted this man punished, and they brought criminal action against him. They have already successfully resisted his claim for $63,000, and they are now trying to recover this $143,000 from him. Now a great deal has been said about the cost of this work, and the wages. Any man who has been in the habit of doing work must understand that circumstances may alter the rate of wages. For instance, if you are working in water, or in an uncomfortable place, you have got to pay more wages to keep men there. In the next place, every hon. gentleman knows that it is more expensive to do Government work than it is to do work for a private individual, or a private contractor. People take every possible advantage of the Government. Then we must remember that much of this work had to be done at night, and had to be rushed through hurriedly, and there is no doubt that it cost a great deal more than it would have cost if it had been done in the daytime. Again, as was pointed out a short time ago, when work has to be done in a limited time, and hurriedly; when it is absolutely necessary as in this case, that it be pushed through as fast as possible, it is also necessary to put on additional plant, and a large number of men, and no doubt many of them did stand in each others way; but that is always the case when you have to put on a larger number of men than would be necessary if you had a longer time in which to do the work. I can speak from my own experience with a contract on the north shore of Lake Superior, where the work had to be put through in a hurry. If the Canadian Pacific Railway had taken several years in which to do that work, instead of doing it in the short time in which they did accomplish it, they could have done it for two-thirds of the money that it has cost them. But very properly they decided to push the work through as fast as possible in order that they might utilize the part of the road already constructed, for the construction of the rest of the road, and in order that they might get some benefit for the money they had already expended. Under such circumstances the work cost them more, and it always must cost more to do work in haste than when you have plenty of time. In connection with this bridge a large quantity of ice had to be removed, and it is sometimes more expensive to take out ice than it is to take out rock. No man going there after the work was done, can have the slightest idea of the amount of ice that had to be removed, and the amount of labour that it required to do it. The hon. member for Queen's says there was a fraud perpetrated, and he asks who perpetrated that fraud, That is a very proper question to ask. But is there one hon. member in this House who can say that any Minister of this Government ever perpetrated a fraud since they have been in power? Is there any member of this House who can honestly bring a direct charge against any of the Ministers of having perpetrated a fraud upon the country to the extent of one dollar. How is it possible for the Government to watch these large gangs of men? I say you cannot blame the Minister of Railways and Canals for that fraud. You can no more blame him than you could blame the general manager of a bank for the misconduct of one of his submanagers at a branch of the bank. We know that bank managers have perpetrated frauds, and left the country, taking with them all the money they could lay their hands on. Does the fact that a subordinate bank official has committed fraud, reflect upon the honesty or the honour of the general manager? Certainly not. Now, in regard to the pay sheets and the estimates, we know that on public works, men are usually paid once a month. This work had to be put through, I believe, in two or three months, as it was necessary that the water should be let into the canal on the 1st May. I believe the last pay-sheets before completion were put in on the 18th April for the month of March, that is 12 days before that work was supposed to be completed, and before the canal had to be opened. Until the Government got these pay-sheets, they could not possibly be in a position to know what they were, and when they did get them, the amount upon these pay-sheets appeared reasonable and not alarming, considering the amount of the estimate for doing the work. I understand that on the 18th April, there was only $13,541 put in for labour. If there was only

$13,541 returned for labour, everybody will admit that that was not an alarming amount. It was not an amount calculated to arouse suspicion. Now I must say that I think the conduct of the Minister of Railways in his department has been all through of the most economical character, and it ill-becomes hon. gentlemen opposite, especially, to attack him on the ground of extravagance. For instance, if we take the Intercolonial Railway, when they were in power, there was a deficit in connection with that road of over half a million dollars a year, but the present Minister of Railways has managed that road so economically that the deficit has been wiped away. The fairest way to deal with a matter of this kind is to make an equitable comparison. I am not anxious to present anything but what I believe to be correct, and I will endeavour to furnish facts which will bear out my statements. Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken of neglected duty, political disgrace, and so on. I have here a list of contracts let between 1873 and 1878, and I wish to show the dates on which they were let, to whom they were let, and how they were let. I propose to read a few extracts from the report of the Royal Commission on the Canadian Pacific Railway. This is in regard to the first contract; I cannot go into the whole matter at length, but I will deal with the first contract, which was let very soon after they came into power, and there is no reason why they should not be as honest then as during the balance of their term of office. I now refer to the contract for telegraph line north of Lake Manitoba. That line was built, and the money was practically thrown away. The country never got the benefit of one dollar of the expenditure, and the only men who received any benefit were the contractors, and those engaged in the work. After giving the contract to build the line, and finishing it, the Government paid so much for its maintenance during five years, and received no return whatever from it. I quote from the examination of Mr. Trudeau, Deputy Minister of Railways:

62. Upon what subject was your first contract?—The first contract was for the construction of a telegraph.

63. At what date was the contract made?—On the 17th October, 1874.

64. Have you the contract here?—I have.

65. Give me the names of the contracting parties?—The contract was between John W. Sifton, of the city of London; David Glass, of the same place, and Michael Fleming, of the town of Sarnia, under the name of Sifton Glass & Company.

78. Was the section 1, the telegraph line, the subject of the first contract?—It was.

79. Please read from that statement the name of the person who makes the lowest tender?—R. Fuller, of Winnipeg.

80. Does the work include only the construction of the line, or the maintenance as well?—The tender is for work of two kinds, construction and maintenance.

81. What is Mr. Fuller's tender for the construction?—The rate per mile is $155; for the gross contract, $38,750.

82. What is his tender for maintenance?—$6,000 per annum.

83. For how many years?—Five years.

84. Then, for construction and five years' maintenance his whole price is how much?—$68,750.

85. Who makes the next lowest tender?—H. P. Dwight, of the North-west Telegraph Company.

86. How much does he ask for construction?—$225 per mile; $56,250 for the contract.

87. What is his offer for maintenance for five years?—$30 per mile per year.

88. Was there any estimate of that in the aggregate?—Yes, $7,500 per annum.

89. Then, that is equal to $37,500 for the maintenance; what is the gross amount for the construction and maintenance asked by Mr. Dwight?—$93,750.

90. Who makes the next lowest tender?—Waddle & Smith, of Kingston.

91. What is their price for construction?—$106,250.

92. What is their price for five years' maintenance?—$3,000 per annum, $15,000 for the five years.

93. Then, the gross amount for construction and maintenance for five years is how much?—$121,250.

94. Who makes the next lowest tender?—Sifton, Glass & Fleming.

95. What is their price for construction?—$107,850.

96. What is their price for five years' maintenance?—My recollection of it just now is, that this was a subject of correspondence.

97. Have you the correspondence?—I have not.

98. Have you the original tender made by Mr. Fuller?—I have. (Exhibit No. 2.)

99. Have you the original tender of Mr. Dwight?—Yes. (Exhibit No. 3.)

100. Have you the original tender of Waddle & Smith?—Yes. (Exhibit No. 4.)

101. Have you the original tender of Sifton & Glass?—Yes. (Exhibit No. 5.)

102. In this tender of Sifton, Glass & Co., there is no allusion made to maintenance of the line?—No.

103. You say that was a subject of correspondence; have you any correspondence amounting to a tender for that branch of the work?—At present I am not able to produce that original correspondence, but I believe I can do so at a future time.

104. These are the gentlemen who got the contract?—Yes.

105. Was there, so far as you know, any objection to Mr. Fuller's character?—No, there was none.

120. In addition to the prices called for by tenders, some terms as to time of completion were asked for?—Yes.

121. What terms did Fuller offer?—He offered to complete it within the year 1874.

122. What was Dwight's offer on that subject?—Dwight's offer was to complete it on the 1st of September, 1875.

123. What was the offer of Waddle & Smith?—Five hundred miles a year.

124. What was the offer of Sifton & Glass?—To complete it against the 22nd of November, 1874.

125. Do you know whether the contractors asked for an extension of time?—They did.

126. When?—In a letter dated the 9th of July, 1875.

127. How long did they ask for?—They stated that it would be quite out of their power to complete the work by the time named in their contract, and they asked for an extension of time up to the 30th October, 1876.

128. Would you look at the contract, and see if

the time named therein for completing the work is the same as that named in their tender ?—The time named for the completion in the contract is the 30th October, 1875.

129. That is nearly a year longer than the time mentioned in the tender ?—Yes.

130. So that the contract gives them better terms than the tender calls for on that subject ?—Yes.

133. Then the next lowest tender was from Waddell & Smith. Do you know if they were willing to take the contract ?—I can only infer from the fact that they tendered that they were willing to take the work.

134. Your opinion is that they were willing ?—Yes.

135. Have you any means of knowing now when tenders were to be received by the department for this work ?—The advertisement said up to the 22nd of July, 1874.

136. Look at the tender of Sifton & Glass, and say what time that was received by the department ?—There is a stamp on it marked July 22nd.

137. Is that the last day named ?—Yes.

138. You find that stamp on part of the envelope attached to the tender ?—Yes.

139. And from that, you are of the opinion that it was received on that day ?—Yes.

140. Is it the practice to attach portions of the envelopes to all the tenders ?—Yes, as much as we can.

141. Is it attached to Fuller's tender ?—I do not see it in Fuller's contract.

142. Is there any envelope showing when Dwight's tender was received for Section 1 ?—It has none.

143. Has Waddell & Smith's ?—No.

144. Are you aware of any special reason for attaching the envelope to the tender of Sifton & Glass ?—There is no reason.

145. Do you notice any alterations in their tender from the tender as it originally stood ?—There are.

146. Are they to reduce the price or raise it ?—They reduce the price.

147. In what respect ? Will you state it in each instance as it was originally, and as it was altered ?—It was originally written thus : "In our estimate we placed the wood line from Fort Garry to Winnipeg River, and from Fort Garry to Fort Pelly at $529." This is altered to "$492.00 per mile" ; also, "the prairie land within a distance of 250 miles of Fort Garry at $209 per mile" was changed to "$189.00 per mile."

Hon. gentlemen will see that the Liberal Government changed the tenders of their friends after they received them.

148. In the document which you produce as the tender which reached you on 22nd July, do you find any positive offer for Section No. 1 ?—No.

149. That document is in effect a tender for the whole line ?—Yes.

150. I think they mention there the rates for this particular section upon which they base their offer for the whole line ?—Yes.

151. Is that the only allusion to Section 1 in the document ?—Yes.

152. Can you tell by that portion of the envelope attached to the contract where the letter was mailed ?—No.

153. Where is the letter dated from ?—The letter is dated at Ottawa on the 22nd of July.

154. What is the post mark on it ?—There is no postmark on it at all.

155. Then there is no evidence here with the document that it passed through the post office ?—No.

156. Have you not yet obtained any of the original correspondence with Sifton, Glass & Company, as to the maintenance of the line ?—Yes, but I have not yet assorted it.

157. Can you give any reason why Waddle & Smith did not get the contract in preference to Sifton, Glass & Fleming ?—Waddle & Smith were offered the contract for section No. 5, but they failed to procure securities.

158. When did that happen ? When did they fail to procure securities ?—Section No. 5 became contract No. 4 later.

159. You say that the contract for No. 5 was offered to Waddle & Smith, but that they failed to give security.—Yes.

They tendered for No. 1, and not for No. 5. There was very light bush on the contract they tendered for, and very heavy bush on the other. Naturally, they would not take No. 5 at the prices of their tender for No. 1, and, as a matter of fact, a very much higher price was paid for that section afterwards to other contractors, Oliver & Davidson, friends of the Government.

160. When was it known to the department that they had failed to give security ?—On the 21st of October, 1874.

161. That was the reason for passing over their tender and giving the contract to Sifton, Glass & Fleming ?—Yes.

162. What is the date of the contract to Sifton, Glass & Fleming ?—The 17th of October.

Thus they did not know they were not going to give security until the 21st October, or some days after the contract was awarded to Sifton, Glass & Co.

180. If you look at the contract of Sifton, Glass & Fleming, can you not say whether they are to get anything more than $20,000 for five years' maintenance ?—They ask, "with profits."

181. Have you any reason to know how the persons who tendered for this work considered their prices to be affected by the privilege of taking profits ?—Yes.

182. How do you understand that it effects their offer ? Do they offer to take more or less on account of getting profits ?—They will maintain it for less, if they are allowed to take profits.

183. How much less ?—Waddle & Smith made it one-half.

184. Then on the same basis Sifton, & Glass would want $32 per mile without profits ?—Yes.

185. How much would that increase the aggregate of the offer of Sifton, Glass & Co. for construction and maintenance ?—$20,000.

186. What would make their whole tender ?—$147,850 without profits.

222. Will you read from Sifton, Glass & Co.'s tender those words which make any offer to build, without relating the special conditions ; I wish to ascertain whether his offer to build relates only to the line as a whole ?—He says : "We, the undersigned residents of the province of Ontario, make the following proposal to the Government of the Dominion :—We will do the whole of the work along the whole of the proposed line, including all the sections thereof, and comprising the finding of the material for and the erection of the telegraph line, the clearing of the roadway, the preparation of the pack trail, and all other matters pointed out in the advertisement and information for parties proposing to tender."

223. Is there any other part of that offer which points to the building of that section 1 alone ?—No.

224. Did it happen that persons offering to build the whole line, specified the time at which they could finish particular sections of it in any case ?—It did.

225. Then the mention of particular times for finishing particular sections is consistent with the fact that the tender relates only to the whole line ?—Yes.

226. The certificate you produce, dated 7th August, and signed by yourself, Mr. Fleming and Mr. Braun, relating to the opening of tenders, shows different particulars as to the several tenders ? Will you explain what was meant to be shown by that, generally ? Was it intended to convey the substance of each tender as it relates to each section ?—Yes.

227. Give me the name of the first person on the list who tenders for the construction of section 1 ?—Allan McLean.

228. Does he name a price for construction ?—Yes.

229. Give the next name for the construction of section 1 ?—H. P. Dwight.

230. Does he name a sum for the construction ?—He does.

231. What is the next name ?—Parmelee ; he names a price.

232. What is the next name ?—McKenzie, Grier & Co. ; they give a price. The next is Waddle & Smith ; they give a price. The next is Humphrey & Co.; they give a price. Next, W. G. Taylor & Co.,; they give a price. Next, Mitchell, Macdonall & Gough ; they give a price. Next, the Electric Light Co. ; they gave a price.

233. What is the next name for the construction of section 1 ?—Sifton, Glass & Co., without a price.

234. What is the next name ?—George P. Drummond, with a price. Next Rocque & O'Hanly, with a price. Next, Thompson, with a price. Next, Jocelyn, with a price ; and last, Fuller, with a price.

235. You say that this was intended, on the 7th August, to give to the department the substance of each tender as it related to each section ?—Yes.

236. Was it intended to show that Sifton, Glass & Co. had named any price for section 1 on the 7th of August ?—There is no price shown.

237. You took part in that document ?—Yes.

238. Did you intend to show that Sifton, Glass & Co. had named any price ?—No ; it was not intended.

239. That was after the time for receiving tenders had expired ?—Yes.

240. When was it first regarded by the department that they had made an offer to construct section 1 ?—The tenders, after they were opened, were referred to Mr. Fleming for his report, and on the 10th of August he reported and stated that "Sheet No. 1 shows that there are fifteen proposals for section No. 1, Fort Garry and Fort Pelly."

241. Does sheet No. 1 name Sifton, Glass & Co.?—It does.

242. Then, on the 10th of August, for the first time the department understood that Sifton, Glass & Co. had tenders for section 1 ?—That is the date of Mr. Fleming's report.

282. Have you any original papers from Sifton & Co. as to the terms upon which they would maintain the line ?—I have not, but I have a copy of a letter from Sifton & Glass to Mr. Fleming, dated 30th October, 1874, to the following effect :

"In reply to your letter of this morning we beg to say that according to our tender of the 22nd of July last for the construction of the Canadian Pacific telegraph, or any section thereof, the average price per mile for woodland was to be $629 per mile, and for prairie $259 per mile. We estimate that there would be 1,485 miles of woodland, which at $629 per mile, would be $934,065, and that there would be 705 miles of prairie, which, at $259 per mile, would be $182,595—in all $1,116,660. Our whole tender for the whole work, was $1,290,000, the difference between the two sums, namely, $172,340, being our tender for maintaining the working of the line for five years. Any portion of the work now awarded to us should be based upon this calculation which we estimate at, say $16 per mile per annum. Contractors are to maintain the work and receive the profits of the line.

"(Signed) SIFTON, GLASS & CO."

313. Why was it considered to accept the tenders which were accepted for $225,100, instead of this increased offer at $216,000 ?—Because the acceptance of Mr. Fuller's tender involved a change in the amount.

314. Is that in your deparment held to be a reason for refusing a contract, if a man adds anything to his first tender after it is sent in ?—The practice is that a tender should not be altered after it is sent in.

315. Do you mean that the department will not recognize them if they are altered ?—No.

316. That is the general practice ?—Yes.

317. And do you give that as a reason for this lowest offer having been refused—because it involved an alteration after the tenders were received ?—Yes.

318. Do you know any reason why this should apply to the second contract, and not to the first contract ? You will perhaps remember that in the month of October there was something added to Sifton, Glass & Co.'s tender—$16 a mile for maintenance ?—I am not sure that it was added in that way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have established by the evidence of their own Deputy Minister, under oath befor a Royal commission, the manner in which the Liberal Government were letting their contracts. They refused to accept the lowest tenders in order to bestow favours upon their political friends, and allowed changes to be made in the tenders after they were opened in order to give their friends contracts. According to the evidence given by the Deputy Minister, it would appear, from paragraph 282, that the first offer was very much larger than that mentioned in paragraph 147. Sifton & Co., in their letter, say, according to their tender of July last, that their price for wood land was $629 per mile, and for prairie $259 per mile, and that any portion of the work now awarded to them should be estimated upon this calculation. In the statement in paragraph 147, where the prices have been changed after the tender was sent in, which must be another offer, wood land at $529 per mile is altered to $492, and prairie $209 was changed to $189 per mile. Even this was a very much higher tender than others put in by good and responsible men, as the evidence will show. I have no time to go into details of all the contracts let by them, but we have every reason to believe that the same course was pursued and the contracts

given without tender or to other than the lowest tenderer, as the list of contracts I propose to place before you will show, and what makes it much worse is that in the case of this telegraph line over $1,000,000 was thrown away through the incapacity and stupidity of the Liberal Government, from which the country has not and never will receive any benefit whatever. Let us see what hon. gentlemen opposite were doing during their time in power in regard to giving contracts without tenders. Here is their list:

CONTRACTS LET WITHOUT TENDERS BY LIBERAL GOVERNMENT.

Date.	Contractors.	Amount of Contract.	Nature of Work.
		$	
31 Mch., '74..	Allard, Dufort & Co	84,500	Montreal Post Office.
2 Sept., '74..	B. Gibson	37,682	Drains, public grounds.
2 July, '74..	P. S. McLaren	1,975	Inverhuron Harbour.
21 Oct., '74..	W. H. Carpenter	16,000	Charge of Government Plant, Red River.
29 Dec., '74..	D. Fraser	800	Metapedia River.
12 Oct., '74..	J. Heney	4,059	Gatineau River.
do '74..	A. Legage	4,100	Bic Station.
6 Feb., '74..	Manchester Locomotive Co	50,000	5 locomotives.
29 Mch., '75 ..	J. Worthington & Co	1,089,012	Lachine Canal.
20 Nov., '75..	McNamee, Gaherty & Frechette	531,607	do
19 May, '75..	Jas. Goodwin	449,410	Grenville Canal.
13 April, '75..	H. R. Ives & Co	4,700	Iron gates, Ottawa.
7 Oct., '75..	Wm. McKay	4,833	Painting Library.
20 Dec., '75..	Allard, Dufort & Co	7,922	Montreal Post Office.
26 May, '75..	T. M. Hubbell	7,282	Owen Sound Harbour.
15 Oct., '75..	McLaren & Walker	2,200	Kincardine Harbour.
18 Feb., '75..	W. H. Carpenter	166,000	Work line, Thunder Bay to Fort Garry.
do '75..	J. J. McDonald	1,600	Shed, Jacquet River, N.B.
15 Feb., '75..	D. McKenzie	4,200	do
do '75..	Jos. Baker	4,000	Stations, New Brunswick.
19 Mch., '75..	Grant & Deschenes	1,110	Tank houses, Quebec.
do '75..	Murphy & Bosset	1,450	Stations, New Brunswick.
1 June, '75..	Wm. Murphy	3,000	do
28 June, '75..	Warren Taylor	5,925	do
5 Mch., '75 / 9 Feb., '75	Cooper & Fairman	262,282	Steel rails.
8 Apl., '75..	do	48,666	Transport, steel rails.
23 May, '75..	Red River Co	32,044	do
6 Sept., '75..	Oliver Davidson & Co	3,000	House at Fort William.
16 Feb., '76..	E. E. Gilbert	43,250	Tug.
8 Feb., '76..	Morland, Watson & Co	7,436	Crane chain.
8 June, '76..	R. P. Cooke	23,487	Carillon Canal.
13 June, '76..	S. P. Tuck	39,544	St. Peter's Canal.
21 Mch., '76..	J. Ryan	13,224	Intercolonial.
2 Apl., '76..	J. J. McDonald	9,125	do
.....	Merchants' Transport Co	89,060	Transport, rails.
15 May, '76..	Red River Co	174,806	do
6 Apl., '76..	R. Fuller	15,000	Telegraph line, Fort Pelley to Edmonton.
19 May, '76..	Oliver Davidson & Co	4,200	$10 per mile, operate telegraph line.
23 Oct., '77..	John J. Kennedy	242,624	St. Peter's Canal.
11 Oct., '77..	Holbrook & Mollington	6,480	Carving, West Block, Ottawa.
11 Apl., '78..	G. B. Milne	5,000	Steamer, Gaspé to Campbelltown.
10 June, '78..	Red River Co	5,175	Transport, spikes.
15 Sept., '78..	Purcell & Ryan	70,830	Tunnel, Canadian Pacific Railway.
10 Jan., '78..	Campbell & Humpbrey	320	Ties, Fort William.
27 July, '78..	Aug. Trepanier	1,005	Fort Lévis.
	Total	3,604,800	

In all there were forty-seven contracts let without tender, representing a total expenditure of $3,604,800, or an average of $76,697.87 for each contract. This shows that hon. gentlemen who talk so much about this Government having work done without calling for tenders had better look at home and consult their own consciences to see that they are justified in the charges they have made against this Government in that respect. I have also a statement here of contracts awarded by the Mackenzie Government to other than the lowest tenderer with most extraordinary reasons given for during so. On the 4th of June, 1874, a contract was let at $410 above

the lowest tender; on the 29th of June another was let at $12,330 above the lowest tenderer; another was $2,617 above the lowest tender; another $32,255 above; another $367 above; another $200 above; another $1,478 above; another $975 above; another $267 above; another $9,091 above; another $10,578 above; another $6,343 above; another $5,944 above; another $3,600 above; another $15,489 above; another $54,030 above, and so forth. In all these contracts the excess over the lowest tender amounted to $169,017. Many of the reasons given were of a very flimsy character indeed, and in many cases not such as would justify the action of the Government. In many cases the reason given was that the party had another contract; but if he had, he would certainly be better prepared to carry out the additional contract because he would have the plant and appliances for doing the work. It is certainly no reason to deprive a man of a contract because he has another one, though it may certainly serve as an excuse. Now, I have another list here of the contracts which without any reasons given were let to others than the lowest tenders. I will just give the percentage of excess of the different contracts which were accepted, and which were higher than the lowest tenders. They were as follows:—14 per cent, 19 per cent, 129 per cent, 46 per cent, 74 per cent, 31 per cent, 230 per cent. This last is the British Columbia penitentiary. The tender was, in the first place, $42,000, and they let the contract at $97,000; 150 per cent increase. 16 per cent, 114 per cent, 20 per cent, 16 per cent, 30 per cent, 10 per cent, 25 per cent, 35 per cent, 38 per cent, 178 per cent, 104 per cent, 6 per cent, 49 per cent, 30 per cent, 22 per cent, 25 per cent, 20 per cent, 15 per cent, 21 per cent, 133 per cent, 79 per cent, 66 per cent, 12 per cent, 9 per cent, 16 per cent, 7 per cent, 27 per cent, 26 per cent, 5 per cent, 10 per cent, 6 per cent, 5 per cent, 33 per cent, 49 per cent. There were many other contracts let to other than the lowest tenderer, which I will not mention, as the reasons assigned appear to be satisfactory. It appears that the Curran bridge, through the misconduct of some parties who were inclined to be dishonest, cost $180,000 more than the estimates; $63,000 of that has not been paid, and the Government have taken a suit to recover the balance. I have also explained the difficulty and expense of doing such work at night, and in a hurry. No one who understands work of that kind will dispute the fact that it is more expensive when you have to do it at night and in a hurry. But let me draw your attention to the extravagance of hon. gentlemen opposite. I will show you that there has been more blundering and incapacity on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite in their short term of office, than this Government has shown during the sixteen years it has been in power. Take all the money that was expended on this water stretch scheme, in working upon a fad of that kind to build a road to the North-west, which every man, woman and child in this Dominion knows was the most stupid scheme that any statesman ever attempted to place before the country. Our expenditure on surveys alone for the water stretches, was as follows:—

1874	.....	$ 310,224 88
1875	.....	474,529 89
1876	.....	791,121 19
1877	.....	754,524 57
1878	.....	322,695 42
1879	.....	231,123 92
Total	.....	$2,934,319 87

The Mackenzie Government were prepared to build a road connected by some ten or fifteen portages, where you would have to make two transfers on every portage. That would be a nice road for the people of the North-west to take their wheat over, and for settlers to take their effects in by. In the years I have mentioned about $3,000,000 was thrown away by hon. gentlemen opposite on surveys connected with a scheme that has been condemned by every sensible man in this House and country. If we add the money which was paid afterwards, but which was not chargeable at that time, and was for work done during those years, the amount would be considerably over $3,000,000. Then there are the unused telegraph lines north of Lake Manitoba, which cost about $1,000,000, and the money spent in surveys west of the Red River which must have cost another $1,000,000. I happened to be in the country when this work was going on, and I know what was being done. You gave the contractors money for building the work and then you gave them money to maintain it, and they put the profits in their own pockets, and the country never received a dollar from all that expenditure. The line was condemned and abandoned. Now, as to the Pembina branch. The contract was let to Mr. Whitehead. He took the contract for one item only, the excavation of the roadbed. He was told not to build the bridges, as they would be built at a future time, the reason given being that they might rot before they were needed. If that was the reason, it must be admitted that it was a foolish thing to spend the money of the country to grade a road that they had no intention of building for many years—and they did not build it for many years. Further, the price for that excavation was 22 cents per yard. Nearly a half of the contract was paid out for off-take ditches to drain the road. The contract, in the first place, was 22 cents a yard; but for the off-take ditches, which he got without tender, the Government paid 45 cents a yard. Any man who understands anything about such work knows that it is simply what is called "casting," throwing out the soil on the sides of the ditch instead

of hauling it and distributing it and making a road ; and if 22 cents was the proper price for excavating a roadbed, this other ought to have been done for 10 cents per yard. I am satisfied you could get it done in that country now for 8 cents a yard. That shows the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite managed public affairs while they were in power. If one of these hon. gentlemen should follow me, I would like to hear him justify this expenditure ; I should like to hear him justify the expenditure of $3,000,000 on these water stretches, and $290,951 on the Fort Francis lock, and many others which are too numerous to mention. Take the amount lost on the Curran bridge—which does not reflect upon the Minister or upon the Government—and deduct it from this $290,000 that was thrown away in the Fort Francis lock and you will have a substantial amount left without going any further. So that the people have not suffered much as compared with what they suffered under hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister never tried to hide the fact that a fraud was perpetrated upon the Government. I do not dispute that there was a fraud. Such things will happen in public business as they happen in private affairs. Merchants are often deceived in those they trust, and lose money thereby. Many financial institutions suffer through the misdoings of those they employ. In this case there was no opportunity of knowing how these works were going on. The pay-sheet of March only came in on 18th April ; and how could it be possible for the Minister to know what these pay-sheets contained until they were placed before him. No man who understands this class of work can speak honestly and conscientiously and charge this Government with doing anything but what was fair and square and right in the matter ; and, as soon as they found out the wrong-doing, they prosecuted the parties they considered to be guilty. Now, there has been a great deal of scandal. I am not tired of it because it is doing us any harm. But I am convinced that the people of the country are tired of it ; and I can tell gentlemen opposite that if they have nothing to dish up to the farmers and electors of this country but scandal, they will be left far behind when the test comes. But scandal seems to be the whole stock-in-trade of the hon. gentlemen opposite. When they have a scandal they are happy ; you can see them smile all over their faces. They like to have something to blacken the character of the leading men of the country ; something to bring disgrace upon the country in which they live, at the same time bringing disgrace and discredit upon themselves . Men who are sent here to legislate in the interests of the country should take a higher stand than this. I do not think it is proper for any man to make a specialty of raising scandals. In the old days in Scotland, I believe, witches and scandal-mongers were put to death. But people now are getting more charitable. I am very glad they are, for otherwise I should be called upon to mourn the fate of these gentlemen. I hope hon. gentlemen will adopt something of greater benefit to themselves and to the country than these scandals. I can tell hon. gentlemen that the people are sick and tired of it ; they won't read it ; they won't have it. Gentlemen opposite will never have the slightest chance of being looked upon with favour by the electors unless they get something more substantial and more useful to the country to talk about than scandals.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) opened his speech by stating that the Minister of Railways was quite able to take care of himself. So I should have supposed, but, upon this occasion, it is manifest that the hon. gentleman quailed before the task. In fact, the indictment presented to the House this afternoon by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) was such that the hon. Minister implicated nor any of his colleagues dared to say a word in his or their own defence. True to their record when brought face to face with the consequences of their acts, they have called upon their followers to come to their rescue, and what we have heard from their followers this afternoon is absolutely in keeping with the attitude which has ever been maintained by these gentlemen. They have been loud in their declarations that they would stamp corruption from their ranks as soon as it was shown to exist, but ever when they have been brought face to face with the task they have failed to make good their promises. Every one remembers the pledge given to the people of Canada by the late Prime Minister, with solemn words upon a solemn occasion—when a corner of the mantle had fallen which had preserved the secrecy of transactions of the great spending department of the Government, and when the people stood aghast at the revelations about the Quebec graving dock, the Victoria graving dock, the Langevin block, and other great works. Sir, we have not forgotten the pledges which were then made by the late Prime Minister when, on a solemn occasion, he promised to the people that all offences would be investigated, and that all offenders would be punished. Well, Sir, he ignored that pledge, and the conduct of the Government to-day is the latest evidence we have, after a good many others, however, that that pledge was made simply to reassure disquieted public opinion, but never was intended to disturb those who had perpetrated the offences, and still less to disturb the party which had profited by those offences. Even after that pledge was made, the Government showed on the floor of this House what we were to expect from them

when, in the session of 1891 my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister), from his place in Parliament accused and impeached the Minister of Railways, charging him with grave offences in connection with the construction of the section B of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when the Government invoked, nay, did not invoke, but invented, a statute of limitations in order to prevent the light of day from penetrating into that dark record. So it was then, and so it was afterwards when, in the session of 1893, my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) charged the Postmaster General with having fraudulently appropriated $100,000 of money which had been voted by this Parliament to aid the construction of two railways, the Lake St. John Railway, and the Temiscouata Railway, and when, notwithstanding the pledge which had been given by the late Prime Minister that all offences would be investigated, the Government at once stepped to the front in order to prevent and baulk an effective investigation before this Parliament, the great court of the nation. And later on, in the session of 1894, when the hon. member for West Ontario showed to the House that, even with that imperfect investigation which had been granted, it had been proved that the Postmaster General had appropriated $25,000 of those moneys, though not, of course, taking them out of the public treasury, but all the same moneys coming from the Parliament of Canada, and had distributed those moneys, with the aid of two fellow-members of this House, in several constituencies of the country; and when the hon. member for West Ontario showed, also, that similar offences, and had been tried, convicted, and sentenced; and when he pointed out the fact that the prosecuting counsel had stated that there were members of Parliament who were involved in that transaction, and when the hon. member for West Ontario asked Parliament to mete out, though in a minor degree, some measure of the same justice which had been meted out to the lesser offenders, then the Government came again to the front, came to the rescue of the accused, so that he was enabled that minute to repeat and assert upon the floor of Parliament, being so situated, he would do the very same thing again. Now, Sir, to-day, when it is shown and proved that a similar transaction to all these has taken place in the Department of Railways, one of the transactions with which, unfortunately, the people of Canada have become familiar, one of those transactions which invariably result disastrously to the treasury, most beneficially to the Government and to their friends, again the Government—not by themselves; they have not had the courage to stand up so far and defend their conduct—but they put up their friends behind them to say that there has been no wrong whatever committed, for which the Government is responsible. Sir, the indictment is so strong that they dare not meet it directly, but they attempt to meet it in a circuitous way. We have just been told by the hon. gentleman who last spoke that there are motives behind all this. Well, I will not comment upon the language of the hon. gentleman. I will come to the facts at once, and what are they? It is not denied by those who have spoken to-day on this occasion, it is not denied by any of the ministerial members who come to the resuce of the Minister of Railways, that there has been a great wrong committed in the construction of these bridges to the detriment of the people of Canada. It is not denied that there has been pillage most impudent, it is not denied that there has been corruption, open, flagrant, shameful; it is not denied that the country has been defrauded to the amount of nearly $200,000; and the defence for all this is that, although this be true, the Minister of Railways is not responsible, he is a victim, not sinning, but much sinned against. Well, Sir, I take issue with that statement, and I charge here before these hon. gentlemen, that if there has been pillage most impudent, if there has been corruption, open, flagrant, manifest and shameless; if the country has been defrauded of nearly $200,000, it is due altogether to the fact that the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Railways has openly and designedly violated the law of his department. Sir, we know something of the methods which were employed in the good old days in order to replenish the party treasury at the expense of the Dominion treasury. We have known, under a famous investigation, how it was that tenders, plans, specifications, were manipulated, altered, arranged, re-arranged, figured up, figured down, so that the contract might fall into the hands of a favourite firm of friends who, however, paid deep for the privilege, and who had to put their hands into their pockets and contribute handsomely for charitable purposes, according to the pious expression which was invented for the occasion. I do not charge against the Minister of Railways to-day that he manipulates tenders in that way, but what I charge against him is that he dispenses with tenders altogether, he dispenses with the law altogether. Here is the law upon that subject, the law of his own department:

> The Minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the construction of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency, in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be done more expeditiously or more econmically executed by the officers and servants of the Minister.

Now, I ask, Why were not the provisions of the law carried out in this instance? Why were not tenders invited? Was it a work of pressing emergency? So little was it a work of pressing emergency that it had been in contemplation for years, and in the

session of 1892, in the month of May or April, the hon. gentleman had taken an appropriation of $170,000 to carry on this very work. Now, will it be pretended that from the nature of the work it could have been more expeditiously or economically performed by the officers and servants of the Minister? Why, Sir, no one will pretend that. In the face of the result, such a pretension would be ludicrous. There was no reason for it. In the whole correspondence we have had upon this subject, the only reference which is made to the manner in which the work had to be carried out, is found in a letter of Mr. Parent, the resident engineer in Montreal, of date, 18th October, 1892, which is in these words:

I would advise the Government to build a substructure by day's work, owing to the uncertainty of the mode of execution which circumstances will command.

This suggestion was apparently adopted at once, and that is why I blame the Minister of Railways. Sir, he not only violated the law, but, in view of the event, he committed a most lamentable error of judgment. It was not only a crime, as Tallyrand said, but it was worse than a crime, it was a blunder. Hon. gentlemen opposite will say that he followed the opinion of his engineer. But the hon. gentleman as the head of his department is there to correct the opinions of his engineer when those opinions are erroneous. The hon. gentleman is there to exercise his own judgment and see that all works are properly carried out. The hon. gentleman does not hesitate, if it suits his convenience, to set aside the opinions of his engineer. We have a famous case in the Cornwall Canal, where the hon. Minister condemned the opinion of the engineer and set it aside, and his engineer at that time was no less a man than Mr. Page; also he set aside the opinion of his predecessor, who was the late Hon. John Henry Pope, and he cancelled the contract, on which work had been done already and on which the department had already paid $125,000, and for the cancellation of which the Government had afterwards to pay $29,000. On that occasion the hon. gentleman did not hesitate to set aside the opinion of his engineer, and so it is no defence to say that on the present occasion he followed the opinion of his engineer. Moreover, I am ready to admit that as regards matters professional and matters technical the Minister should hesitate before he set aside the opinion of an engineer. But this was not a matter professional or technical, it was a matter on which every man could exercise his judgment as well as an engineer. Let me again call the attention of the House to Mr. Parent's letter:

I would advise the Government to build a substructure by day's work, owing to the uncertainty of the mode of execution which circumstances will command.

What was the uncertainty of the mode of execution? What was the uncertainty to command that mode of execution? No one has been able to say what the uncertainty of the mode of execution or the commanding circumstances were, because it is impossible for any man to give a satisfactory explanation. Perhaps we will be told that the work had to be done on the canal in the winter, that the water had to be drawn off and the work carried out within a certain time. But every man remembers very well and knows that the same Lachine Canal was deepened by the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, and work was done under contract and not by day's labour, exactly under the same commanding circumstances, and there was much less difficulty for the hon. Minister to overcome than was encountered by the Mackenzie Government at the time. So it is evident that no reason existed why the present Minister should not on this occasion have complied with the requirements of the law. There was no reason that I can see, unless possibly there was the contemplation of immense plunder in store for those who manipulated the work which would allow Mr. St. Louis to come out and make a handsome contribution for charitable purposes. But strange to say—no, not strange to say, for it is in keeping with the invariable conduct of this Government—no sooner had it been decided to carry out the contract by day's work than the decision was violated in the most important particular. The Minister for reasons of his own would not give the work by contract, but decided to carry it out by day's labour; and in December one of the officials, Mr. Kennedy, asked for private tenders to have the work carried out by contractors so far as furnishing labour was concerned. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) took some pains to say that the work had been let by tender. But it must be borne in mind that even in this particular the letter of the law was not observed, because the law says that all tenders shall be asked by public advertisement, but here it was not so done, but simply private tenders were asked. Mr. Kennedy wrote three or four letters to three or four different parties, presumably friends, and the result was that at the end of January Mr. Parent reported the fact to the department, and recommended the adoption of the tender of Mr. St. Louis, who happened to be the lowest tenderer. Here are the words of Mr. Parent:

I beg to submit to your consideration an abstract of tenders sent in by contractors for the supply of labour required for the construction of the masonry pier of the Wellington bridge, &c.

Although the tenders show eight items, it is most likely that only stonecutters and masons will be called for, as it is the intention to furnish our own labourers, derricks and teams.

This mode of procuring skilful hands, from contractors for a work which has to be done within a limited time, is considered the safest and to minimize the risk of a strike at a critical moment, as these men are almost constantly em-

ployed by the contractors and are paid weekly by them, and can be better controlled by those who employed them the year around.

This letter was communicated to the Minister by the Deputy Minister, as it is in evidence. It is not in evidence that the hon. Minister took any exception to the fact that tenders had been invited privately instead of publicly. I absolve him, however, from that at the present moment. I must give him this credit, that his good sense rebelled at first against the proposed contract. I give him this credit again, that he rebelled against the entering of this contract, which was of an unheard of character. Mr. St. Louis was sent for, Mr. Parent was sent for, and the latter official repeated the explanation he had given in his letter. Look at the evidence of Mr. Schreiber at page 109 of the evidence. He is answering a question put by the Minister of Railways :

Q. What came next ?—A. On the 10th, Mr. Parent forwarded abstracts of tenders for labour.

Q. Yes ?—A. Upon receipt of these, I took them in to you. You examined them, and you asked, if it was not rather an unusual course to pursue ; that you had never heard of its being done in that way before. I said, yes, it was rather unusual, although I had known cases where it had been done.

Then he went on to mention that he sent for Mr. Parent. He continues :

He thought it would be the most economical way. He said the contractor for the labour would have nothing whatever to do with the men after they were once upon the work ; that he or Kennedy would requisition for a certain number, and the contractor would be bound to send them. That would end his business with them. The Government would have their time-keepers keeping the time, the pay-rolls would be made out in his office, and, as a further guarantee, he said, the pay-rolls, before being paid, would be certified to by the time-keepers, Mr. Kennedy and himself. The Minister asked me, " What do you think of that ?" Under these circumstances, I said, I did not see any great objection. Then I recommended it. The moment I recommended it, I became responsible.

I have said, and I repeat that I give credit to the Minister for the good sense he showed at the first blush in hesitating to enter into such a contract ; but he was carried away by promises, first that there would be proper supervision, and next by the suggestion stated in Mr. Parent's letter, that this would avoid the possibility and danger of a strike. The fear of a strike seems to have warped the Minister's judgment. It is human to err—it is human to make mistakes. But did it occur to the hon. gentleman whenever he had a decision in his department or elsewhere to make, that possibly there might be snow storms in July, that water would run up hill, or fish would live in air, or birds would swim ? It would be as sensible for him to entertain any of these suggestions as to imagine a strike in Montreal in the winter of 1893. The hon. gentleman is aware that the great National Policy has brought to the city of Montreal hundreds and thousands of men every winter, who parade the streets of the city asking for work for the strong arms which God has given them. A strike in Montreal ! Why, it is on record that every morning at the works there was a scramble and jostling of men to secure work. A strike in Montreal ! It is in evidence that out of thousands of men walking the city every day there was opportunity afforded for picking out men on account of political recommendations. There was such a scramble that instead of there being any danger of a strike, the opportunity was afforded for some patronage to be exercised by the Minister of Public Works, the member for Montreal East, and some other gentlemen. Listen, upon this point, to the evidence of Mr. Kennedy :

Q. Do you know how the men were engaged ?—A. I myself engaged most of the men in connection with the Wellington bridge.

Q. Was it not necessary to have a recommendation to be engaged ?—A. Well, as for the labouring men, there were few recommendations received, but as for the stone-cutters, there were quite a number.

Q. By whom were they recommended ?—A. By different parties. Quite a few were recommended by Hon. Mr. Ouimet.

Q. Give us all the names of the people who recommended them ?—A. I cannot, speaking from memory.

Q. You will certainly find some other names in your memory ?—A. Other names ?

Q. Yes, surely. There were dozens of letters, I am sure.—A. Here are a few letters which I found straying around ; a few men were recommended by Mr. Lépine.

Here is a sample of some of these letters in favour of men who were clamouring for work when the Minister supposed they were going on strike :

Q. Read the whole list ?—A. These are orders sent from St. Louis' office for the reason that stonecutters would come there and say to our foreman, and often to myself, " Mr. St. Louis has sent us to cut stone." We would put them on, and then St. Louis, in going to the sheds, would ask why they were at work. He said he had not sent them, and so it was agreed to send an order from himself to our foreman to have such and such a man put on.

The Chairman (reading).—These are the orders.

" Please give some work to the bearer, Joseph Delfourne, stonecutter, and oblige

" Yours truly,
" EM. ST. LOUIS,
" J.A.A.M."

" Please give some work to the bearer, stonecutter, Jos. Bertrand. He is a poor fellow sustaining two young brothers, and oblige,

" Yours truly,
" EM. ST. LOUIS,
" J.A.A.M."

" Please give some work to the bearer, Zéphirin Gauthier, stonecutter, and oblige,

" Yours truly,
" EM. ST. LOUIS,
" J.A.A.M."

"Please be kind enough to give some work to the bearer, Joseph Deschenes, and oblige,

"Yours truly,

"EM. ST. LOUIS."

"Please be kind enough to give some work to the bearer, Louis Deschenes, and oblige,

"Yours truly,

"EM. ST. LOUIS."

"Please give some work to Alphonse Jetté, and oblige,

"Yours very truly

"EM. ST. LOUIS."

The other recommendations are as follows :—Stanislas Gervais, stonecutter ; Adélard Labelle, Ovila Jany, Charles Lavigne, J. B. Major, Hormidas Larin, F. Jobin, Léon Cardinal, Ed. Cérat, Napoléon St. Louis, M. Norbert Sénécal, J. B. Lanière, Napoléon and Adolphe Trudeau.

Here is one which reads as follows :

"Please give some work to Napoléon and Adolphe Trudeau, stonecutters, both strongly recommended by the Hon. J. A. Ouimet, Minister of Public Works. They must work without fail even if you are obliged to dismiss two present stonecutters, some one whom you do not care for.

"Yours very truly

"EM. ST. LOUIS,

"J.A.A.M."

And, Sir, this was in the face of the fear of a strike! We are told that it was because the hon. gentleman was afraid of a strike that this contract was entered into. Mr. St. Louis was the contractor, and supplied the labour, and, at the same time, he used the recommendations of the Minister of Public Works in order to get employment for these very men whom he engaged to work for the Government. I can well understand the advantages which Mr. St. Louis had. Mr. St. Louis was making high profits, and although the tenders had been asked simply for masons and skilled labourers, by and by Mr. St. Louis set up the pretension that by his contract he was to furnish, not only skilled labour, but ordinary unskilled labour as well. Mr. St. Louis argued : Certainly my contract includes ordinary labour, because ordinary labour is skilled labour, men skilled with the shovel and the pick. I cannot see, Sir, how, according to the tenders, the very ingenious construction of Mr. St. Louis should have been accepted. The tender says :

Abstract of tender for the supply of "skilled" labour for building the new Wellington Bridge pier, and renewal of masonry on Lock No. 1.—Foreman, stonecutters, skilled labour, double teams, &c.

Mr. St. Louis pretended that his contract gave him the privilege of putting on men who simply used the pick and the axe as they were more skilled in that than others, and he claimed $1.87½ cents a day for each of them. It is in evidence that the Minister of Railways compromised with Mr. St. Louis, and agreed to give him for these skilled men with the pick and the shovel, $1.50 per day each, although that kind of labour was not within the terms of his contract. And for the labourers for which Mr. St. Louis received $1.50 a day, he paid as he himself says, $1.10, $1.15, and $1.25. He made a profit on every unskilled labourer working there of 25 cents, or 35 cents, or 40 cents a day, and that was not upon one man, but at least on from ten to twelve hundred men for almost every day during six weeks or more. This was a profitable contract to Mr. St. Louis, and we can understand, under the circumstances, why he was ready to contribute, as he afterwards did, for "charitable purposes." One of the reasons of the hon. gentleman for entering into this contract was that there should be supervision, and as Mr. Schreiber, in his evidence, said :

The Government would have their time-keepers keeping the time, the pay-rolls would be made up in his office, and as a further guarantee, the pay-rolls before being paid would be certified by the time-keeper, Mr. Kennedy, and myself.

When you hear that one of the reasons which induced the Minister of Railways to agree to this unheard of contract was that there should be supervision, would you imagine that upon one of the bridges the Government had no time-keeper at all ? It may be said, as was hinted this afternoon by some of the followers of the hon. gentlemen : The Minister could not know what was going on. Well, first of all it was the business of the Minister to know what was going on, and I go further and say, that he had evidence of what was going on, as my friend beside me (Mr. Davies showed this afternoon. The letter of Mr. Kennedy, and the reply of the Solicitor General to that letter is most conclusive on this subject. Mr. Kennedy wrote on the 12th of March as follows :—

I beg leave to acquaint you of the scandalous manner how certain things are being conducted on the Lachine canal, in reference to the construction of works in connection with the new Wellington and Grand Trunk railway bridges, as well as the renewal of the masonry of old Lock No. 1.

* * * * * * * * * *

Without consulting any one and for what motive, I consider a mystery, he (Mr. Parent) issues specifications, asking for rates for the supplying of foremen, derricks, stonecutters, stonemasons, double and single teams, and skilled labour ; Mr. E. St. Louis was announced the successful tenderer. Now, I can get all the above by the thousands, at an average day's pay, without any discontent ; we have also supplied ourselves with the necessary derricks capable of running the work of construction of Wellington bridge ; they now want to turn all those engaged on their list, which would increase the cost of the work 75 per cent. Imagine their trying to place pick and shovel labourers, whom I employ for $1.25 per day, at $1.87½ on this (Em. St. Louis') list.

One of my friends beside me read that this afternoon and the Minister said : How could I know it, but my friend was able to point out at once the answer of the Solicitor

General to Mr. Kennedy, and the Solicitor General wrote :

My dear Mr. Kennedy,
I have seen the Minister of Railways and Canals and found that all has been tendered for, including labour for the carrying out of the work of the bridge.

Therefore, Mr. Kennedy's complaint was taken to the Minister and apparently the Minister answered : Well, what is there to complain of ; everything has been done by tender and there is no more to do about it. Sir, there is more than that also. It is in evidence that the Solicitor General on the same day wired to Mr. Kennedy, after he had received a telegram from Mr. Kennedy that he was coming here :

Don't report to the department before you see me.

Kennedy was on his way to Ottawa. He was met at the station as he says himself by the Solicitor General, and by Mr. Senator Drummond, and instead of going to the department to acquaint the department, still more of what was going on, he was sent back to his work, and the same system continued, and St. Louis was able to plunder the department even after the notice of the Minister had been brought to this fact by Kennedy one of the supervisors of the work.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Kennedy was sent back under pain of dismissal.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes. Kennedy was sent back under pain of dismissal. Under such circumstances, is it possible for the Minister of Railways to say that he is altogether free from blame in this matter. Sir, there was one way only by which the hon. gentleman could have freed himself from blame. It was to show that his good faith has been taken by surprise, and he could have shown this only in one way ; that was, by prosecuting, and prosecuting severely and without fear, all those who have been guilty of cheating the Government in this matter. Last session, when this matter was brought before the House, the Minister stated that he would prosecute all offenders, just in the same way that the Prime Minister some few years ago stated that all offences would be investigated and all offenders punished. To-day the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) stated that for his part he regretted very much indeed that there had been no prosecution in this matter. Does the hon. gentleman regret it so much ? Has he no compassion for the Minister he is now supporting ? Has he reflected on the consequences of a prosecution in this matter ? Does he not know that the air of a prison is not conducive to the health of prisoners ? Does he not know that if there had been a prosecution, there would surely have been a conviction, and somebody would have been sent to jail ? And does he expect that a different measure of justice would have been meted out to Mr. St. Louis from what was meted out to certain offenders a few years ago ? Does he believe that if the air of the prison was not conducive to the health of those parties, the health of Mr. St. Louis would have been jeopardised in this instance ? The Government were wise in not prosecuting, because if they had done so they would have brought trouble upon themselves ; they would have had to release Mr. St. Louis after conviction, and it is far more easy to release him before a conviction. More than this, Mr. St. Louis is charitable towards this Government, and he is discreet in his charity—he does not let his left hand know what his right hand doeth ; if it is necessary to burn his books in order to conceal his charity towards the Government, he will go that length. But the Government had to do something to save appearances, and accordingly, in the month of October, a complaint was lodged against Mr. St. Louis, and it took six months to dispose of the preliminary investigation. Well, Sir, if it takes six months to dispose of the preliminary investigation, Mr. St. Louis can rest assured that he will never answer for his trespass before doomsday. I do not hesitate to say, and I say it in the presence of the Minister of Justice, that the prosecution of Mr. St. Louis was a farce, and nothing else. I cannot conceive that the Government ever had any intention of securing a conviction against Mr. St. Louis, for this reason : that the prosecution was carried on, not by senior counsel, but by junior counsel only. Was it conceivable, when Mr. St. Louis was defended by the best legal talent the city of Montreal could afford, Mr. Geoffrion and Mr. MacMaster, that counsel of equal eminence were not engaged on the other side ? I have certainly nothing to say against the junior counsel who conducted the case for the Government. Far be it from me to say anything against his honour or his character or his reputation as a lawyer. I would not forgive myself if I said anything here that would redound to the disadvantage of that young lawyer. But, Mr. Speaker, even if that young gentleman were an Erskine, he could not have coped successfully, in such a case as this in which so much was involved and there were so many details, with the eminent counsel opposed to him. It was absolutely indispensable under such circumstances for the Government to have senior counsel of weight and authority before the court, to share with him the responsibility of the case. The result was, as might have been anticipated, that Mr. St. Louis was acquitted by the presiding magistrate. The Government were not satisfied with that, and they very properly attempted to present an indictment before the grand jury. But, Sir, there the virtuous government of the province of Quebec came to the rescue of Mr. St. Louis, and I can understand their doing so. Why, at this very moment Mr. St. Louis is a contractor of the Quebec government for the construction of the Montreal court-house ;

and the court-house of Montreal is like Penelope's shroud—what is done upon it during the day is undone during the night; and it will never be finished. It has been going on for five years, and it seems to be no more advanced to-day than it was five years ago. I am not surprised under such circumstances that the virtuous Quebec government should have come to the rescue of Mr. St. Louis; and they commenced by asking for security for costs. Security for costs from the Dominion of Canada! The Attorney General of the province of Quebec actually asked the court that the Dominion of Canada, before presenting that indictment before the court, should give security for the costs to be incurred in the case. Well, Sir, it is true, we have a deficit of $5,000,000 and over this year; but I hope it has no yet come to this, that the Government of Canada have to find bondsmen to meet their liabilities. Although the credit of the Government is not as high as you and I might wish it to be, still, for my part, I would be willing to trust them for all the liabilities they may incur, though I have not much confidence in them. The Government this year introduced into the Senate an insolvency Bill, though I understand they have since withdrawn it; but they have not done so, I am sure, with the expectation that they would be the first victims of such a law if it were put on the statute-book. Well, the grand jury threw out the indictment, and the result is that to-day Mr. St. Louis is as free as he ever was, to go on contracting with the Quebec government, or with the Dominion Government again—for some day it may come to that. Sir, the more you look at this transaction, the more you become convinced that it is fraudulent from the first to the last. The fact is that fraud is oozing from every detail of it. The whole of that transaction was conceived in iniquity and carried on in iniquity—conceived and carried on in order to give to the friends of the Government the power out of their ill-gotten gains, to come to the rescue of the Government in matters electorate. No other conclusion can be drawn. If this were the only instance, for my part I would not insist upon it; we might pass it over. But this is not the only instance. I call upon the hon. gentleman to show me a contract of any magnitude which has been carried out within the estimate since the present Government came into office. During the last fifteen years there has not been a contract let by this Government which has not cost 25, 50 or 100 per cent more than the estimate. If this were an isolated case, we might say that it was the result of an accident; but when we see the same thing happening on every occasion, it is evident that this result is not brought about by accident, but by design. We have been told to-day that the former Government has been delinquent. What has that to do with the matter? Is that the only answer we are to hear on this and similar occasions—"you have done the same thing?" I care not whether these offences are perpetrated by one side or the other side, though I do not admit that Mr. Mackenize was ever guilty in any such respect; I say that so long as these things continue, it is impossible for this country to develop as a country. I do not pretend to pose here as a purist——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER—but I do pretend to pose as a patriot. I called to hon. members opposite to apply their sneers to their own friends and to see that such transactions are not repeated by recording their condemnation of them on this amendment. This is the spirit in which we approach this case. It is not in the spirit of revenge spoken of by the hon. member for Glengarry. Nothing certainly was more foreign from the idea of my hon. friend who moved this amendment, and moved it in a speech which was marked, above all things, by calmness and judicial tone. It is in that spirit that we on this side approach this case, and it is in that spirit in which it ought to be approached also by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down seems to be particularly anxious to know why I did not reply to the attack of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) before this, or why no other member of the Government rose in his place to answer the series of attacks which have been made in support of the amendment, and the hon. member intimated that perhaps it was because there was no defence to the accusation made against me. I notice that the amendment is not an attack upon the Government, nor upon the department, but a personal attack upon me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. It is an attempt to hold me responsible personally for all the acts and for all that has occurred with reference to the Curran bridge. The very words of the resolution point directly to the Minister of Railways, as corrupt and incapable and guilty of all the charges that can be made in connection with this matter. The hon. member formulated his charge under a certain number of heads in which he was followed by hon. gentlemen opposite who spoke after him. The first attack is this: that I let the contract contrary to the law of the land, contrary to the principles which had been laid down by this Parliament, again and again, and which ought to guide every Minister in letting contracts. It came with very bad grace from the leader of the Opposition to state that I had been a transgressor of that law. Does he forget that he was a member of a ministry, the leader of which and Minister of Public Works, without assigning

any reason even to his own colleagues, let contracts again and again in violation of the Act, and the very words, in which the hon. gentleman accused me of violating the law of the land, he could with much greater force apply to the Government of which he was a member. Does he not know that that Government, again and again, gave contracts to parties who were not entitled to them. Does he not know that without even going through the form of asking for tenders, they gave contracts without deigning to assign any reasons to this House or even to their own colleagues for the letting of these contracts. I am aware that that is not a sufficient excuse for a Minister of Railways if he has violated the law. But I have violated no law. In recommending the awarding of the contract as I did, I recommended it for reasons that I gave in my memo. to the Council, and it was awarded on an order of the Council. I recommended the awarding of it for the reasons given to me by the chief of my department and the engineers at the head of the particular work in question. The hon. gentleman has made this debate an excuse for resuscitating some old attack against me. He proceeded to speak of my connection with section B. What does the hon. gentleman know about that? Does he know that I ever had any interest or connection with that contract? Will he or anybody else get up and say, on his honour as a member of this House, that I was interested in that contract? Has he not had my solemn denial, as well as the affidavit of an hon. senator, that I was not the contractor or had the slightest interest in or connection with it. If he or any one else will make the statement that I had, I will give him all the investigation he likes for the purpose of inquiring into it. Then the hon. gentleman asked why I should not set aside the opinion of my engineers in reference to the manner in which contracts should be carried out. Did I not override the opinion of Mr. Page in reference to Cornwall Canal? Yes I did in reference to the building of Sheik's Island dam, and in doing so I followed the advice of the engineers connected with the work, the chief engineer of my department, and the board of engineers who inquired into it. And I leave it to any one competent to judge whether the change that I made in that work was not for the benefit of the country and an improvement in any engineering point of view over the work as constructed prior to my occupying the position which I do. The hon. leader of the Opposition makes another charge. It is one of those general and vague ones which hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of making. It is the general charge of corruption and incapacity. I have been a member of this House for the last twenty-five years. I remember when Joseph Howe, Sir John Macdonald, D'Arcy McGee and a lot of the most brilliant and most eminent men that ever occupied a seat in the Government of this country had to meet charges made again and again by the Opposition taunting them with incapacity, with not being fit to occupy the positions they held, and that is always a charge which the Opposition makes. That is a charge which they invariably fall back upon when they have no policy, when they have nothing to go to the country on. It is the old trick practiced by the lawyer who has a bad case, of finding fault with the opposing attorney. That charge has been again and again reiterated in this House. In every speech hon. gentlemen opposite make, they reiterate it. There is another serious charge which the hon. gentleman made. He said that there is no contract which has been carried out by this Government which does not exceed the estimates. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be more precise and tell us those which do exceed the estimates. I venture to state that he cannot mention one which does. I would ask the hon. gentleman does the expenditure on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal exceed the estimate?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. The expenditure on the Sault Canal, for building this work, will be about $500,000 less than the estimate?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. And every other work over the contracts for which I have had control, as Minister of Railways, except the Curran bridge, has cost less than the estimates.

Mr. LISTER. Not one is within the estimates.

Mr. HAGGART. I make that statement, and I state, moreover, that the deputy head and engineer in chief of my department made the statement upon oath before the Public Accounts Committee two days ago in reference to the Sault Canal—and the hon. member for Lambton was listening to him. And the hon. gentleman now says that the expenditure will exceed the estimate.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for Lambton did not listen to him, the hon. member for Lambton was not there. But I will tell the hon. Minister that the estimate made under the Minister preceding him, Sir Charles Tupper, is exceeded by over a million dollars.

Mr. HAGGART. The estimate of the department for the completion of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, as sworn to by the deputy minister before the Public Accounts Committee, was $4,000,000——

Mr. LISTER. Not at all.

Mr. HAGGART.—and it has been constructed for about $3,500,000. And a similar

statement can be made of the other works in my department.

Mr. LISTER. It exceeded the estimate——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to keep order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to a point of order. The hon. Minister is entirely out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to a point of order, and I will be heard, or the Minister shall not get a point further. I ask your ruling upon the point I raise, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister of Railways is out of order in referring to what took place in a committee of the House which has not yet reported to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. Minister is certainly out of order in the reference he makes.

Mr. HAGGART. Your ruling is perfectly correct, Mr. Speaker. To justify what I have stated, I committed the unpardonable fault, in a parliamentary sense, of referring to what occurred in the committee of the House which has not yet been reported to the House. The facts, nevertheless, come to my knowledge from my own department, which perfectly justifies me in making the statements I have made, independent of the evidence given. In order to a perfect understanding of this whole affair, I will supplement some of the remarks I made last session. The hon. leader of the Opposition twits me with not speaking before. As I have stated, I devoted more than an hour of my time last session to this matter, and if an election does not come on before another session, I suppose we shall have the charges repeated again. It will be necessary for hon. gentlemen opposite to change their base of attack, in order that they may have new material for discussion. We shall likely have a motion this time covering section B, or the Tay Canal, and some of the other antiquated stuff that has done duty with hon. gentleman for a number of years past, and with which they vainly hope to satisfy the people for the deficiency of their fiscal policy. I shall devote perhaps more time than I would like to at this late hour of the night to a statement in reference to this bridge. In the autumn of 1892 it was decided by the Government to respond to the earnest solicitation of the board of trade and the people of Montreal to replace two bridges, known, I believe, as the Wellington bridges, one used for the Grand Trunk Railway, and the other as a foot passenger and traffic bridge across the Lachine Canal. On account of the congested state of the Wellington Street bridge, occasioned by the enormous traffic, which had increased rapidly between these sections of Montreal, it was decided by the Government to build two new bridges at that point. Estimates of the probable cost were called for from Chief Engineer Trudeau, who was at the head of the department, and he estimated that for an 18-foot navigation the bridges would cost $170,000.

Mr. MCLOCK. For the two bridges?

Mr. HAGGART. For the two bridges. On being requested to state what would be the extra cost for the two bridges with substructures for a 20-foot navigation, he added $40,000, making $210,000. The charge was made by the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution that I had deceived the House as to what the cost of the bridges would be; that I had made a statement to the House which had led them to believe that the bridges could be built for a certain sum, and had afterwards entered into a contract in a most unjustifiable manner supplemented the vote by a Governor General's warrant. I will deal with that point afterwards, but in the meantime let me confine myself to the question of the cost of the bridges. It was decided that the substructure of the bridges should be increased in depth for the purpose of affording a 20-foot navigation on the Lachine Canal at this point. The chief engineer, Mr. Schreiber, in discussing the matter with the superintending engineer, Mr. Parent, made a mistake, and instead of saying that it was to be 22-feet depth of water, necessitating putting the substructure to a depth of 24 feet, he said that the intention was to carry out the work for a 22-foot navigation, which would necessitate putting the substructure at a depth of 26 feet.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Only one of them was put to a depth of 26 feet.

Mr. HAGGART. It does not matter. They built the substructure of these bridges for a 22-foot navigation, that is to say, at a depth of 26 feet. What I want to get at is that the additional cost, through a mistaken statement of the engineer, as estimated, was $13,000, making a total estimated cost of $223,000. Another condition as to the building of the bridge was that the canal should be unwatered on the 15th December. Every one who knows the city of Montreal, knows that a great number of important manufactories are situated along the Lachine Canal, and those who know the facts in that regard, will be able to estimate the injury and loss to the manufacturers and the workingmen of the city which would follow the stopping of these establishments. There was a meeting of the manufacturers held in the city of Montreal, when they urged upon the department the necessity of building the bridges in the speediest possible manner. I gave instructions to Mr. Parent, who was superintending engineer, to find out what was the quickest possible time in which the bridges could be built. The information I received from these gentlemen was that the water could be taken out of the canal

on the 1st of March, and the whole work completed by 1st May. Then my instructions to the chief engineer were to see the superintending engineer of the canal and instruct him that all materials for the canal were to be obtained by tender, and that every precaution should be taken in order that the work might be pushed energetically upon the canal being unwatered. In October I may state incidentally, the superintending engineer of the canal was given full charge of the work, he was instructed that he was responsible entirely for the work to be done upon these bridges. Under those instructions, then, the work was commenced, the material was furnished, and everything was in readiness for unwatering the canal on the 8th March. One of the charges made by hon. gentlemen opposite is that labour was supplied by tender. The instructions to the officers were, at least the instructions that were communicated to me before they were sent, were that all materials furnished to any canal in the Dominion, or any public work under my control, was to be obtained by tender. The officer in charge of the canal at Montreal, under instructions, as he stated, from Mr. Trudeau, asked for tenders for the skilled labour for doing this work. Hon. gentlemen who followed the evidence before the committee must see that the report of the superintending engineer of the canal to my department was that the work could be done by the labourers connected with the canal, with the assistance of what skilled labour might be required, and which he advised me to obtain by tender. Tenders for this labour were asked for, and five tenders were received, Mr. St. Louis being the lowest. The superintending engineer forwarded an abstract of the tenders to the department as he was directed. I declined, as the hon. gentleman said, to act upon it at first. It was the first time I ever heard of labour being supplied by tender, but he assured me it was the proper way. One of the reasons he gave for supplying skilled labour by tender in the city of Montreal was that skilled labour, being mostly under the control of certain contractors in that city, there was less liability of strikes, and that the proper plan, as the Government, of necessity had to complete the whole of that work within two months, was to secure that labour from some contractor who would be responsible to see that we were furnished with the kind of labour required. His statement to me was that if a strike should occur delaying the works (which would be much more likely to occur if the Government hired the men for a few weeks than if supplied by a contractor who employed them the year round), it would be an awful calamity, not only to the navigation, but to all the manufacturers along the Lachine Canal, if the work was not finished by the 1st of May. By the evidence of the gentleman, I agreed to that plan. I accepted the advice of the superintending engineer, and of my deputy, that the skilled labour required for the work should be furnished by tender. Is that a crime? Is that something for which the Minister, who is more than anything else the political head of the department, should be impeached by a motion in this House, he having acted upon the advice of the superintending engineer of the canal? The hon. gentleman asks, Why did I extend the tenders? I shall deal with that afterwards. The hon. gentleman has not charged that the amount which was allotted to skilled artisans for the purpose of doing this work, was extravagant, or was higher than the rates usually paid for such work. The leader of the Opposition says, Oh, you gave $1.50 to men who were working at shovelling out ice from the water, you gave them 15 cents per hour. That labour was supplied by Mr. St. Louis for $1.10, $1.15, and $1.25. The deputy head of the department was told by the superintending engineer that $1.50 per day was not too much for a good labourer employed on that canal, and I knew myself that in my section of the country no man would engage in any work of that kind for a less sum than was awarded by the Government for that work. The price was a fair one for the labour which those parties performed. At that time, as everyone knows, the House was in session, the House was in session from January to the 1st April, all this work of construction was done between March 8th and about the 1st of May, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite say that the Minister of Railways should have a supervision over the work. What the Minister of Railways is responsible for is to see that the parties under him honestly fulfil the duties which are required of them. The party who had charge of that work, the superintending engineer of the canal, was reported to me to be an efficient engineer. I knew he had been thirty years in the service of the Government, and I knew that the party who was under him as superintendent of the canal was an active and energetic man, fit to take charge of work of that kind, and see that it was properly carried out. Hon. gentlemen opposite intimate that the duty of the chief engineer is to have an active supervision a personal supervision, of every railway and canal in the Dominion. No member of this House is foolish enough to suppose that it was his duty to do so. It is his duty to act according to the best of his knowledge, and to see that the men under him are efficient, and able to perform the work which the Government require to be done. Had he not a right to suppose that a man who had been thirty years in charge of the canals, and a man like Mr. Kennedy, who was the superintendent of the Lachine Canal, were able to supervise a work such as the building of these two bridges? Then

the hon. gentleman says that Mr. Desbarats, one of the officers in charge, was removed because he was too officious, that he was removed because he prevented Mr. St. Louis from carrying on his corrupt practices, and that the Deputy Minister and the Minister of Railways winked at his removal for that reason. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the superintending engineer of the canal, and the assistant engineer under him, Mr. Papineau, were perfectly capable engineers, and were quite sufficient for the purposes of supervising such a work. It was a work involving the expenditure of about $200,000, and an engineer could sit on a stone and see every bit of the work that was going on. It was a work that any engineer could supervise, and yet the charge is that Mr. Desbarats was dismissed because he was interfering with Mr. St. Louis in corrupt practices against the Government. Mr. Desbarats was not dismissed.

Mr. TARTE. He was.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman states what is not so. Mr. Desbarats was removed and afterwards sent to fill an important position on the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Rocky Mountains. Mr. Schreiber wanted some one to supervise the work of construction on the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Rocky Mountains, and Mr. Desbarats was sent out there for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was not the ground stated in his letter of dismissal.

Mr. HAGGART. He was removed from Montreal and placed in charge of a work on the British Columbia section of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There was no intention of dismissing him. No charge was made in the department against Mr. Desbarats, who was a very active and efficient officer, and on account of his activity and efficiency he was charged by the chief engineer with the responsibility of superintending some work on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The letter at the time stated that his services were no longer required.

Mr. HAGGART. At that particular work.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The department did not agree to continue him there, although Mr. Parent stated it was necessary.

Mr. HAGGART. In regard to the labour contract, I may say that the instructions I gave at the time to the superintending engineer were that the labour was to be obtained by requisition by him on the works, that no labour was to be employed unless it was absolutely requisite, and that the party should be dismissed immediately if they were not found efficient, active and suitable. Two charges have been made, and they have been made not against my department but against myself personally: The first was, that I ordered work to be constructed in a particular manner instead of inviting tenders publicly and letting the work; the next was that the labour contract was not such as was in the interest of the country. I may have been mistaken in regard to the contract, the chief engineer of my department may have been mistaken in regard to the best mode of the employment of labour, and that it should not have been obtained by contract. Is that a serious charge to be made in this House and to be embodied in an amendment to go into Committee of Supply—an error of judgment, perhaps, committed by me because I accepted the recommendation of the chief engineer of my department and of the superintending engineer of the Lachine Canal. I am not supposed to possess sufficient technical knowledge to act on these matters. It would be sufficient justification for me at any time if, instead of exercising my judgment, I simply accepted the advice of my department. If the officers of my department act wrongly, if frauds are committed on the Lachine Canal or elsewhere, if parties steal and commit fraud, if there was collusion between the officers of the department, the time-keepers and the contractors for the supply of labour for the work and the Government is thus defrauded, am I responsible? Is the deputy head or the chief engineer of the department responsible? All they can do when they find out that such crimes have been committed is to see that the parties receive just punishment. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) made a further charge against me—that after the time I knew that irregularities had been committed, Mr. St. Louis was paid money. The first time I knew that extravagant expendiutre was being made was in a report made by Mr. Schreiber on 26th April. I never certified to payments, nor is a single payment certified to by myself. Since I have been in the department the Minister has not certified to payments, and the same is the practice in the Department of Public Works. The Minister does not know of payments being made. It is quite a mechanical process. The accounts are certified to by the chief engineer in charge or superintendent of the particular work, they come to the superintendent engineer in my department, and if they are within his knowledge he also certifies them; then they go to the Auditor General, and he sees that the vouchers in regard to the work are perfect and complete. I am not aware of a single account having been paid, either by the Minister of Public Works or by the Minister of Railways. The parties are paid by cheques of the department or of the Auditor General, and the party who supervises the works and certifies the pay-rolls is responsible as to the payments and the Auditor General checks them to ascertain if they are in order. The only time the attention of the

Minister is drawn to a certificate is when the estimate is exceeded, and then the reason is given. The hon. member for Queen's said, why had any payments been allowed after the 26th April? I did not authorize a single payment to be made; there were no payments made by my authority after the report of the chief engineer; there were no payments made on the chief engineer's certificate after that time. The charge against me is a personal one, that the Minister is responsible for the amount. The Minister is not responsible for the amount. If he had supervision for the payment of moneys, he might be responsible. If I saw every amount paid, the position would be different, but the hon. gentleman knows I am not responsible, and that no payment was made by my authority after 26th April. After the assurance I have given him he will relieve me of all responsibility. The first charge was that I violated the statute by not letting the work by public contract; the next charge was that by gross mismanagement I let a contract for labour when the department should have employed the men, and that there was no proper supervision of the work. Is that a charge against me, that I did not properly superintend the work? Another charge is, that after all the facts came to my knowledge, payments were made, even when I knew there was corruption in the transactions between Mr. St. Louis and an officer or officers in charge of the works. I had no knowledge of any such charge; officers of my department had no knowledge of any frauds being committed. They thought there was extravagance, but that was the only statement made to me. Mr. Douglas, an officer of the department, stated to Mr. Schreiber that the work was being extravagantly conducted, Mr. Schreiber informing me that from the reports there was an excess of expenditure over the estimated cost. I never suspected fraud until some time after the commission was appointed. When the commission was appointed all it was able to discover in the shape of fraud was that certain lumber and timber charged for was in excess of the quantities to be found in the works. But there was no evidence in the department of fraud; and as the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) stated, the first evidence in our possession in respect to fraud was when we got possession of Mr. Frigon, who gave evidence before the Public Accounts Committee. Then there is the sworn information and the definite information obtained by Mr. Schreiber on 10th May, 1894, and the only evidence was that of Mr. Frigon. Did I conceal it? No. It was contained in a private letter, which was communicated to me. I placed no reliance on it. Nevertheless, I took the opportunity, the Public Accounts Committee being in session, of bringing the witness here and making inquiry as to whether the charges made by him were correct or not. When I found there was evidence to sustain the charge I furnished the information to the Public Accounts Committee and immediately afterwards forwarded the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee to the Department of Justice, and my instructions were to prosecute all persons who had committed fraud on the Government and do everything possible to bring them to justice. I might go into details and criticise the whole of the evidence, if the hour were not so late; I have prepared a brief which would take about one hour to read in regard to the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee. The charge has been made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) that we had an offer to build the Grand Trunk Railway bridge for a fixed sum, and the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) repeated the statement. He stated positively to this House, and so did the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that Mr. Hannaford had offered to build that bridge for $70,000, and that he could have saved $10,000. Mr. Hannaford never made an offer to build the bridge for $70,000. We were most anxious to have the work completed with the least possible delay, and one of the reasons of the delays was on account of the negotiations going on between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway, with reference to the Grand Trunk Railway Company building the bridge. They kept the negotiations for building the bridge open, but came to no definite conclusion, until at last a letter was received from Mr. Sargeant, manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, offering to build it, charging the Government the actual cost, with a fair percentage added for superintendence, &c. Here is the evidence of Mr. Hannaford with reference to that:

By Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper:

Q. You referred to an offer by the Grand Trunk to do the work for a certain sum. Was that in writing, or are you referring to a conversation?—A. I am referring to the general manager's letter of the 29th of December, 1892.

Q. Have you that letter?—A. I have a copy of it.

Q. I would like to have that letter?—A. It is written by Mr. Seargeant to Mr. Schreiber, dated 28th December, 1892.

"My dear Sir,—Your predecessor has written us with reference to the railway bridge across the canal here, which has to be rebuilt in connection with the proposed public bridge. There is not much time to be lost in proceeding with the work, which I understand it to be the wish of the Government this company should undertake.

"Mr. Hannaford estimates the cost of the superstructure for the railway bridge at $35,000, and that it may take a similar sum to construct two new masonry abutments, leaving the centre pier as it is, and constructing additional crib-work and piling protection around it. The present rest piers will require to be removed. Thus the superstructure and masonry, together with the crib-work and piling, for the railway bridge complete may cost $70,000, more or less.

"I beg to suggest that, considering this work has to be carried out in winter and the spring,

when the days are short and the difficulties are great, that the fair and proper course will be to charge the Government the precise cost of the work, adding a reasonable amount for plant and superintendence, and that payment should be made on account as the work progresses, on the certificate of the Government engineer.

"That seems a fair arrangement, and I shall be glad to know whether it is approved in principle."

Q. Have you any other letter relating to the offer to do the work ?—A. Only that of the 28th.

Q. Is that the letter in which you say they are willing to take the work and do it for $70,000 ?—A. Yes.

Q. That is the construction you put upon this letter ?—A. Yes, that is the construction we put upon it.

Q. What particular portion do you think—might I trouble you to read it—It seems to me they merely give an opinion as to its costing that amount, but state only a readiness to do it for whatever it will cost, keeping an account ?—A. Quite so.

Q. Not an offer to do it for $70,000 ?—A. No.

Q. Was there ever any such offer made ?—A. To do it for $70,000 ? No, sir. We offered to do it in good faith.

There is an answer to the statement of the hon. member for Wellington, that the Grand Trunk Railway offered to build the bridge for $70,000. But the hon. gentleman only quoted a portion of Mr. Hannaford's evidence. The fact is that the department never received any offer from the Grand Trunk to build it for any stated sum. The only offer was the offer of the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, to undertake the work for what it might cost, with a percentage added for superintendence, use of tools, derricks, &c.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They were willing to do that in the month of December.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was no offer whatever.

Mr. HAGGART. There is not a word of any offer to that effect. That is the only letter and the only offer ever received from the Grand Trunk Railway on the matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will see it stated in Mr. Hannaford's evidence just below where he is reading. In reply to Mr. Lister he said he was willing to build the work for that amount, if he had got the work in December.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Hannaford never made an offer at all. Mr. Hannaford was only the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway. When he talks about doing the job or anything of the kind he means in reference to the Grand Trunk Railway. What he did was to estimate the cost of the work, report to the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, and any offers as to building or construction, Mr. Hannaford had nothing to do with it. It was Mr. Seargent who was concerned in the case. The hon. gentleman must know it, and ought to know it, and he must know that this questioning and this letter came out immediately after the cross-examination of Mr. Hannaford. There is no evidence at all which shows that Mr. Hannaford offered to do the work for $70,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman pardon me for calling his attention to the evidence at page 291 :

By Mr. Lister :

Q. Is that true ?—A. Not as Mr. Schreiber would call completed, because he is just and upright, and keeps people, as old Silas Wegg says, "With their noses to the grindstone." He keeps them flat. Mr. Schreiber would have said : "You did not finish that bridge, sir." I said : "No, Mr. Schreiber, I will tell you what I will do. I will have the bridge ready for navigation on the 1st of May, and let the Grand Trunk jump on me ; they will jump on me enough, if it not ready for the railway." I would have taken the contract for $70,000, and have pocketed $10,000 for the company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That does not say he offered to do it.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has only read what the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) read some time ago. He knows that Mr. Hannaford is not in a position to do any work of that kind. Any one who knows anything of the relations between the Grand Trunk Company and their chief engineer, knows that we were not dealing with Mr. Hannaford at all. We were dealing with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) stated broadly, that one of the charges that he made against the department, and particularly against the Minister, was that an article appeared in the Montreal "Star," that that article showed that there was corruption and extravagance, that it warned the Minister that there would be an inquiry, and that if the Minister got that warning why did he proceed in the manner he did. The hon. member knows that there was no such charge as that made in the "Star." I will take the trouble to read the whole of the article, and I will show that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies's) statement was without a scintilla of foundation in reference to the charge he made :

An army of men, a forest of derricks, pick-axes swinging on every side, huge blocks of ice being hoisted in the air and carted away, pile drivers pounding down great timbers into the earth, busy workmen and rushing horses, noise bustle, piles of earth and deep excavations, temporary stone-yards on every side—stand on Wellington Street bridge, and all these are what will surround the spectator. A few days ago the neighbourhood around the bridge presented its usual wintry appearance, to-day work is being pushed forward on every side, and the scene is a regular hive of industry. The work for the new roadway bridge and the Grand Trunk bridge has commenced, and has to be complete before the opening of navigation, hence all this rush and activity. Twelve hundred men are working with all their might and main, and the locality has being completely metamorphosed. It was last Thursday that the operations were commenced,

and they will be continued day and night without intermission till the work is completed. On both sides of the canal, above and below the old bridges, the excavations are being made for the abutments. Wherever there is room to swing a pick there is a labourer cutting away the earth. Teams stand above the excavations and cart away the dirt as rapidly as possible to a dump about half a mile distant. A temporary bridge has been erected across the canal just above the old bridge for the use of the workmen. In the canal, on the ice, scores of workmen are engaged in cutting up the ice, which is hoisted up by a big steam derrick and carted away. Some of these blocks are of enormous size. One taken out yesterday measured in cubical contents 256 feet, or in weight above 23,140 pounds. A couple of hundred yards above the bridge a temporary scaffolding is erected right out into the canal. There will be another derrick on top of this, which will be used for getting rid of the surplus material from the bottom of the canal. Some of the water in the canal was let out on Tuesday night, but about four feet still remain in the canal. It was found impossible to let all the water out till the ice above the bridge had been removed, as otherwise the ice would have formed a dam at the bridge and retarded the work. The staff was divided into two gangs of 600 men each and work will go on without intermission. Thirty-five electric lights have been put up to enable the night work to proceed. The masonry for the superstructure has to be completed by April 15, but it is hoped to have everything ready before that time. There was almost a fatal accident at the works on Tuesday. A labourer named Victor Chalifou, while at work on the Grand Trunk bridge fell through into the water. He had sunk for the second time when a foreman named Trudel caught him by the hair and pulled him out. Besides the 1,200 men engaged on the work there are 100 single horses, 50 teams, 14 derricks, and 2 steam pile-drivers. The new roadway bridge will be about 160 feet west of the old one. The new Grand Trunk bridge will occupy the same site as the old one. These two bridges were built with three piers in the water, two abutments, and a pivot pier each. The new bridges will have only a pivot pier each. The ends of the swing girders will rest on the abutments, which will give a much greater waterway for navigation, and do away with a good many yards of costly masonry. The new railway bridge will cross the canal at an angle. The extreme length between abutments will be 253 feet 6 inches; width over all, 14 feet, with a head room of 21 feet 6 inches. The new roadway bridge will be constructed with two electric train lines, two carriageways and two sidewalks, the latter each 5 feet wide, outside the trusses. The width over all will not exceed 48 feet, with a total length between abutments of 232 feet 3 inches, and a clear head room of 18 feet. The contract for the superstructure has been awarded to the Dominion Bridge Company, of Lachine, who have undertaken to erect the railway bridge for $26,000, and the roadway bridge for $34,000. The masonry and excavation are being done by day work, while Messrs. William Hood & Son have the contract for the piling. The abutments will be 15 feet wide and 68 feet long at the bottom, sloping to 97 feet long for the roadway bridge and smaller for the railway bridge. Mr. E. N. Parent, superintendent engineer of canals in this district, is chief engineer of the work, with Mr. Edward Kennedy, superintendent of the Lachine Canal, chief foreman.

Now that I have read the whole article in the "Star," does the hon. gentleman state that that article showed that there was any corruption, and that there would be an inquiry by the House into the matter?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not say that it did.

Mr. HAGGART. I will take the hon. gentleman's statement when he says that he did not say that, but I understood him to say that the article in the "Star" had pointed out the corrupt and expensive manner in which the work was being carried on, and warned the department that an inquiry would be made into the expenditure. Is not the article in the "Star" altogether complimentary? The only inference of another kind that the Minister could draw was that there were too many men employed on the work for the amount of space they had. My attention was called to the statement that there were 1,200 men and 100 teams employed on the work, and I stated to Mr. Schreiber that that was too many men, and he agreed with me. He addressed Mr. Parent on the subject, and Mr. Parent's statement in reply was that the number was greatly over-stated. Was I not to rely upon the statement of the superintending engineer of the work? He further stated that he had discharged over four hundred men, and I forget how many teams.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman pardon me? I did not say that the "Star" charged corruption. What I said was that the "Star" stated that 1,300 men were employed, and that the department had been informed that the expenditure was conducted in a lavish and extravagant manner. I quoted that phrase from the records. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the letter of Mr. Schreiber, of the 10th of March, addressed to Mr. Parent, in which he says:

I earnestly trust reports which are current, that the work at the Wellington Street bridges is being conducted in a most lavish and extravagant manner, are greatly exaggerated statements of the actual facts.

So that the department was informed that the work was then being carried on in a most lavish and extravagant manner. That is all I stated.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood the hon. gentleman to attribute that statement to the article in the "Star," but if he will look at his speech in "Hansard" to-morrow, he may find that I am mistaken, and he is right. As soon as that article appeared in the "Star," the hon. gentleman is right in saying that Mr. Schreiber wrote as follows, to Mr. Parent:—

Dear Sir,—I earnestly trust the reports which are current, that the work at the Wellington Street bridges is being conducted in a most lavish and extravagant manner, are greatly exaggerated statements of the actual facts. You will bear in mind that the responsibility in the conduct of this work rests with you, and you

will be judged by results. My instructions to you are to prosecute the work with vigour, to ensure its being completed by the 1st of May, proximo, having due regard to economy, but I see by the public press it is stated that you have one thousand three hundred men at work, a number immensely in excess of the requirements, and quite sufficient to retard the progress of the work by being in one another's way.

The superintending engineer's attention was called to the matter by this letter. He was ordered to come up immediately and report upon the work, and he reported that the statement made in the "Star" as to the number of men employed was greatly exaggerated, and that a great reduction had been made in the number of men and teams employed. Then, the hon. gentleman states that I ought to have had knowledge that the expenditure was in excess of the estimate. The superintending engineer of the canal was the party who made the estimate. He made it in my office, and I questioned him as to the amount required for the building of the bridges. I had the plans prepared and brought before me, and I understood that the amount which I had stated to Parliament was sufficient to cover the expenditure on the bridges during the year; and, when cross-examined before the Committee of Public Accounts, Mr. Parent himself admitted that it was his duty to inform the department as to the excess of the expenditure over the estimate. There was no information in the department on the subject; the deputy had no information, and the chief engineer had no information until late in April, when it was too late to correct it. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. What evidence is there? I will be compelled, in order to put the hon. gentleman right, to quote from the evidence, although I do not like to trouble the House at this late hour with reading at any length. The amounts paid for labour were as follows:—

November	$ 2,544
December	3,307
January	4,494
February	11,879
do	4,169
March	7,263

Those were the amounts which were paid on the labour pay-rolls up to the 28th April. They do not show at all that the account would be likely to be exceeded. The chief engineer only gave his certificate of approval for payment of the pay-rolls up to a particular day. There was no evidence at the department, there was no means by which I could know at the time that the expenditure was being exceeded. Yet the hon. gentleman will move an amendment and charge me personally with being responsible for the excessive expenditure over the estimate. There was no information in the department by which I could be aware of the excessive expenditure. The hon. gentleman cannot show by the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee that the department could have been in any way informed, or that the Minister could have been informed, that the estimates for the building of these bridges before the 20th April, 1892, had been exceeded or would likely be exceeded. Yet the hon. gentleman will get up here and solemnly, in those ponderous tones in which he displays his eloquence, not only on pay-rolls, but on everything else—speaking with partisan heat instead of making, in a judicial manner, clear, concise and precise statements, as he ought to do when attacking the head of a department, who, he knows, may have been led into error by the reports of his officers—tries to hold me personally responsible, although he knows that I did everything possible to ferret out the wrong and punish those who committed frauds upon the department. How different is the action of the hon. gentleman opposite from what the leader of the Opposition would do in England. If frauds were committed there in the Ordnance or the Supply Department, would there be any charge brought against the officers of the department? If the system of audit or the system of management proved wrong, would there be any charge made against the political head of the department? No, not one member in the House, no matter how bitter an opponent he might be against the Government, would impugn the honour of the department, without the most grave and serious reasons. He would not impugn the honour of the head of the department, but would assist in every possible manner, if he were on a committee for the purpose of investigating the evils, in discovering and punishing those who were guilty of the frauds, instead of making political capital out of them for the purpose of damaging the reputation of a Minister of the Crown. It is too cowardly, too mean a manner of making capital in the country—gentlemen without a fiscal policy, without anything on which to approach the electorate of the country, trying to fix a scandal or a charge of corruption against a Minister, without a tittle of evidence to support it. Not attacking the department, not attacking those parties who committed the wrong, not attacking them at all—no, but trying to atone for their lack of policy, trying to get some credit in the country, by an attack upon the honour of the Minister who is at the head of the department. The hon. gentleman knows that there could not have been any knowledge of these frauds in the department. I appointed a commission for the purpose of inquiring into the expenditure, and I determined that the guilty parties would be punished if there was any wrong-doing. I sent the police inspector of the Intercolonial to ferret out wrong if wrongs existed. I did all I possibly could for the purpose of getting at the cause of the heavy expenditure. I have done all that man can do. To hold

the department responsible because the contractor for a particular work, a work in charge of a superintending engineer in a distant or even near part of the country, perhaps under the eyes of the engineer-in-chief at Ottawa—to hold the department responsible because the resident and superintending engineer allowed fraud to be committed between the party supplying the labour and the time-keepers whose duty it was to check and see that the contractor received nothing but the honest time; to hold the head of a department or the chief engineer responsible, is anything but fair. All the head of the department could do, when fraud was committed and when the superintending engineer was not efficient in the performance of his duty, was to discharge him and every other person found guilty. This was done in this case. It was my duty to see that every person who committed a fraud was punished if possible. I have done that, and I have insisted that my department shall do it; and if it be possible at all, I will see that the parties who committed the frauds are punished. I have done everything I possibly could to recover from those who received money they were not entitled to, the money thus wrongfully received. I do not believe that any officer in my department at headquarters was negligent of his duty in any respect, but that he did all he possibly could for the faithful performance of his duty.

Mr. MARTIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the adjourned Debate on the motion of Mr. Foster for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, and the motion of Mr. Davies in amendment thereto, be made the first order at the next sitting of the House this day, after questions to be put by members.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that my hon. leader has agreed to this. I am sorry, because there are many Bills on the Order paper for Wednesday, the only day now left for private members. I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether he proposes to give the private members another day, say Tuesday, to make up for the Wednesday. Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Minister of Finance a very proper question. My impression is that this motion has been assented to without consideration of the Order paper; and I do not think it is fair to private members that the motion should be carried. There are many matters on the paper that are of very considerable interest and importance, and I ask the Finance Minister, in all fairness now, whether, if he deems it necessary that this debate should proceed de die in diem, whether it is not fair that proper compensation should be made to the private members.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the motion we have been debating to-day is a very important one, involving want of confidence in the Government; and, after consultation with the leader of the Opposition, it was agreed that it should go on de die in diem until it was finished. It is so important a motion that I think we must dispose of it before we can go on with other business. It was in the line of that idea that the agreement was made. It does take from private members, Wednesday, which belongs to them, but there are Mondays and other Wednesdays which will still be private members' days. I could not make a promise, of course, to give a Government day in return for this. It may have, however, the effect of making me a little less strenuous in asking for an additional day for the Government. That matter I will be very glad to consider.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the motion in order, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, a motion of this kind, strictly-speaking, would require a notice. But it has been the practice ever since I have been in Parliament, when a question affecting the Government, I may say a question in which the Government was involved so closely as the question before the House, for the House to agree to the passing of the motion.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was not asking what the House ought to do, but whether the motion is in order. If the motion is in order, as both leaders have agreed to it, of course there is nothing to be said; but if it is not in order, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Rule as to the practice of the House for the last ten years.

Mr. SPEAKER. If there is objection made to it, of course I shall have to declare the motion out of order.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do object to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend had better consider that objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have considered it. It is well known that the Order paper is loaded down with Bills, and at this stage of the session, if there is to be any possibility of pressing these Bills it must be to-morrow night. Of course, I am quite willing to agree to the motion if the hon. leader of the House thinks fit to exchange days.

Mr. FOSTER. I doubt very much if my hon. friend will forward even what is upon the paper for to-morrow by taking an objection against the general sense of the House. I would have no objection, so far as I am concerned, to make Monday next a day upon which the Bills could be taken, instead of the motions. That would have

the effect desired. Again, I would ask my hon. friend to consider his objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. So far as I am concerned, I would be willing to accept the offer. I do not know if it will suit all hon. members. I have nothing upon the Order paper myself.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the motion is put with the unanimous consent of the House ?

Mr. MULOCK. I did not intend to raise a point of order myself ; I only intervened in the discussion to the extent of asking the leader of the House, whether, in assenting to this motion, he could not see his way to giving hon. members another day in return for the one he was taking. I do not think the hon. gentleman is making much of a concession now.

Mr. McCARTHY. You will move the motion with regard to Monday, afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. We will arrange for that, yes.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to : and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 19th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 118) to amend the Fisheries Act as respects the salmon fishery.—(Mr. Costigan.)

MR. SUTTON AND THE ROYAL CANADIAN DRAGOONS.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Mulock) asked, Was the officer commanding Her Majesty's forces in Canada consulted in regard to the appointment of Mr. Sutton to the Royal Canadian Dragoons ? If so, did such officer recommend Mr. Sutton for such appointment or express any opinion either in favour of or against Mr. Sutton being appointed ? If so, what was the nature of such opinion ?

Mr. DICKEY. There is nothing on record in the department to show that the officer commanding Her Majesty's forces in Canada was consulted in regard to the appointment of Mr. Sutton to the Royal Canadian Dragoons.

ATLANTIC AND SUPERIOR RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. Flint) asked, Has the Government guaranteed, or does it propose to guarantee the interest on the bonds of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, issued or to be issued in London, as stated in the following telegram to the Montreal "Gazette" of June 17th inst. :—"London, June 15th.—Robinson, Fleming and Company, London, have invited applications for £500,000 first mortgage 4 per cent 20-year bonds of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, being part of the authorized issue of £4,000,000. The issue price is 99. It is stated that the Government of Canada has guaranteed the interest on the bonds for the period of their currency and that the coupons will be so endorsed."

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has not guaranteed, nor does it propose to guarantee, the interest on the bonds of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company issued, or to be issued, in London. What the Government has done is this : It has agreed to accept from the company a sum of money as a loan for which it will pay 3 per cent interest, the sum of money so loaned and accumulated interest to be paid as directed by the company, and the company's direction will be that it be paid to the coupon holders of its bonds. As to the character of the road, the quality of the road, or the scheme in any way, the Government takes no responsibility and makes no guarantee.

Mr. LAURIER. What sum of money do you loan ?

Mr. FOSTER. £300,000. The Government receives the money and pays the interest.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. Flint) asked, Is it the intention of the Government, in case it undertakes to guarantee the bonds of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, to compel the said road to purchase the South Shore Railway between Montreal and Sorel and to use the same as a portion of its line, or is it the intention of the Government to permit the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company to

build a road between Montreal and Sorel parallel with the said South Shore Railway ?

Mr. FOSTER. As the Government does not undertake to guarantee the bonds, so far as this transaction is concerned, it makes no conditions with the road.

SIR JOHN THOMPSON'S FUNERAL EXPENSES.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked. Have the following accounts re the expenses of the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson, been examined and found correct ? If not, what is the cause of the delay :

PUBLIC WORKS OF CANADA.

RETURN OF ACCOUNTS

Chargeable to Funeral late Sir John Thompson.

Voucher No.	Name of Party.	For what.	Amount.
			$ cts.
1	Pay-list of men employed by Public Works Department		314 30
2	Nova Scotia Printing Co	Printing tickets	2 50
3	A. P. Sherwood	Expenses	86 56
4	Chas. W. Davies	Opening locks in church	4 00
5	D. Henley	Horse-hire	4 00
6	Lotta Redman	Typewriting	1 60
7	A. & W. MacKinley	Stationery	2 80
8	Burns & Murray	Black material	5 10
9	F. W. Bateman	Making two keys	0 75
10	Fishwick's Express	Cartage	2 00
11	Halifax Illuminating and Motor Co.	Lighting provincial buildings	333 24
12	Peter C. Fleming	Cab-hire	22 00
13	Morning Herald Printing and Publishing Co.	Printing tickets	17 00
14	J. D. Irons	Works at entrance to cemetery	143 37
15	Mess 63rd Halifax Rifles	Rations	31 25
16	Canadian Pacific Railway Co's Telegraph	Messages	13 55
17	Kenny & Co	Black material	1,228 29
18	James Monaghan & Sons	Building vault	350 00
19	do do	Work in cemetery	249 88
20	Major Apsley Smith	Horses and harness	7 97
21	Nova Scotia Nursery	Loan of flowers	272 00
22	Halifax Gas Light Co	Gas and electric light	107 50
23	do do	Wiring church and prov. buildings	303 50
24	Gorden & Keith	Church decorations	8,771 35
25	John Snow & Co	Undertakers	2,961 62
26	W. F. Compton	Choir master	50 00
27	Martin, Young & Co.	Draping post office	408 21
28	Nova Scotia Publishing Company	Decorations of prov. buildings	4,072 33
29	E. A. Neal	Measuring materials	22 50
30	E. P. Ryan	Valuating materials	10 00
31	John Overy	Measuring materials	13 50
32	Major Monteith	Horses	3 65
33	Louis Coste	Expenses	251 43
34	Davidson & Sons	Flower decorations	1,925 00
			$21,992 75
35	Grand Trunk Railway		633 00
36	Canadian Pacific Railway		230 50
37	Canada Atlantic Railway		234 75
38	Canada Atlantic Railway		8 53
39	Intercolonial Railway		2,509 17
			3,615 95

SUMMARY.

Total General Expenses	$21,992 75
" Railway do	3,615 95
Total	$25,608 70

PUBLIC WORKS OF CANADA.

DUPLICATE PAY-LIST.

Number of persons employed from the 22nd December to 31st January by conductor of works at funeral of the late Sir John S. D. Thompson.

Names of Men employed.	Their Occupation.	Number of Hours' Labour.	Wages per Hour.	Amount of Wages.
Men employed on the construction of cemetery church, draping, and cutting trees, restoring old arch and gateway to former position, and time of one man overseeing taking down decorations at the cathedral and lying-in-State Chamber in Provincial Building—			$ cts.	$ cts.
J. D. Irons	Foreman carpenter	200	0 40	80 00
L. Johnston	Carpenter	198	0 30	59 40
D. Irons	do	186	0 25	46 50
E. Brennen	do	37½	0 20	7 50
T. Burke	do	34	0 20	6 80
E. Lydiard	do	42	0 20	8 40
E. Delaney	do	44½	0 20	8 90
A. McKay	do	20	0 20	4 00
E. J. Collins	do	32½	0 20	6 50
T. Mulkerns	do	15	0 20	3 00
T. McRea	do	4	0 20	0 80
E. N. Neal	Assistant in office	34 days.	1 50	51 00
Mr. Jackson	Caretaker and janitor	17 days. 3 nights.	1 50 2 00	31 50
Total				314 30

Correct in every particular.

($314.30) (Sgd.) E. W. DODWELL,
Resident Engineer.

HALIFAX, N.S., 1st Feb., 1895.

(Sgd.) LOUIS COSTE.

OTTAWA, 11th March, 1895.

Ordnance Department to Nova Scotia Printing Co., Dr.

Halifax, 18th February, 1895.

Dec. 28, 1894—To printing 500 tickets, general wharf. Tickets of admission to general wharf where body was landed. Printed by order of General Moore.....$2 50

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Ordnance Office,
Halifax, 18th February, 1895.

Dear Sir,—With reference to your letter of the 14th inst., I beg to forward herewith a duplicate copy of the account for printing tickets as requested.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) A. G. FINCHAM, Major A.C.G. of O.,
Senr. Ord. Store Officer.

To Louis Coste, Esq., Dominion Engineer, Ottawa.

Mr. A. P. Sherwood to Windsor Hotel.

Montreal, 5th December, 1894.

Board, 1¼ days..... $5 00

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Halifax, N.S., 5th June, 1895.

Mr. A. P. Sherwood to H. Hesslein & Sons.

To coach	$ 0 50
Coach	6 00
Papers	0 25
Board	13 50
	$20 25

Paid. JUBIEN.

Statement of expenses incurred by Sergt. T. C. Slade and six Dominion policemen in connection with attending the funeral of the late Right Hon. Sir John Thompson, at Halifax, N.S.

January 3, 1895.

Sergeant and six constables, three meals each at 35 cents a meal	$ 7 35
Street cars to St. Mary's Church and return	0 70
Room at Revere House	1 00
Cab-hire	0 85
	$ 9 90

Certified correct.

(Signed) T. C. SLADE,
Sergt., Dominion Police.

Expenses incurred by A. P. Sherwood, Commissioner of Police, going to Halifax to superintend the funeral of the late Right Hon. Sir John Thompson.

1894.	$ cts.
Dec. 29—Cab-hire	1 00
do 28—Telegrams, 25c., 48c.	0 73
do 29—Telegrams, 38c., 41c.	0 79
do 29—Railroad fare, Halifax	17 45
do 29—Supper	0 75
do 29—Cab, Montreal	0 25
do 30— do	0 25
do 30—Hotel	5 00
do 30—Hotel porter	0 25
do 30—Pullman	4 00
do 30—Supper on train	1 00
do 31—Meals on train, $1.00, 75c., 75c.	2 50
do 31—Tip to porter	0 50
1895.	
Jan. 1—Telegrams, 30c., 51c., 70c	1 51
do 1—Cabs, $1, 50c	1 50
do 2—Cab	2 00
do 2—Telegram	0 38
do 3—Saddle horse	2 00
do 4—Cab	1 00
do 5—Tips, hotel, 50c., 25c., 25c.	1 00
do 5—Cab	0 50
do 5—Pullman	4 00
do 5—Hotel	20 25
do 5—Meals, $1.00, $1.10, 95c	3 05
do 6—Tip to porter	0 50
do 6—Cab, Montreal, 25c., 25c	0 50
do 6—Hotel, Montreal	2 00
do 6—Telegram	0 25
do 6—Pullman and porter	0 75
do 6—Paid on account of considerable (per account)	9 90
do 6—Street cars, newspapers, stamps, &c.	1 00
	$86 56

Certified correct, and altogether expended on Government business.

(Signed) A. P. SHERWOOD,
Commissioner of Police.

Halifax, N.S., 4th January, 1895.

Public Works Department,
to Charles W. Davies, Dr.

Jan. 4—To opening 20 locks on pews, taking off do., and fitting on at St. Mary's chapel, at 20 cts. ..... $ 4 00

Pews in church found locked on the morning of funeral. Had to be unlocked.

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 12th January, 1895.

Public Works Department of Canada
to D. Healy, Dr.

Jan. 3—To horse hire, funeral Sir J. S. Thompson $4 00

Mount for marshal.

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 14th January, 1895.

C. E. Dodwell, Esq., to Lotta Redman, Dr.

Jan. 7—To type-writing for Sir John Thompson's funeral, 6 copies, 7 folios each, paper $1 60

Received payment.

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Type-writing instructions to marshals and order of precedence in procession.

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 31st December, 1894.

Mr. C. W. Dodwell to A. & W. MacKinlay, publishers, booksellers, stationers, &c.

500	envel.,	56½ antiq	$ 2 00
500	do	76-6	0 80
			$ 2 80

For mailing tickets.

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 19th December, 1894.

Dept. of Public Works (for Mr. Story)
Bot. of Burns & Murray.

2 yds B.N. book muslin, 2-30 -60 8-12 ..... $5 10

For station Intercolonial.

(Signed) L. C.

Intercolonial Railway of Canada,
Halifax Station, 5th January, 1895.

Louis Coste, Esq., Chief Eng.,
Dept. Public Works, City.

Dear Sir,—The enclosed bill is for 2 pcs. muslin purchased on your authority, 19th Dec., and is distinct from the 1,200 yards subsequently got on account I.C.R. to complete our designs.

Yours truly,
(Signed) D. A. STORY.

Halifax, N.S.

Mr. Dodwell to T. W. Bateman, Dr.

Dec. 24, 1894	—Making two new keys..(A)	$ 0 50
Jan. 1895	—Making one new key..(B)	0 25
		$ 0 75

A for room adjoining office for storing materials; B extra office key.

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 17th January, 1895.

Mr. Dodwell to Fishwick's Express.

To cartage on black drapery ..... $ 2 00

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 8th January, 1895.

Dear Sir,—We were quite unprepared for running a day service, and did so at great risk. Out of a circuit of 1,500 lights we had to run 930, besides rendering our machinery unfit for proper night duty and partly burning out an armature.

(Signed) H. J. & W. Ry.

Halifax, N.S., 8th January, 1895.

The Department of Public Works, to Halifax Illuminating Motor Co. (Ltd.), Dr.

To supplying day and night service with electric light in Provincial Buildings, at obsequies of Sir John S. D. Thompson, with 97 lts., running 930 lights, 32 hours day service at 1c. per hour	$ 297 60
49 hours night service, at ¾c. per hour	35 64
	$ 333 24

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 8th January, 1895.

Public Works Department of Canada to Peter C. Fleming.

1894.

Dec. 18	Driving Mr. Greenwood in search for Mr. Monaghan	$ 1 00
do 26	Taking goods to North street	0 50
do 26	Driving Mr. Greenwood to Gordon & Keith	0 50
Jan. 1	Driving Mr. Greenwood from 8.30 to 5 o'clock	9 00
do 1	Driving Mr. Greenwood 2 hours in the morning	2 00
do 1	Distributing tickets from 1 till 8 o'clock	7 00
do 3	Driving Mr. Greenwood 2 hours	2 00
		$ 22 00

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S.

Dominion Public Works Dept., to "Morning Herald" Printing and Publishing Co., Dr.

Jan. 1, 1895	To 1,260 tickets St. Mary's Cathedral, obsequies Sir John Thompson—300 east aisle, 260 west aisle, 350 centre aisle, 100 end, east and west gallery, 150 standing room, pointing mourning border included	15 90
500	order of procession slips	2 00
		$17 00

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 16th January, 1895.

Dept. Public Works, to J. D. Irons, Dr., Building Arch, &c., Holy Cross Cemetery.

To	Black material covering	$ 40 31
	Gilt mouldings	22 73
	Lumber	19 30
	Mill work	5 55
	Gilding	17 97
	Truckage	7 50
	Upholstering	22 85
	Hardware	4 16
	Electric light	3 00
		$ 143 00

Sub-vouchers examined and found correct.

(Sgd.) C. E. W. DODWELL.
(Sgd.) L. COSTE.

Dear Mr. Coste,—The annexed is a bill of the cost of rations supplied to the 63rd Battalion by their officers on the occasion of the funeral of the late Premier. Expecting the landing to take place in the forenoon the men were warned for 9 o'clock a.m., and it was not thought advisable to dismiss them until the duty was performed, and consequently the officers provided lunch for them. I have no way of making it a charge against the Militia Department, but I think it would be a fair charge to be paid by the committee having charge of funeral arrangements. I trust you will give it favourable consideration.

(Sgd.) JAS. D. IRVING.

5-1-95.

Halifax, N.S., 5th January, 1895.

L. Coste, Esq.

Sir,—The men of the regiment under my command were ordered to parade on January 1st at 9 o'clock, and as they are under arms until 5 p.m., I have to provide rations for them. I enclose a bill from the Mess Committee for the amount.

I have the honour to remain, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) THOS. J. EGAN,
Lt.-Col., 63rd Rifles.

Halifax, N.S., 1st January, 1895.

Louis Coste, Esq., Secretary, to Mess Com., 63rd Hx. Rifles.

For Rations supplied 125 men at 25c..... $ 31 25

Correct.

(Sgd.) THOS. J. EGAN,
Lt.-Col., 63rd Hx. Rifles.

MR. C. E. DODWELL, Engr. HALIFAX, N.S., December, 1894.

To Canada Pacific Railway Company's Telegraph, Dr.

Date.	To Whom.	Place.	From whom.	Place.	Charge.
Dec. 15	Coste	Montreal			$0 50
do 15	Dodwell	Halifax	Coste	Montreal	0 52
do 18	Governor General	Montreal			1 66
do 18	do do	do			1 62
do 20	do do	do			0 84
do 20	do do	do			0 46
do 22	do do	do			0 36
do 22	Coste	Ottawa			0 44
do 24	do	do			0 38
do 24	Sheppard	Quebec			0 58
do 25	Governor General	Montreal			0 54
do 27	Coste	Ottawa			0 30
do 28	White	Montreal			0 36
do 28	Davidson	do			0 56
do 29	Coste	Ottawa			0 78
do 29	Dodwell	Halifax	Ouimet	St. Vincent	0 68
do 29	Willis	Toronto			0 32
do 31	Coste	Ottawa			0 70
Jan. 1	do	do			0 36
do 3	Ouimet	do			0 39
do 3	Coste	do			0 42
do 3	Philips	do			0 30
do 4	Coste	do			0 48
					$13 55

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Halifax, N.S., 31st December, 1894.

Department of Public Works, Ottawa,
Bought of Kenny & Co.

1894.				
Dec. 18	22 ps. black grenadine..	1,446	3	$ 43 38
do 24	4 cases bk. cotton bunt'g	9,163	8	730 38
do 31	3 ps. violet cashmere ..	106	35	37 10
do 31	1 case black bunting...	2,065	8	165 20
do 31	2 cases do ...	3,052½	8	244 20
do 31	Paid sundry telegrams re bunting and cashmere			6 18
do 31	Paid express charges on one parcel from Quebec			1 00
do 31	Paid express charges on parcel from Montreal			0 35
				$1,228 29

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 11th January, 1895.

Public Works Department, Canada, to James Monaghan & Sons, Dr., Masons, Plasterers and Contractors.

Building vault for late Sir John S. D. Thompson, and furnishing granite cover for do. at Holy Cross Cemetery, Halifax, N.S., per agreement $350 00

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 18th January, 1895.

Public Works Department, Canada, to James Monaghan & Sons, Dr., Masons, Plasterers and Contractors.

Building roadway and platform, Holy Cross Cemetery, for funeral late Sir J. S. D. Thompson.

1894.		$ cts.
Dec.	..—Spruce lumber, 9,000 at $14 per M.	126 00
do	..—100 ft. refuse spruce, $1 ; 1 package screws, 50c.....	1 50
do	..—54 ft. spruce lining at 2c.....	1 08
do	..—2 kegs nails, $3.25.....	6 50
do	..—18 trucks, 35c.....	6 30
		141 38
do 24	1 day, horse and man, $2.50 ; 1 day, labourer, $1.50	4 00
do 24	1 day, carpenter	2 50
do 24	2 days, carpenter, $2.50, $5 ; 2 labourers, $1.50, $3.....	8 00
do 28	1 day, carpenter, $2.50 ; 1 labourer, $1.50	4 00
do 29	4 days, carpenter, $2.50, $10 ; 3 labourers, $1.50, $4.50.....	14 50
do 31	3 days, carpenter, $2.50, $7.50 ; 2 labourers, $1.50, $3	10 50
1895.		
Jan. 1	3 days, carpenter, $2.50, $7.50 ; 2 labourers, $1.50, $3	10 50
do 2	4 loads sand for road, at $1.50...	6 00
do 3	3 watchmen at vault, $1.50.....	4 50
do 2	2 carpenters, $2.50, $5 ; 2 labourers, $1.50, $3.....	8 00
do 5	2 carpenters, $2.50, $5 ; 2 labourers, $1.50, $3	8 00
do 8	Horse and man, $2.50; 1 labourer, $1.50	4 00
do 14	Horse and man, $2.50 ; 1 labourer, $1.50	4 00
do 15	Horse and man, $2.50 ; 1 labourer, $1.50	4 00
do 16	1 day, carpenter, $2.50 ; 2 labourers, $1.50, $3.....	5 50
	Total.....	$249 88

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Statement of expenses incurred on occasion of State funeral. (Landing of body at Ordnance Yard.)

To Gunners Newbury and Hodboy for cleaning harness	2 50
Gunner Mock, for trimming harness.....	3 04
Lieut. Elliott, R.A., for tape	0 50
Mahon Bros., for tape.....	0 50
J. F. Kelly, for polishing paste, &c.....	1 00
Dillon Bros., for bath brick, &c.....	0 43
Total.....	$7 97

APSLEY SMITH,
Major, Asst. Mil. Sec.

Halifax, N.S., 11th January, 1895.

Department of Public Works of Canada, to Nova Scotia Nursery, Dr.

Jan. 5th—To time and labour superintending, placing, lending, repacking and removing plants used at State funeral...	$65 00
Truckage with covered and warmed conveyance	25 50
Wrapping paper, twine, &c.....	6 50
Loan and loss on specimen, exhibition and other plants in part as follows :— Tree ferns, palms, dracaenas, ficus, pandanus, marantus, cycas, lilies, calas, narcissus, hyacinths, &c., &c.....	225 50
	322 00
Less value of palms returned	50 00
	$272 00

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 18th January, 1895.

The Department of Public Works, Canada, to the Halifax Gas Light Co., Limited, Dr.

Jan. 12th, 1895—For gas used at St. Mary's Cathedral, while being draped and wired, 15,000 cubic feet at $2.50.....	$ 37 50
For running electric light station specially with one circuit for lighting cathedral, 35 hours at $5.....	175 00
e	$212 50
Deduct 21 hours for Sunday services charged in above at $5.00.....	105 00
	$107 50

(Signed) L. COSTE.

The Department of Public Works, Canada, to the Halifax Gas Light Co., Limited, Dr.

1895.		
Jan. 12	For labour and materials, wiring Council Chamber in Provincial Building with 56 lights and removing same, superintending do. at $1.50.....	$ 84 00
do 12	For labour and materials, wiring St. Mary's Cathedral with 219 lights and removing same, superintending do., $1.50.....	328 50
		412 50
Less—Wire, lamps and materials returned.		109 00
		$303 50

Reduced to $303.50 by the Department of Public Works after consultation with Mr. Ewart.

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 31st Dec., 1894.

Department of Public Works, Canada, bought of Gordon & Keith, manufacturers of Furniture and General House Furnishers.

36 yds silk cord at 5c	$ 1 80
11½ yds silk ribbon at 10c	1 15
2 yds. silicia at 15c	0 40
1 doz. silk twist	0 60
½ doz. silk thread at 80c	0 40
9 doz. repp buttons at 10c	0 90
44 yds. maroon felt at $1	44 00
46¾ yds. twine matting at 20c	9 35
Laying do	1 50
1 pole and trimming	0 50
1 brass rod	3 00
1 pr. P. R. brackets	0 45
3 doz. pins and rings at 20c	0 60
7⅓ yds. matting at $1	7 34
32¾ yds. felt at $1.25	40 94
200 lbs. paper at 6c	12 00
5 yds. wadded at 10c	0 50
1 piece picture wire	0 25
1 gross screw eyes	0 50
6 doz. hooks at 18c	1 08
3 doz. silver nails at 20c	0 60
1 coil wire	0 75
½ gross eyes at 60c	0 30
1 package tacks; thread, with hire of 3 upholstered chairs for Lady Thompson at $2.50	7 50
95 yds. hemp, 56 yds. hemp (151 y.) at 20c	30 20
1 box candles	1 50
1 doz. screw hooks	0 20
45 lbs. paper at 6c	2 70
16 yds. black ribbon at 10c	1 60
4 yds. white ribbon at 25c	1 00
16½ yds. black ribbon at 28c	4 13
36 do 8c	2 88
32 do 20c	6 40
57 do 28c	15 96
54 do 30c	16 20
50 do 35c	17 50
12 do 15c	1 80
8 pieces purple edging at 60c	4 80
5 yds. silver bullion fringe at $4.75	23 75
30 do tassels at $3.75	112 50
12 gold bullion tassels, 8 in., at $7.25	87 00
3 yds. gold bullion fringe at $2.25	6 75
Lot of sewing silk twist	2 00
2 gross screw hooks at $1.25	2 50
10 lbs. electric wire at 50c	5 00
28 lbs. manilla rope at 15c	4 20
25 do 13c	3 25
40 lbs. steel nails at 6c	2 40
35 lbs. twine, 8 balls, at 22c	7 70
6 cod lines at 55c	3 30
6 corn brooms at 30c	1 80
2 yds. canvas at 40c	0 80
2¾ lbs. lash cord at 75c	2 07
25 lbs. wire brads at 12c	3 00
2 gross steel screw eyes at 50c	1 00
10 lbs. twine, 2 balls, at 20c	2 00
Regilding and repairing Archbishop's chair, best gold leaf used	24 00
Covering banners with crape	6 00
Hire of banners from Montreal	100 00
Express charges on same, both ways	8 70
Hire of 3 sewing-machines, 1 week at $5	15 00
Sewing 1,500 yds. cashmere (outside parties, in order to be in time) at 1c	15 00
176 yds. white crepon at 25c	44 00
25 yds. black crepon for banners at $1	25 00
324 yds. white ½-inch cord at 5c	16 20
60 yds. silver trimmings at 12c	7 20
36 yds. cord at 10c	3 60
6 bamboo tables (on hire) at 25c	1 50
Making 1 stand for sanctuary	12 00
Making 3 frames for altar draping at $2.50	7 50
Materials used for arch for inscription over sanctuary	15 00
Repairing candlestick and altar seat	7 50
2 wooden window tassels at $2	4 00
Making small platform in sanctuary for "Aberdeen"	5 75
Making catafalque to order	37 50
Repairing altar rail	3 00
Lumber used for scaffolding and trusses.	25 00
do draping ceiling	22 75
1 black satin banner	40 00
Making apartment for Lady Thompson in cathedral and draping same in best purple silk	47 50
1 reading desk for pulpit	5 50
Making "Baldachen" and upholstering with best purple velvet and black silk, and trimming with bullion fringe and tassels and gilding cross for it	100 00
Upholstering Governor General's pew in plush, without materials	2 50
Draping catafalque and trimming same with purple silk and gold tassels, upholsterer's time	7 50
Upholsterer's time in draping 6 tables in black and purple	3 00
Time of 6 carpenters erecting scaffolding and trusses before commencing draping in sanctuary, and also removing same.	90 00
Upholstering 24 chairs, spring seat, and covering same in purple repp, for sanctuary. These chairs to be on hire at $3.	72 00
Two armchairs for Governor General and Bishop, in purple and velvet, at $7	14 00
Time of 47 upholsterers and general help draping inside of Cathedral walls, ceiling, and gallery, organ, pulpit, pews, and covering floors—	
2,961 hours at day at 25c	740 25
1,316 hours at night at 35c	460 00
Time of ten firemen working extension ladders and shifting ordinary ladders—	
630 hours, day, at 25c	137 50
280 hours, night, at 35c	98 00
Time of 3 experienced designers and drapers arranging places and assisting at inside drapery of St. Mary's Cathedral, also Academy of Music and Glebe House, outside, 30 days at $3.50	105 00
Time of member of our firm overseeing and directing men, taking time workmen, and generally looking after work until completed, day and night	
Time of buyer attending to purchasing of materials for completing work	
Time of three women sewing draperies and using sewing machine in cathedral, day and night, 24 days at $3	72 00
Hire of 251 chairs and cathedral cartage	27 50
Making ornamental devices (bronzing front of organ, two coats of bronze), ornamented with gold leaf, and otherwise decorating cathedral with Maltese crosses, Latin crosses and inscriptions in silver, "I am the resurrection and the life," and "Requiescat in pace," and monograms "I.H.S.," 576 hours, day, at 25c., $144; 154 hours, night, at 35c., $53.90	197 90
Time of mechanics, day and night	
30 lbs. best silver bronze at $3.75	112 50
10 lbs. embossed brocade (silver and gold) at $3.75	37 50
5 books gold leaf at 50c	2 50
12 large pebble boards at $1.50	18 00
Gold leaf substitute	10 00
Bristol board	30 00

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

3 galls. bronzing liquid at $3.50	10 50
1½ galls. white shellac at $3	4 50
12 papers tacks at 5c	0 60
2 balls white cord at 20c	0 40
3 steel draping needles at 50c	1 50
Cotton and pins	1 00
Time of 4 decorators, night and day work, 24 days at $3	72 00
Time of 43 men draping outside of St. Mary's Cathedral, Glebe House and Academy of Music, 430 hours at 25c	107 50
Marble-cutters, removing altar rail and placing again in position	48 25
Carpenter's time altering choir gallery, and lumber supplied for same	330 10
Hire of ladders for draping	25 00
Cartage to cathedral of materials, 40 Mozart Requiems at 90c., $36 ; music, 30 Mozart Requiems at 65c., $19.50	55 50
Telegrams	7 75
Time of men taking down draperies from inside St. Mary's Cathedral, and measuring and rolling up same, 680 hours at 25c.	170 00
Time of men taking down draperies from St. Mary's Cathedral, Glebe House and Academy of Music, 100 hours at 25c.	25 00
Time of 6 firemen with extension ladders taking down draperies from sanctuary, 24 hours at 25c	6 00
Cartage of materials to Department of Public Works office	2 50
Upholsterer's time making 13 cushions at $1	13 00
Upholsterer's time covering one stand	2 75
Upholsterer's time making covering for settee	3 25
Upholsterer's time making cover for 9 prie-dieu at $1.50	13 50
18 lbs. of curled hair used in cushions, at 60c.	10 80
144 papers of upholsterer's tacks at 20c.	28 80
67 ft. of ⅜ inch pipe at 10c	6 70
35 ft. of ⅜ inch comp. at 10c	3 50
8 ft. of ⅜ inch tee at 10c	0 80
7 ft. of ⅜ inch nipples at 10c	0 70
5 ft. of ⅜ plugs at 11c	0 55
10 ft. of ⅜ inch ells at 11c	1 10
1 ft. of ⅜ inch union at 30c	0 30
3 ft. of ⅜ inch screws and plugs at 35c	1 05
1 ft. of ¼ inch plan	0 25
8 ft. of 8 inch nipples at 15c	1 20
1 ft. of ⅜ inch cross at 15c	0 15
6 flanges and drop screws at 35c	2 10
8 ft. single P. brass brax at $1.50	12 00
2 ft. double P. brass brax at $2.00	4 00
10 globe-holders and smoke-pans at $1.50.	15 50
4 bulb burners at 25c	0 70
Taking down, altering and fitting up pipes and fittings	39 45
Repairing large branch broken by ladder.	3 75
Paid sexton and wife, St.Mary's Cathedral, per Rev. Dr. Murphy	35 00
	$4,436 75

Cr.

By ret'd 20 yards felt at $1	$20 00	
do 31 yards twine matting at 20c.	6 20	
		26 20
		$4,410 55
12,600 yds. black material at average price 26c.		3,536 00
1,031 yds. purple material at average price 80c.		824 80
		$8,771 35

$5,000 might be paid on account, pending further consideration of this bill.

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Certified to the amount of $8,771.35.—L. Coste.

Halifax, N.S., 21st January, 1895.

Department of Public Works of Canada, to John Snow & Son, Dr., Undertakers, Embalmers and Funeral Directors.

Undertaker and his assistants opening casket containing remains of late Sir John S. D. Thompson at the Provincial Building	10 00
Removing casket from Provincial Building to residence of John Pugh, Esq., and again returning it to Provincial Building, undertaker and his ten assistants, all night work	100 00
Removing casket from Provincial Building to St. Mary's Cathedral and placing it on catafalque, undertaker and ten assistants, all night work	40 00
Remodelling two wagons for conveying flowers and wreaths and draping same in black cloth, repainting one wagon for this occasion, at $62.50 each	80 00
State funeral car, complete, including silver tassels and silver bullion fringe, plumes and drapings came in velvet and black bengaline silk and festooning with flowers	1,500 00
Undertaker's assistants loading and arranging flowers on wagons before funeral at Provincial Building	10 00
Hire of 10 black horses for state funeral and attention devoted to managing them for funeral, at $12.75 each	50 00
10 black palls for horss made and trimmed with silk fringe and bound with braid, at $15 each	150 00
Painting Victor's wreath and monogram on horses' palls, 10 at $3	30 00
6 feather horse-plumes at $6.50 each	39 00
14 prs. knee-boots for undertakers at $3.50 each	49 00
14 black overcoats at $20 each	280 00
14 black silk hats at $4 each	56 00
15 collars and neckties at 50c. each	7 00
50 pair black kid gloves at $1.50 each	75 00
Distributed to clergy and undertakers, 50 hat crapes at $1.25 each	62 50
1 oak outside case for casket, sent to Holy Cross Cemetery	20 00
5 pine outside cases supplied to Holy Cross Cemetery for the remains of relatives of the late Sir John Thompson	20 00
Undertaker and assistants removing remains and placing same in the shells supplied at Holy Cross	25 00
28 white silk badges for marshals at $1.25	25 00
Hire of candelabras, 7 lights at Provincial Building and at John Pugh's residence	5 00
2 boxes wax candles	3 50
Erecting temporary building for constructing funeral car, men's time and material supplied	110 87
Men's time removing building and piling up lumber in yard	27 25
Carriage maker's time stripping and taking the trimmings off funeral car	25 00
Undertaker and his 14 assistants' time and services at state funeral, conducting same, devoting sole attention to the successful carrying out of everything in connection with state funeral of the late	

Sir John S. D. Thompson, all other business dispensed with for the occasion—

Chief undertaker, 1 day at $25	25 00
14 assistants at $10	140 00
	$2,961 62

Work performed certified to the amount of $2,961.62.

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, 19th January, 1895.

Department of Public Works, Ottawa, in account with W. F. Compton, Choir-master, St. Mary's Cathedral.

To managing and conducting musical services at requiem for the late Sir J. S.D. Thompson $50 00

(Signed) L. COSTE.

Halifax, N.S., 19th January, 1895.

Public Works Department, Ottawa, to Martin Young & Co., Dr.

Jan. 7—To draping, &c., Post Office and Custom-house :—

1,000 hours' labour at 25c	$ 250 00
50 hours' night work at 35c	17 50
95 lbs. manilla rope at 12c	11 40
78 lbs. twine at 30c	23 40
53 lbs. wire nails at 5c	2 65
Truckage	1 65
Superintending draping, &c	30 00
To plastering and touching up paint work, Legislative Chamber :—	
15 days' work at $3	45 00
Mortar, plaster, putty, paint, &c	10 00
1 pane glass 21 x 50 x 15½	1 25
6 do 21 x 25 x 16 at 40c	2 40
3 do 21 x 14 x 10 at 12c	0 36
5 lbs. putty at 5c	0 25
Glaziers, 1 day's work	3 00
Painting gates, &c., Holy Cross Cemetery :—	
25 lbs. paint at 15c	3 75
2 days' work at $3	6 00
	$408 21

Halifax, 15th January, 1895.

Department of Public Works, Ottawa, to Nova Scotia Furnishing Co. (Ltd.)

To draping and decorating State Chamber, draping interior and exterior of Provincial Buildings, making railings in halls and stairways ; draping ordnance wharves and gates, Government House and fence, monument and fence, St. Paul's churchyard, headquarters building and fence, St. Matthew's church, and erecting and draping arch in front of St. Mary's Cathedral, taking down and returning all materials to Works Department :—

15 packages of silver bronze at 50c	$ 7 00
4 quires silver paper at $1	4 00
5 bottles gold leaf substitute at 40c	2 00
25 sheets cardboard at 13c	3 25
16 dozen black silk cords and tassels at $2	32 00
40 yards silver bullion fringe at $1.20	48 00
12 black silk tassels at 60c	7 00
100 yards silver cloth at $1.85	185 00
6 pks. silver tacks at 20c	1 20
75 pks. upholsterer's tacks at 10c	7 50
3 pairs silver draping chains at 75c	1 50
4 chain hooks (silver) at 25c	1 00
Manilla ropes	1 95
2½ yards crape at $2.15	5 37
4 spools silk at 15c	0 60
315 ft. spruce boards for staging at 2c	6 30
365 ft. 3 x 4 scantling at 2½c	9 12
194 ft. 2-in. plank for staging at 2½c	4 85
642 ft. firring for framework at 8c	12 84
Truckage on lumber	2 75
5½ yds. silver bullion fringe at $1.20	6 60
10¼ do do $1.20	12 30
3¼ do do 90c	2 92
40 yds. lace at 50c	20 00
160 ft. copper wire	1 50
20 lbs. nails at 6c	1 20
8 silver window poles at 40c	3 20
8 sets silver pole trimmings at 85c	6 80
7 balls upholsterers' twine at 30c	2 10
50 blind slats	0 50
120 ft. 1-in. pole at 5c	6 00
Finisher's time, gilding posts, &c	3 50
75 iron brackets at 15c	11 25
2 gross screws at 45c	0 90
69½ lbs. 3-in. manilla rope at 15c	10 42
5½ lbs. small rope at 18c	0 99
Iron work fitting up canopy	3 00
1 paint brush	0 50
8 doz. screw hooks and eyes at 25c	2 00
12½ yds. silk cord at 75c	9 00
To dyeing 100 yds. cashmere purple	12 00
15 yds. purple ribbon at 25c	3 95
129 yds. yellow frillette at 15c	19 35
94½ yds. yellow silk at 40c	39 80
Paid to sexton St. Matthew's Church, cleaning church and tolling bell	10 00
2 prs. strap hinges	0 50
8 prs. hooks and eyes at 10c	0 80
2 gro. screws at 45c	0 90
2 corn whisks	0 50
Refreshments for men on night work	18 50
Mr. Lutler's time superintending draping of State Chamber, &c., 13 days and 98 hours, Sunday and night work included	250 00
80 lbs. wire nails at 9c	7 20
15 lbs. cut nails at 6c	0 90
Labour putting up and taking down draping on different buildings, 54 men, 964 hours at 25c	241 00
2 foremen, 65 hours at 50c	32 50
Twine, $3 ; locks, $1.50 ; rope, $2	6 50
Hire of ladders and truckage	15 00
Labour on State Chamber and interior of Province building, time of head draper, 11 days at $3.50	38 50
60 hours night work at 50c	30 00
Sunday, day and night	8 00
3 carpenters, 13 days at $2.50	32 50
50 hours night work at 40c	20 00
6 carpenters and jobbers 25 days, $2	50 00
63 hours night work at 30c	18 90
1 man, Sunday day and night	5 00
1 draper 11 days at $2.50	27 50
65 hours night work at 30c	19 50
Time of foreman of upholsterers, 9 days at $3.00	27 00
30 hours, night and day, at 50c	15 00
8 upholsterers draping, 47 days at $2.50	147 50
129 hours night work at 35c	45 15
6 upholsterers draping, 27 days at $2.50	67 50
39 hours night work at 30c	11 70
Time of seamstress with sewing-machine	9 00
Time of upholsterers taking down draperies in State Chamber and interior of building, foreman, 37 hours at 40c	14 80
15 men, 279 hours at 30c	83 90
85 yds. Napier matting at 67c	55 25
Covey, Connors & Co., account for the following work : making canopy	45 50
26 spear heads at 35c	9 10
20 newel posts at 50c	10 00
Platform under canopy	15 00
Arch opposite St. Mary's Cathedral	20 40
Catafalque	23 76

Dais for flowers	$	41 06
150 ft. railing at 3c		45 00
130 ft. thin stock for draping at 3c		3 90
150 ft strapping for St Matthew's Church at 3c		4 50
100 ft. do draping at 3c		3 00
300 ft. narrow pine for draping at 2c		6 00
180 ft. 3-in. pine at 3c		5 40
To cutting, fitting and erecting railings, jobbing, &c. :—		
10 men, average of 8 days each, 80 days at $2		160 00
3 men in attendance at building during Wednesday day and night and Thursday, 75 hours, at 25c		18 75
		2,199 73
1,048 yds. purple material at 60c.		628 80
4,146 yds. black material at 30c.		1,243 80
		$4,072 33

Funeral of the late Sir John Thompson.
18th February, 1895.

Dr. to E. A. Neal,
8 Carleton Street, Halifax.

To 15 days' services measuring materials, &c., in connection with accounts of the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson in February, at $1.50 ..... $22 50

(Sgd.) L. COSTE.

Funeral of the late Sir John Thompson.
20th February, 1895.

Dr. to E. P. Ryan,
17 Spring Garden Road, Halifax.

To services valuing dry goods from decorations at funeral of the late Sir John Thompson $10 00

(Sgd.) L. COSTE.

Funeral of the late Sir John Thompson.
20th February, 1895.

Dr. to John Overy,
15 Russell Street, Halifax.

To 9 days' services measuring materials, &c., in connection with accounts of the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson, at $1.50 .. $13 50

(Sgd.) L. COSTE.

From Major R. W. F. Monteith, A.S.C. Officer, acct. of transport, Halifax, N.S.

To Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Halifax, N.S., 14th February, 1895.

Sir,—Will you kindly cause the sum of $3.65 to be paid into my hands, being the contract rate for the service, as per attached requisition. which was performed in connection with arrangements for the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson.

I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) R. W. F. MONTEITH,
Major, acct. transport A.S.C.

(Sgd.) L. COSTE.

Royal Artillery.—Four Draught Horses.

Conveyance required to be at R.A. Park at 9 a.m. o'clock, the 26th day of December, 1894, for the purpose of fitting harness and preparing for funeral of the late Sir J. Thompson.

(Sgd.) A. W. ANSTRUTHER,
Licut.-Col. R.A., Condg. R.A., H.D.

Draught pairs, 2. Remarks, ½ day.

(Sgd.) R. W. F. MONTEITH, *Major.*

(Sgd.) L. COSTE.

Mr. Nolen,—These horses were detained three hours.

(Sgd.) A. W. ANSTRUTHER,
Licut.-Col. R.A., C.R.A., H.D.

Halifax, N.S., 5th January, 1895.

Mr. L. Coste to H. Hesslein & Son.

Jany. 5. To amount acct ..... $ 73 80

Paid. (Sgd.) JUBER.

Department of Public Works,
Funeral of the late Right Honourable Sir John Thompson,
Dr. to Louis Coste.

Dec.	14.	Cabs, Ottawa, $1.00; railway fare to Halifax, $20.50; Pullman and meals on board, $1.50	$ 23 00
	14.	Telegrams, $1.60; cab to hotel, 50c.; baggage, 25c.; cab in Montreal, $1.00	3 35
	15.	Cabs, Montreal, $2.50; lunch, $1.10; telegrams, $2.08	5 69
	16.	Telegrams, 90c.; telephone, $1.00; cabs, $2.00; tips, 50c.; hotel bill, $9.50	12 90
	16.	Cabs to station, 50c.; baggage, 25c.; Pullman car fare to Halifax, $4.00	4 75
	17.	Meals on board, $3.30; telegrams, $1.50; cab to hotel, 75c.	5 55
	18.	Cabs in Halifax, $5.00; telegrams, 30c.	5 30
	19.	Telegrams, 35c.; cabs, $2.00	2 35
	20.	Telegrams, 72c.; cabs, $3.50	4 22
	21.	Telegrams, 55c.; cabs, $3.00	3 54
	22.	Cabs, $3.00 (23); cabs, $3.00 (27); cabs, $4.25	10 25
	24.	Cabs, $3.75 (23); cabs, $3.25 (25); cabs, $2.50	9 50
	26.	$2.00 for cabs (29); cabs, $3.50, $5.25; lunch, $1.00	11 75
1895.			
Jan.	1.	Cabs, $3.50, (2) $5.00, (3) $16.50.	25 00
	4.	do $6.50; stamps, $1.25	7 75
	5.	Hotel expenses, $73.80, and extra meals, $4.20 ($78); cab to station, 50c.; tips, $2.50; baggage, $1.50	81 50
		Railway fare to Ottawa, $20.50; Pullman, $4.00; telegrams, 78c.	25 78
		Meals on board, $3.25; cabs in Montreal, $1.00; hotel in Montreal, $3.00	7 25
	6.	Pullman to Ottawa, 50c.; cab, Ottawa, $1.00	1 50
			$251 43

The whole of the above expenditure has been incurred in connection with the funeral of the late Sir John Thompson.

(Signed) LOUIS COSTE.

Department of Public Works, Canada,
Funeral of Sir John Thompson,
Dr. to Messrs. Davidson & Sons, Montreal.

Floral decorations in Council Chamber, Halifax	$1,925 00
Should be reduced to, say	900 00

About $900 would be a fair price.

(Signed) L. COSTE.

MONTREAL, 4th February, 1895.

Dominion Government, Ottawa,

Bought of W. B. Davidson & Sons.

2,000 roses at 30c. each	$600 00
4,000 carnations at 10c. each	400 00
3,000 ferns at 2½c. each	75 00
590 Lilly Hanissii at 37½c. each	177 50
3,000 Roman hyacinths at 5c. each	150 00
1,000 yds. smilax at 25c	250 00
125 paper white narcissus	11 50
Wire designs	50 00
Boxes for designs	25 00
Beams for carrying designs	36 00
Time and expense	100 00
Expressage	50 00
	1,925 00

Account not certified pending further evidence as to number of flowers and prices charged.

(Signed) L. COSTE.

MONTREAL, 12th February, 1895.

Dominionion Government, Ottawa,
To the Grand Trunk Railway, Dr.

Jany. 3. To special train Coteau Junction to Lévis and return in connection with Sir John Thompson's funeral. 422 miles at $1.50 ..... $633 00

Service performed.
Charge fair and just.

(Signed) D. POTTINGER,
(Signed) COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER.

This account has been paid by the Intercolonial Railway.

(Signed) D. POTTINGER.

Department Railways and Canals, Ottawa.
To the Canadian Pacific Railway, Dr.

For haulage of private cars "Gaspé," "Victoria," I.C.R. Car No. 34 for funeral of the late Sir John Thompson as under:—

Jan. 4 to 6. "Gaspé," St. John to Ottawa	608	miles
Jan. 4 to 6. "Victoria," St. John to Montreal	481	"
Jan. 4 to 10. I.C.R. No. 34, St. John to Ottawa and return	1,216	"
	2,305 at 10 cts.	
		$230 50

Service performed.
Charge fair and just.

(Sgd.) D. POTTINGER,
(Sgd.) COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER.

This account has been paid by the Intercolonial Railway.

(Sgd.) D. POTTINGER.

CANADA ATLANTIC RAILWAY CO.,
OTTAWA, 5th March, 1895.

Department Railways and Canals.
To the Canada Atlantic Railway, Dr.

Jany., 1895. For special train conveying members of Parliament to attend the funeral of Sir John Thompson at Halifax.

Ottawa to Coteau and return, 156½ miles at $1.50 per mile $234 75

Service performed.
Charges fair and just.

(Sgd.) D. POTTINGER,
(Sgd.) COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER.

This account was paid by the Intercolonial Railway.

(Sgd.) D. POTTINGER.

OTTAWA, 31st Dec., 1894.

Department Railways and Canals,
To the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, Dr.

Dec. 21, 22 for cleaning	18	hours at	12½	cts. Ottawa	
	11	"	15	"	$3 90
" 31 "	20	"	15	Gov. spec.	
	13	"	12½		4 63
					$8 53

Services performed.
Charges fair and just.

(Sgd.) D. POTTINGER.
(Sgd.) COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER.

This account was paid by the Intercolonial Railway.

(Sgd.) D. POTTINGER.

Dominion Government,
To Douglas Stewart, Dr.

To expenses as secretary to committee in charge of arrangements in connection with funeral of late Sir John Thompson.

December 26, 1894—	
Cab to station, Ottawa	$ 0 75
Railway fare, Ottawa to St. John	17 50
Pullman and porter, Ottawa to Halifax	5 50
Subsistence on train	4 25
Telegrams, on train	1 45
Telegrams, Halifax	3 75
Cabs, Halifax	5 25
Halifax Hotel, 8 days at $3.50	28 00
Pullman and porters, Halifax to Ottawa	5 50
Railway fare, Lévis to Ottawa	7 00
January 10, 1895—	
Subsistence on train, and hotel, Montreal	5 75
Cab, Ottawa	2 50
	$85 25

Correct.

(Signed) DOUGLAS STEWART.

Ottawa, January 31st, 1895.

Dominion of Canada, Ottawa,
To the Intercolonial Railway, Dr.

December 31, 1894—		
To amount advanced at Ottawa by Department of Railways and Canals to Mr. Douglas Stewart in connection with funeral of late Rt. Hon. Sir John Thompson	$ 100 00	
January 5, 1895—		
To charges in connection with state funeral train, Ottawa to Halifax and return—sleeping car berths Ottawa to Halifax and return, 61 berths at $4.50	274 50	
Sleeping car berths, Montreal and Quebec to Halifax and return—70 berths at $4.00	280 00	
		$ 554 50
Car Gaspé (6-section sleeper) for Lady Thompson and party, Ottawa to Halifax and return, 4 days at $22.50	90 00	
To car Kennebecasis (full sleeper) for Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell's party, Lévis to Halifax, tariff rate	85 00	
		175 00
To special train, Lévis to Halifax and return, 135 miles at $10.00		1,350 00

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

To meals:—		
131 on buffet car per menu card, average $1.45½	191 53	
91 meals at Lévis at 50c	45 50	
128 meals at Trois Pistoles at 50c	64 00	
		301 03
To sundries:—		
Cigars supplied	$ 17 30	
Appollinaris, ginger ales and soda supplied	20 00	
Printing menu cards	4 00	
Hire of extra dishes	1 25	
		43 44
		$2,523 97
Less refunded by Mr. Douglas Stewart, unexpended balance of advance of $100		14 80
		$2,509 17

Services performed.
Charges fair and just.
(Sgd.) D. POTTINGER.
(Sgd.) COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER.

Add: G. T. Ry. Co. acct	$ 633 09
C. P. Ry. Co.'s acct	230 50
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s acct	234 75
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s acct	8 53
	$3,615 95

Mr. OUIMET. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I have to say that the accounts in question have been examined, and in some cases have been reduced.

Mr. LAURIER. You do not mention the reduction?

Mr. OUIMET. That was not asked.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman was so anxious to get a display on the paper, that he forgot his question.

TOBIQUE VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Mulock) asked, 1. What is the total Dominion bonus voted, and what is the total Dominion bonus paid to the Tobique Valley Railway? 2. What have been the working expenses of the railway during the period in which the company earned the sum of $2,200, mentioned by the Minister of Railways in the House on Monday last? 3. What is the reason for the line not being officially opened for traffic? 4. What progress has been made in the work of construction of the railway? 5. What is the total bonded debt of the company? 6. What is the total floating debt of the company?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. Total Dominion bonds voted up to 30th June, 1894, $182,400; total Dominion bonds paid, $134,016. 2. The few trains which have been run on this railway have been run by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and consequently no returns have been made to the department. 3. Because certain conditions required of the Tobique Valley Railway by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not been fulfilled. 4. Twenty-eight miles have been constructed. 5. According to the return made by the Tobique Valley Railway Company, the following is the bonded debt:—First preference, 5 per cent. $140,000 authorized, $70,000 issued, $42,000 realized. Second preference, 5 per cent. $140,000 authorized, $70,000 issued, $21,000 realized. Making a total of $280,000 authorized, $140,000 issued, $63,000 realized. 6. According to the returns made by the Tobique Valley Railway Company, the floating debt is nil. It has not been worked at all, and no return has been made.

GARDNER'S CREEK BREAKWATER, N.B.

Mr. HAZEN asked, From whom were tenders received for the construction of the Gardner's Creek breakwater, St. John County, N.B., and what were the amounts of such tenders? Has any contract been entered into for the construction of the breakwater, and if so, with whom, and when will the work be proceeded with?

Mr. OUIMET. Tenders for the construction of a breakwater at Gardner's Creek, St. John County, N.B., were received from the following parties and were for the amounts set opposite their names:—

Thos. B. Carson, St. Martins, N.B.	$ 7,400
John Burns, Ottawa	8,487
John Heney and Henry Smith, Ottawa	8,900
James E. Simmons, Fredericton, N.B., and David C. Burpee, Gibson	8,950
George F. Wilson, 51 Victoria St., Ottawa	10,764

The lowest tenderer has been communicated with (on the 14th instant) with a view of ascertaining whether he was willing to enter into contract for the above mentioned work in accordance with his tender. No answer has as yet been received.

CONTRACTS FOR NEW DREDGE.

Mr. HAZEN asked, By whom were the plans and specifications for the new dredge, now being constructed under contract with the Government by Carrier, Lainé & Co., prepared? From whom were tenders for the construction of the said dredge received, and what were the amounts of such tenders, respectively?

Mr. OUIMET. The plans and specifications for the new dredge now being constructed under contract with the Government by Carrier, Lainé & Co., were prepared by the chief engineer of the Department of Public Works, assisted by the superintendent of dredging and by Mr. Larochelle, mechanical engineer. Two tenders were received for the construction of the said dredge, one from Messrs. Carrier, Lainé & Co., of Lévis, P.Q., for $40,000, and the other from Messrs. M. Beatty & Son, of Welland, Ont., for $52,764.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF MADOC AND MARMORA.

Mr. McMULLEN asked. Whether a geological survey was made, on or about the years 1885-86, by the Dominion Government of the townships of Madoc and Marmora, or either of them? Who made the survey? What did it cost? Has a report thereof been published? If not, why not? If published, where can it be found?

Mr. DALY. During portions of the years 1884, 1885, and 1886, a geological survey was made in the townships of Madoc and Marmora by Mr. Eugene Coste. The total expense of surveys in the Madoc and Marmora vicinity was $5,757.81. A geological map of the principal mining area of Madoc and Marmora, based upon the surveys, was printed in 1889, but no report has been published. No report has been received from Mr. Coste.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PRIOR. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance whether the return, asked for by me on 26th April is ready, or nearly ready; if so, how long will elapse before it is brought down?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the exact time, but I will make inquiry and let him know to-morrow.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the leader of the House intend to produce the papers ordered on the motion respecting Loiselle? Those papers were ordered last year, and the hon. gentleman last week said he intended to bring them down, but he has not yet laid them on the Table of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I added a codicil, "or later." I shall have to ask to be allowed to avail myself of that. I will bring down the papers.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the papers be brought down or not?

Mr. FOSTER. They will be brought down.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. LISTER. I desire to draw the attention of the House to the fact that it is impossible to make any progress in the Public Accounts Committee owing to the action of the Government and its supporters on that committee. This House has been in session for more than two months——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LISTER. What is the point of order? If it is necessary to move the adjournment of the House, I will do so.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House. If the hon. gentleman desires to ask a question, he may, perhaps, be allowed to do so.

Mr. LISTER. I wish to state the facts.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not introduce controversial matter.

Mr. CASEY. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I second the motion.

Mr. LISTER. I desire to call the attention of the Government and the House to the fact that Parliament has been in session more than two months, and the Public Accounts Committee, up to last week, was called together only once a week, and, of course, hon. gentlemen will know that the daily sitting of that committee is only two hours. The result is that it is almost impossible to make any progress. As a matter of fact, the business before the committee is of a most important character, and the conduct of the Government, or the friends of the Government in that committee, and the member of the Government who presides at that committee, and controls its proceedings, is simply scandalous.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman is guilty of two breaches of parliamentary rules. In the first place, he is out of order in referring to something that has taken place before a committee, the proceedings of which have not yet been reported; and, in the second place, by describing the conduct of a member of the House as scandalous. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that term.

Mr. LISTER. I withdraw the word "scandalous," and substitute the word "improper," if that will suit the members of the House. At all events, my object is to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the committee is not able to get along with its business, that it has met only once a week till last week. Last week it held two meetings, and this week it has held one meeting, and no meeting is to take place until next week. The House will, no doubt, prorogue in two or three weeks, and so it will be impossible to have more than three or four more meetings. In that case, no satisfactory progress can be made by the committee with the important investigations with which it is charged, and it will not be able to bring them to a close. It will be impossible to make any report, or to make any statement as to the results of the labours of that committee. I feel that this committee is entitled to hold more sittings, because it can sit without interfering with the business of the House, and, in the public interest, and in every interest every effort should be made that the work of the committee should not be interfered with or delayed, but that its work should be helped along and brought properly to a close before the House prorogues.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the question brought up by the hon. member to the attention of the House is one which deserves some attention at the hands of the Government. The hon. gentleman makes a complaint which is in the nature of a public complaint. He has stated that the Public Accounts Committee meets only once a week. The leader of the House must admit that for such a committee to meet once a week it is impossible to have the work which belongs to it properly done. The hon. gentleman should say what reason there is why the Government should not favour such a motion.

Mr. FOSTER. Such a motion as what?

Mr. LAURIER. Such a motion as made by my hon. friend now, that the committee should meet more than once a week.

Mr. FOSTER. It does meet more than once a week.

Mr. LAURIER. It does not.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend does not attend that meeting, and he is speaking simply by hearsay, and as usual is badly informed. Since the committee was first called together, it has met almost twice a week.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. If it did not meet there was some reason which presented itself to the committee, and I have never heard any strong objection taken in the committee to the meeting time being fixed as it was fixed by the committee. The hon. gentleman refers to some person who as a Minister presides over the committee. No Minister presides over it or presides at it. When there is an attack made on a department, the Minister of that department is there and is alert to see that justice is done; but it is a wrong impression to give to the House or to the country that some member of the Ministry presides at that committee and acts improperly. There is no improper action. The committee guides its own action, and arranges for its own meeting time, and the subjects it will take up. Although I am not going to say as to what takes place in committee, I do make the assertion that there is no trouble at all in arranging this matter in the committee itself.

Mr. LISTER. You were not there this morning?

Mr. FOSTER. I was.

Mr. LISTER. You were only there part of the time.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite so. I have a right to be in and out as I may please and not simply as the hon. gentleman thinks I ought to be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister is misinformed. It was proposed we should meet twice a week, and the Finance Minister, on behalf of the Government, assented to it; but from various causes the agreement has not been carried out. This week we only meet once, as on several other occasions, and after a division to-day we adjourned until next Tuesday. It is utterly impossible, Sir, to carry on investigations to any purpose if we are going to interpose a week between each meeting of the committee. It would be better to have no Public Accounts Committee, and let the country know that there is no intention of carrying on investigations, than to meet at intervals of a week apart. I can conceive no sufficient reason why the Committee on Banking and Commerce and the Committee on Public Accounts should not meet at the same time. It does appear to me to be trifling with the House that the committee should meet only once a week, particularly at this period of the session, and while important investigations are going on. No human being can hope to get through any investigation at the rate of two hours per week. In 1891, the committee met week after week, three or four times in succession, and when there is anything of importance going on, exertion ought to be made by the Government to see that this committee, which is supposed to investigate important public questions, should meet at least two or three times a week, particularly at the latter part of the session.

Mr. HAGGART. The committee does not meet twice this week because there is a meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee to-morrow (Thursday), and many members belong to both committees. Besides, the Banking and Commerce Committee occupy the same room as the Public Accounts Committee. Now, on Friday there is a meeting of the Railway Committee. The principal charges to be investigated before the Public Accounts Committee are charges against my department, and I should be present, but it is absolutely necessary that I should also be present at the Railway Committee on Friday, and assurance has been given by the Government that the committee will meet regularly twice a week until the end of the session. The hon. gentleman knows that that is as much time as the Minister at the head of a department such as mine can spare.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What the hon. gentleman says may be partially true, but we have got to look at the result which is surely to follow the adoption of the course which the Government have taken in this matter. A very important matter is being investigated before the Public Accounts Committee, and that investigation has dragged out over four meetings. The committee only sits for two hours. It is now apparent to every member that unless we meet oftener and sit longer, that investigation cannot be concluded, and when my hon. friend seeks to have more frequent meetings for the purpose of concluding this investigation and reporting

to the House, we are told that the committee is not to meet until next Tuesday. I think we have a right to bring the question before the House, or otherwise the action of the Government will have the result of frustrating inquiry. I remember very well that some years ago the Public Accounts Committee met every day to conduct an important investigation, and when it was found necessary, the committee sat concurrently with the House. We have Mr. Thompson, an engineer, before us, and his examination is not concluded, and other important witnesses are waiting from week to week. It is perfectly plain that by sitting for only two hours each week we cannot conclude the inquiry if what we all hope is realized, that the House will prorogue at a reasonably early day.

Mr. FOSTER. I know it was stated across the floor in the early part of the session that the committee would meet twice a week. That has been the endeavour, and in the main it has been done. Very good reason is given why the committee only meet once this week. I would suggest that as the committee is to meet twice per week afterwards, and hon. gentlemen opposite are anxious to get through their investigation, they might come at 10 o'clock in the morning and have two meetings of three hours each per week.

Mr. LAURIER. All right.

Motion to adjourn the House negatived.

SUPPLY—LACHINE CANAL BRIDGE CONTRACT.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply; and the motion of Mr. Davies in amendment thereto.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the greater portion of the remarks of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson), in connection with this motion were directed to the cost of the work. Excuses were put forward by them why this work should have cost more than the estimates provided for. I may say at once that so far as any arguments as these are concerned, they may be eliminated entirely from this debate, because the figures given by the commission appointed by the Government, as to what the cost ought to have been, taking into consideration all these various circumstances referred to by hon. members, are the figures which are accepted by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and are the figures which I shall accept. No question arises in this debate as to whether the sum of $200,000 which these gentlemen estimate as being the proper amount for the work, and as the amount the bridges should have cost. Making all these allowances, as to the ice, as to the limited time, as to the contract for labour, the commission estimated that the work should have cost $200,000. It might have been urged on this side of the House that a fairer estimate was that of the engineers Casgrain and Roy, who were appointed to look into the matter carefully, and who came to the conclusion that the work should have been done for $141,000. But that ground is not taken, and therefore the greater portion of the remarks of those two hon. gentlemen, as well as a large portion of the remarks of the hon. Minister himself, had no reference whatever to the charge made in the resolution before the House; because that charge is not that the work cost more than it was estimated to cost, but the charge is that gross frauds were committed on the Government in connection with that work, and that the hon. Minister of Railways is to blame for those frauds. The first matter at the opening of this work in which the Government went wrong was in a gross violation of the statute law of this Dominion as to the letting of the contract. It is provided in section 13 of the Public Works Act:

The Minister shall invite tenders, by public advertisement, for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency, in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly plain that this was not a work of pressing emergency, because the money for it was voted fully a year before the work was commenced. The time chosen for the work was that which seemed to the department most suitable, and there was every opportunity for preparation; therefore that exception is eliminated. The other exception is "from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department." Now, no pretense is made that that could be done, and that course was not adopted; the work was not executed by the officers and servants of the department. In direct violation of this section, no tenders were invited by public advertisement. The hon. Minister attempts to answer this charge by saying that Mr. Mackenzie in his day frequently violated this statute by letting contracts without tender. I defy the hon. Minister or any of his supporters to produce a single instance, in which Mr. Mackenzie, while at the head of the Public Works Department, violated this section—a single instance in which he let a contract without inviting tenders by public advertisement, unless the contract came clearly within the two exceptions provided for by the section. But that statement, even if it were true, would be no answer, as the hon. Minister himself admitted, in this case. He endeavoured to say, however, that he had observed the section—that he had invited tenders, and

that the work was done only after an Order in Council had been passed. Now, there seems to be an idea on the part of this Government that almost anything can be done by an Order in Council—that no matter how much any particular action of the Government is in violation of the statute law of Canada, an Order in Council will cover it up. Of course, an argument of that kind needs no answer. An Order in Council is absolutely worthless unless that Order in Council has authority in the law, and an Order in Council permitting the Minister to do this work by inviting tenders, not by public advertisement, but by private notice, is an Order in Council which is perfectly worthless, and which affords no defence whatever for the hon. Minister for this preliminary violation of the law in connection with this disgraceful affair. But even after this Order in Council had been passed, what was the course of the Government? In the commissioners' report, at page 6, an account is given of the manner in which the tenders for labour were obtained. Hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) attempted to maintain that tenders had really been invited for labour, and also for material. As to that the commissioners report:

> On the 15th December, 1892, Mr. Kennedy invited tenders privately for the supply of skilled labour. Two tenders were received, addressed to Mr. Kennedy, one from Turner & Co., and the other from E. St. Louis, both dated the 20th December. From the evidence it appears that these tenders were sent to Mr. Parent, the superintending engineer on the 20th December, 1892, who, considering there was not sufficient competition, asked for other tenders, also privately. Two new tenders, addressed to Mr. Parent, and dated December 20th, being of the same date as those addressed to Mr. Kennedy, were received, one from John R. Rose, and the other from J. E. Trottier, a former clerk of Mr. St. Louis.

The commissioners say as to these tenders:

> There is considerable doubt whether these tenders were bona fide; the competition may not have been genuine, and in reality there may have been only one tender.

Now, Sir, the hon. Minister goes on further and makes an appeal to the labour sentiment in justification of this contract. He says: "It is true, I did allow a contract to be awarded to Mr. St. Louis for the supply of labour without any form of tender; and further, without any attempt to investigate the matter, I allowed Mr. St. Louis' contract to be applied to the Grand Trunk bridge, it being only for the Wellington bridge in the first instance." A question arose. Mr. St. Louis claimed $1.87½ a day for all kinds of labour which he furnished, and the Minister eventually settled with him for $1.50 a day; and the hon. gentleman makes an appeal to the labouring people, saying: "I did think then, and I still think, that $1.50 a day is not an unreasonable amount to pay to those men many of whom had to work up to their waists in water." Is that the fact? Did the hon. gentleman ever agree that $1.50 a day should be paid to the labourers employed on this work? Did he ever take any action by which the labourers on this work should get $1.50 a day? Was the question whether a man working up to his waist in water was to be fairly paid ever considered by the hon. gentleman? No, because the $1.50 was not to go to the labourers; it was to go to Mr. St. Louis. It has been shown, as a matter of fact, that these poor labourers who worked up to their waists in water in this nasty work, actually received from Mr. St. Louis $1.10, $1.15 and $1.25 per day, while St. Louis received $1.50. Even on the settlement that was finally made with St. Louis, he claimed that he was entitled to $1.87½ for all these labourers. A settlement was finally made on the basis of $1.50 for ordinary labour; but in the final payments, the only kind of ordinary labourers who were paid for at this rate were those that actually used a pick and shovel. No matter how ordinary the labour was, no matter if the man was carrying lumber, or doing any other kind of ordinary labour, Mr. St. Louis received $1.87½ for each one of these men unless the man actually used a pick and shovel. So we find that, at the very outset, the Minister of Railways, knowingly and intentionally violated the law of the Dominion. We find that at the very outset he allowed this contract to be made which was of such great advantage to Mr. St. Louis; and I desire to point out that in the criticisms we make of the amounts which had been stolen from the Government, we allow as profit, legitimate under the circumstances, the whole amount of St. Louis' contract at $1.87½ for each man, and at $1.50 for each pick and shovel man. All the steals that we criticise were over and above that. All these amounts which the commission find the Government have been defrauded of, are over and above that—all these amounts for men that never worked, for time that was never put in, and which were simply straight frauds upon the Government. Now, the hon. Minister said that he had never conducted a public work, except this, in which the estimates had been exceeded. That statement was met by one on this side just the opposite, namely, that no public works on which the hon. gentleman or his department had been engaged for years had been constructed for anything like the estimate. I do not intend to go into that matter at length, but desire to point out that in this very matter we are discussing, the original estimate, as shown by the report of the commissioners at page 4, was $122,000, and the actual cost, according to the bills rendered, $430,225. This is for the substructure. The Government actually paid for this work, which they estimated would cost $122,000, $334,000. There are just one or two matters, which perhaps have not very much to do with

the question, but which I may refer to briefly as the hon. Minister brought them in. The hon. gentleman referred to the charge made against him in connection with section B contracts, and he threw out a very bold challenge to gentlemen on this side —offering to have a very full investigation if any hon. member here was bold enough to make an explicit charge against him. With regard to that, let me call attention to the records. In 1891, the hon. member for West Lambton stood up in his place and made the following charge, which it appears to me, if I understand the English language, is as explicit and clear as it is possible for a charge to be made :

That Jas. Frederick Lister, Esq., the member representing the electoral district of West Lambton in this House, having declared from his seat in the House, that he is credibly informed, and that he believes that he is able to establish by satisfactory evidence :—

That in the year 1879, Messrs. Alexander Shields, John James Macdonald, Alexander Macdonell, James Isbester and Peter McLaren entered into contract with the Government of Canada for the construction of a portion of the C.P.R. between Port Arthur and Rat Portage, known as section B.

The said contract and the work in connection therewith were completed by the said contractors, to whom they were a source of great profit.

During the whole period covered by the said contract, the Hon. John G. Haggart, now Postmaster General, and a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada, was a member of the House of Commons for the South Riding of Lanark, and is still such member.

That the said Hon. John G. Haggart became and was beneficially interested in the profits of said contract which accrued to the share thereof standing in the name of the said Peter McLaren, and has received large sums out of the said profits, and has otherwise derived direct and substantial pecuniary benefits therefrom.

That charge was not investigated, and for what reason ? On the plea that too long a time had elapsed to justify its examination. But the hon. gentleman to-day, four years afterwards, comes forward and boldly offers to have an investigation if the charge is renewed. The hon. gentleman is very bold. Possibly he knows that now evidence which could have been had at that time could not be obtained. What other possible conclusion must we come to ? If it is proper to-day, on a charge being made, to have it investigated ; if the hon. gentleman is prepared to have his connection with the section B contract investigated to-day, why was he not prepared four years ago ? With regard to the question under discussion, I intend as briefly as possible to draw the attention of the House to those evidences of frauds which appear all through the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee and set forth in the report of the royal commission. I shall draw attention to those evidences of fraud, with the avowed object of inducing the House to believe that the fraud was intentional from the beginning, that the Department of Railways designedly allowed such circumstances to exist as to enable those persons who were in a position to profit from those frauds to commit them and obtain the profits. I shall endeavour to show that all along, from the commencement of the work, the Minister of Railways had information at his command which would have enabled him to learn perhaps not the exact frauds, not the exact persons who were committing them, but beyond the possibility of doubt that these frauds were going on and that the Government was being robbed day by day. I propose to show that apparently the hon. Minister refused and neglected to avail himself of those opportunities of investigation at his command, and allowed the whole of the work to be completed under circumstances which he knew at the time were such as to give every opportunity for fraud. I propose to show that he knew, at the time that these circumstances were being availed of for the purpose of largely enhancing the cost to the Government, and that after the work was completed or nearly so, the hon. Minister knowingly allowed that work to be paid for. I propose to show that he knew that those frauds were being committed, and that the work had cost through them this large amount in excess of what it should have cost. The motion of the hon. member for Queen's is a fair one, under the circumstances, and one which should be adopted by this House. In the very first instance, we find this work placed in the hands of Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy was an officer of the department. The hon. Minister and his deputy knew, or should have known, the character of Mr. Kennedy. They knew, or should have known, the record that Kennedy had made in the department, and whether he was or was not a man fit to take charge of the work when the work was to be done by day labour. Let us see, then, what Mr. Kennedy's record was. The commissioners at page 19, referred to the fact that after Mr. Kennedy became superintendent of the canal the amount spent for repairs had enormously increased. The following are the figures :—

From 1879 to 1881,	cost of repairs	.....	$42,000
do 1882 to 1884	do	.....	54,000
do 1885 to 1887	do	.....	61,000
do 1888 to 1890	do	.....	65,000

Then we come to Mr. Kennedy's time :

1891 to 1893, cost of repairs $155,000

—or more than double as much for any similar period. Then the commissioners show us, at page 22, that the record of Mr. Kennedy in relation to the purchase of supplies and material was a record of extravagance. This refers to the time prior to the construction of the bridge, when Mr. Kennedy was in charge of the canal :

The purchase of supplies and materials was extravagant, especially timber and lumber, which

covered the banks. During 1892 and part of 1893 the timber and lumber supplied to the canal amounted to $417,116; of this amount, Henderson Bros. supplied $83,163. During the same period the timber and lumber charged to repairs amount to $42,098, the balance was charged to special appropriations of income and capital. There seems to have been a mania on the part of the management for purchasing timber and lumber.

This is the man whom the department deliberately put in charge of this work under the circumstances I have named. The next point we have, to which I have alluded was that the construction of the work was undertaken, in violation of the law, without tender. And it having been determined to construct a bridge by days' labour, the labour was contracted for. The reason given for this was that there was fear of a strike. I shall not delay the House to go over the ground with regard to this matter covered by other speakers, but I will say that a more absurd excuse, a more ridiculous excuse, could not have been given. As the commissioners point out, this suggestion is not borne out by the evidence. The fact is that no facts were given to show that there was danger of a strike; and, so far as I can see, there appears to be no more reason to think that a strike would occur when the work was in the hands of the Government than when it was in the hands of a contractor for labour. It is a very strange and a very suspicious circumstance, when we look at the result, and it bears very strongly upon the charge made that that contract should not have been entered into. Because it can be fairly said, Mr. Speaker, that if that contract with Mr. St. Louis for labour had not been entered into, the chief portion of the huge fraud committed in connection with the construction of this bridge never could have occurred; because it was in stuffing the pay-list, it was in getting from the Government a large amount more than he paid, that Mr. St. Louis was able to defraud the Government out of $170,000, according to their charge against him. The next matter that I draw the attention of the House to in support of the resolution is that Mr. Desbarats was dismissed. Now, Mr. Desbarats was an engineer, in the employ of the department here, who was sent down to Montreal to look over the work and prepare plans for it. He was sent there while, as the department knew, Mr. Parent, the superintending engineer of the canal, and Mr. Papineau his assistant were there. The very circumstances which in the end were put forward as a reason for the dismissal or withdrawal of Mr. Desbarats from the work existed at the time he went to the work. But, in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Desbarats had proved himself a man different entirely from Mr. Kennedy, a man who proposed to do his duty. And, as it was intended that fraud should be committed upon the Government in connection with this work, and as this was a man who stood in the way of the commission of those frauds, he was the man who must be removed—and, accordingly, Mr. Speaker, he was removed. Up to the time he left, at the end of February, only a small portion of the work had been done; but already we see from the evidence the work of fraud had commenced. In Mr. Desbarats' evidence, page 65, he states that Mr. Kennedy was bringing upon the ground a great deal more lumber than was required under his specifications. Now, it will be remembered that in the end the commissioners report that over one million feet of lumber was paid for by the Government more than went into the work; and already Mr. Desbarats had found that out, had objected to it and had sought to check it. Again, he says, Mr. Kennedy refused to furnish him the time-lists. This was on the 18th February. It was part of his duties, as he understood them, to check the workmen upon the work in order to see that the Government were not paying for more labour than was actually done. While it might not have been strictly his duty to keep the time, he considered that as engineer—and I think that the House will believe that he was right—it was part of his general work of superintendence to see the time as furnished to the Government was correct. Mr. Kennedy deliberately refused to furnish him with these time-lists. Again, at page 73, he states that large quantities of lumber billed as furnished never was delivered upon the works. The bill was put in presumably, but the lumber was never furnished. As I have stated, Mr. Desbarats prepared the plans. He referred to a very significant fact when he said that the number of men breaking stone for 50 yards of concrete was most extraordinary. He observed this and drew Mr. Kennedy's attention to it. Again, we find that both Mr. St. Louis and Mr. Parent told Mr. Desbarats that he was being removed through the influence of Mr. Kennedy. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways says, with regard to Mr. Desbarats' removal, that he was never dismissed, that he was changed from this work and sent to British Columbia. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is in direct contradiction to the evidence, the evidence of Mr. Desbarats himself. At page 77 of the evidence, Mr. Desbarats says:

Q. You told Mr. Schreiber nothing about it?—A. No. I did not see Mr. Schreiber till after I was dismissed.

Then, at page 75, we have from Mr. Desbarats a circumstantial account of how he was dismissed and what was said to him and done to him by Mr. Schreiber:

Q. And was the letter you received from Mr. Schreiber the first information or intimation that you were no longer required on that work?—A. There was a letter from Mr. Parent inclosing a letter from Mr. Schreiber to him.

Q. Stating that you were dismissed or relieved, which?—A. Stating that I would not

be required on the work after the end of the month.

Q. Your instructions when you went to Montreal, were to go back to the office ?—A. To go back to the office when I was through with the work on the Wellington bridge.

Q. The intention was at the time you were appointed that you should continue in Montreal until the completion of the work ?—A. Yes.

Q. When you received that intimation you went back to the office ?—A. Yes.

Q. You saw Mr. Schreiber in his office ?—A. Yes.

Q. And asked for an explanation ?—A. Yes.

Q. What did he say ?—A. I think I just stated that. Do you wish me to repeat it ?

Q. That you were no longer required at the works, that they could get along without you ?—A. He said he thought the staff in Montreal could do the work.

Q. Yes ; now, Mr. Papineau wasn't on the staff ?—A. Oh, yes, he was on the canal staff.

Q. He was on the canal staff ?—A. Yes.

Q. Was he removed from that and put into your place ?—A. No, I think he continued on the canal staff, but was appointed to do my work, the work I had been doing.

Q. Did you ask Mr. Schreiber for further work ?—A. I did.

Q. What did he say ?—A. He said he did not see that there was anything just then.

Q. Is that all he said ?—A. Well, I don't remember. He may have said something else, but that is what remained in my mind.

Q. After your interview ?—A. Yes.

Q. That was all ?—A. That was the substance of it.

Q. Did you ask him whether you would get further work or not ?—A. I told him I wished for work. I asked him if anything turned up, if there was anything coming, if there would be a chance of my getting work, and he said there might be. He said there were several works going on, and there might be work for me later on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that effectually disposes of the statement made by the Minister of Railways that Mr. Desbarats was not dismissed from this work, but that he was removed to other work in British Columbia where he was required. He was dismissed from the work. He came up to Ottawa and was told that there was no further work for him to do, that there were some other works going on, and that if anything turned up, he would be taken on again. Then the next matter to which I will refer is the fact that there was no check whatever kept upon the time of these men for which the Government was paying $1.87½ a day to Mr. St. Louis. At page eight of the commissioners' report, we are told by this commission, appointed by the Government, that Mr. St. Louis furnished time-keepers for the Government ; that Mr. St. Louis, who had a contract at so much a day for furnishing men for this work, furnished the time-keepers also. Why, Sir, could you imagine a looser contract than that ? Could you imagine a wider door thrown open to fraud ? Why, a man would be less than human, it would be a temptation that scarcely any man could resist, to take advantage of the circumstances when he was told : Here is a Government with plenty of money. You are getting $1.87½ per day for every man that is employed on this work, and you may keep the time as well. Send as many men as you like, put into the account what time you like, and you will be paid $1.87½ per day. Is that an evidence of careful supervision ? Is that an evidence that the Government were determined this work should be carried on in a business-like way ? Is it not a corroboration of the charge made in the resolution of the hon. gentleman ? Mr. St. Louis' time-keeper, Mr. Villeneuve, was also an official of the Government, and he was also receiving his pay month by month from the Government. And while it would appear to Mr. Schreiber, or to any other person going upon the works and finding Mr. Villeneuve as a regular employee of the canal staff, attending to the time, that he was doing so in the interest of the Government, we find he was not working for the Government at all, it was no part of his duty as a Government official to keep that time, but he was entirely employed and paid by Mr. St. Louis, although at the same time receiving his monthly salary from the Government as well. We find that the officers who were supposed to keep time for the Government, Mr. Doheny and Mr. Coughlin, did not keep time, but that they signed the time-lists as a mere matter of form. We find upon the pay-rolls that were produced before the commission, the name of Doheny as stone measurer, and one looking at the pay-roll would naturally conclude that this was an official of the Government who was certifying the pay-rolls. But Mr. Doheny tells us that he never intended to certify the pay-rolls, that he knew nothing about it, and that he put his name there as a matter of form ; and he thinks there were some other accounts attached to that pay-roll for which he was certifying. We find by Mr. Coughlin's evidence, on page 421, that he never had anything to do with the Grand Trunk bridge, that he never took any part in it, but that the time-rolls were brought to him and he was requested to put his name down there as certifying they were correct, and he did so. On page 353 of the evidence, we are told, also, by Coughlin that the other time-keepers all knew, as this work was going on, that the time that was going into the Government and that was being certified to by the department at Ottawa, was not at all the correct time, but that the pay-rolls were fraudulent and stuffed. Now, in reading over the report of the commissioners, it is evident that they were impressed with the magnitude of the fraud that had been committed in connection with this work. It is rather strange, also, that the Government should have selected as one of the commissioners, Mr. Douglas, who was sent round there several times during the progress of the work to

learn whether matters were going on satisfactorily, but he was never able to find out anything until the work was almost complete. Keeping that in view, this particular fact deserves comment, that Mr. Doheny, the time-keeper who appeared before the Public Accounts Committee, and gave them the data showing how Mr. St. Louis' time-lists were fraudulent, although he was before the commission at Montreal, and while he had all this information on his hands ready to give the commission, he was never asked the question. One would think that a commission, appointed to investigate this matter, would very soon have come to the conclusion, as this commission say they did, that these time-lists were probably fraudulent. Now, if this commission, thinking that the time-lists were probably fraudulent, had the time-keepers before them, one would expect that the very first question they would ask these time-keepers would be: Were the lists sent into the Government the same as the lists you kept? But when Doheny was before the commission he was never asked that question. Mr. Frigon, who appeared before the Public Accounts Committee, and who gave detailed evidence as to the fraud in connection with these lists, was in Montreal, but he was never called before the commission at all. Then the sixth point to which I wish to allude is that the officer who was chiefly responsible to the Government, Mr. Parent, is shown by the evidence to have been, during the progress of the work, all the time intoxicated. At page 322, Mr. Kennedy said:

Q. You told us the other day that Mr. Parent was in a semi-state of drunkenness while the work was going on? Is that so?—A. Yes, sir. I have asked Mr. Parent as early as ten o'clock in the morning about information on the work to know how I would do certain things, and he said he had taken too many drinks that morning. He could not talk business, he was too drunk.

Again, at page 315 it is stated that Mr. Parent was drunk all the time, and that he was nearly the whole of the time in the company of Mr. St. Louis. Mr. St. Louis' business, instead of working up to his waist in the water, as it has been suggested that he was doing, for $1.50 per day, appears to have been to keep Mr. Parent in that state of drunkenness which rendered him unfit to overlook this work. We find from the evidence that Mr. Douglas, the departmental official who was sent down there from time to time to check these men, was also drunk. At page 323 we have Mr. Kennedy's evidence as to Mr. Douglas:

Q. Then, I understand from the evidence that Mr. Douglas, the engineer, was in the habit of going down to inspect the work once or twice a week?—A. Well, he made a visit from Ottawa to Montreal about the beginning of March, and he came down there about the middle of April and remained there until after my suspension.

Q. How long would that be?—A. About five or six weeks in my time.

Q. Did he see what was going on?—A. He did, and he added very much to the iniquity and debauchery himself.

So I find, Mr. Speaker, all these circumstances to which I have alluded. But I desire to direct attention of the House for a few moments to the knowledge which, according to the evidence, the Minister of Railways possessed, of these frauds from time to time. In the first place, I have alluded to the facts that the Minister authorized this labour contract, without which the principal part of these frauds could not have been committed. There were two classes of fraud. First, in connection with the pay-list, by which the Government were called on to pay men large amounts over and above the sums to which Mr. St. Louis was legitimately entitled under his contract. There was another class of fraud, that which arose from lumber and material being charged to the Government although it was never furnished for the works. It appears from the evidence that the Minister of Railways also assented to the manner in which the lumber contract was let. It is there shown that Mr. Schreiber laid the proposition for lumber contracts, simply asking for private tenders, before the Minister, and the Minister agreed to it. Then we have the fact that no sooner had the work commenced, on 8th March, than the Minister had his attention called to the article in the "Star." That article stated that 1,200 men were employed on the work, that the work had to go on day and night until 1st May. The Minister admits, and it is scarcely necessary to take up time to argue it, that it was plain information to him that matters were not right. He could see at once that 1,200 men could not possibly be employed on such a work with any regard for economy. It might be looked at in this way: The wages of 1,200 men at $1.65 per day, which was less than the average price paid, would amount to $1,980. The same amount for work at night would bring up the expenditure to $3,960, and $1,040 was less than the teams cost that were employed, and these items bring up a total daily expenditure of $5,000. The work commenced on 8th March, on 9th March the "Star" article appeared stating that 1,200 men were employed, and on 10th March this article was brought to the attention of the Minister. The employment of 1,200 would mean the consumption of $5,000 per day of public money on that work for labour alone. The original estimate for labour was $30,000. If a fair amount is added for increased depth of navigation, the total amount of labour for the work, according to the engineer's estimate, should have cost not more than $40,000. Not more than eight days would be occupied at this rate, of which the hon. Minister was informed, in consuming this amount of $40,000 for labour. The "Star" article was brought to his notice, the Minister immedi-

ately took action, and a letter was written to Mr. Parent by Mr. Schreiber. Mr. Parent was told to come to Ottawa and bring the pay-list with him. Mr. Parent came to Ottawa; he did not bring the pay-list. According to his evidence, he told Mr. Schreiber that the reason he did not bring it was that Mr. Kennedy would not give it to him. The real trouble in this matter was the fact that Mr. Kennedy was in charge. I do not suppose Mr. Parent lent himself knowingly to these frauds. He appears to have been placed in a position where he was incapable of attending to the work. The responsibility and opportunity for fraud were entirely in the hands of Mr. Kennedy. If he had done his work and guarded Government interests, there would be no fraud; and yet we find the Minister had noticed at this early day, when the work had been only two or three days in progress, that Mr. Kennedy was deliberately refusing to obey the orders of Mr. Parent and withholding from Mr. Parent and Mr. Schreiber information which would have enabled the department to have at once put an end to fraud; but no remonstrance was addressed to Mr. Kennedy, no effort was made to induce him to guard his work and furnish this information. The Deputy Minister, not satisfied with what had been done, sent Mr. Douglas down to the work, and he reported that the work was being extravagantly conducted, that there were more men than there should be; yet nothing was done. Mr. Kennedy was left in full charge and allowed the frauds to continue in collusion with Mr. St. Louis, nothing whatever was done although the Government had explicit notice from Mr. Douglas in regard to the truth of the "Star" article. At the same time we have this additional peculiar information. On 10th March Mr. Parent wrote to Mr. Schreiber and told him that Mr. Kennedy had not time enough, and indeed objected to take any control or supervision of the Grand Trunk bridge. Upon the Grand Trunk bridge the great bulk of frauds were committed, and yet on 10th March the Minister had clear and explicit notice by Mr. Parent that Mr. Kennedy did not intend to exercise any supervision over that work. So we are not surprised to find in connection with this labour matter that so many men were allowed to remain there, no efforts being put forward by the department or Minister to bring Mr. Kennedy to time and compel him to perform his duty and take the oversight of his work. We are not surprised that while the Wellington Street bridge was to cost $144,000 the payments for labour amounted to $151,000, $7,000 more than the whole cost should have been. We need not be surprised that on the Grand Trunk Railway bridge, which should have cost altogether $56,000, according to the engineer's estimates, the pay-lists alone amounted to $139,000, nearly three times as much as the engineer's estimate as the total cost of the bridge. We find at page 151 that Mr. Schreiber remonstrated with Parent, and told him that the only way he could exercise any supervision was to have weekly reports made, and he must obtain them. Mr. Parent said he could not get them, because Mr. Kennedy refused to supply him with the necessary information. There again, we have ample notice given to the Minister, and information that whatever Mr. Schreiber learned with respect to these matters was communicated to the hon. gentleman. The Minister of Railways told us in his speech last session that he had a great deal of anxiety with regard to this matter, and that Mr. Schreiber kept telling him from day to day that he would learn all about it as soon as he could get hold of the pay-rolls. They found they could not get hold of the pay-rolls, and why? Because this Mr. Kennedy deliberately refused to part with them. The next point, and the point which appears to me conclusive as to the knowledge of the Minister of Railways as to the frauds, was his deliberate payment of money after he was in possession of all the facts, which justified him in suspending Mr. Parent and Mr. Kennedy and ordering a royal commission to investigate. Why, Mr. Speaker, what would be thought of an ordinary business man who was having a work done for him who found out that the work had cost double what it should have cost, and was put in possession of information that in all probability fraud had been committed in connection with the accounts for that work; what would be thought of the man who under those circumstances would pay the money for the work in full, and then set about to investigate the matter afterwards? That is exactly what the Minister of Railways did in this case. On the 27th March, the pay-roll for February was received. After repeated efforts on the part of the Deputy Minister, Mr. Kennedy was finally induced, or rather Mr. St. Louis saw fit to send in his accounts against the Government for the month of February. It will be remembered by the House that there was no work done on the superstructure in February, and that what was done was simply preliminary work in getting ready the material and stone-cutting. Two pay-rolls were received on the 27th March, the first amounting to $11,879, and the second amounting to $4,169, or a total of about $15,000. That is, one-half the original estimate of the engineer for the labour necessary to complete the whole work, was done in the month of February before the work actually commenced at all. That of itself was ample notice to any business man, and to any man claiming the astute business knowledge that the Minister of Railways claims and that his friends claim for him. I say that was most ample notice that there was something grossly wrong in connection with this work. No objection was taken to these pay-rolls and they were paid in

due course on the 30th March. On the 7th of April a letter was sent to Mr. Parent by Mr. Schreiber, asking for the pay-rolls for March. On the 13th April a telegram was sent to the same effect, and then on the 14th April the letter from Mr. Douglas was received. This letter is practically the information upon which the commission was issued, and on which Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Parent were suspended. A portion of that letter reads as follows :—

As I wired you to-day, from information given me, the expenditure on the Wellington Strcet and Grand Trunk bridges, as per pay-lists and accounts for March, which will be forwarded by Monday evening next, will amount to about $132,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the original estimate was $30,000 for the labour necessary for the work ; $15,000 were paid for February, and on the 14th April, when the pay-rolls were being held back, and it was necessary to take the extraordinary course of sending down a special officer to obtain them, that officer reports that they will amount to $132,000, or four times the original estimate. The work was then going on, all this fraud was going on, all these men were tumbling over one another on the works ; lumber was being brought there and carried back again and charged for ; and on the 14th April Mr. Douglas informs the department in reference to the enormous cost. The Minister tells us that after he got the information he allowed no one to be paid, and that no money was paid after that except this $15,000 on the February pay-roll. In his speech last session, at page 6327 "Hansard," the Minister says :

Up to the 28th April, the only money paid for labour in connection with this work was $13,541.

I say, that on the 14th April, Mr. Douglas gave the information to the department, on the strength of which, on the 25th April, Mr. Schreiber writes to the Minister as follows :—

Dear Mr. Haggart,—As I mentioned to you, I was not a little startled upon receiving from Mr. Parent the pay-rolls and accounts for the month of March in connection with the Wellington Street bridges, which summed up to an enormous figure. I at once despatched Mr. R. C. Douglas off to Montreal to look into the matter and ferret out all the information he could, and report to me the position of matters. The information he gives me is as follows :—

December, January and February pay-rolls, &c., in round figures.....	$ 79,000
March	132,000
April	110 000
Contracts for superstructure.....	61,000
	$382,000
Less materials, &c., to be credited to this work, and to be debited to other appropriations, say.....	22,000
	$360,000

This he considers is the minimum figure the work is likely to cost. Then on the strength of that, on the 10th May the Minister suspends Mr. Parent and Mr. Kennedy. Now, let us see when it was that this payment was made ? At page 451 of the evidence, we have a statement put in by the Minister himself, or his deputy, showing when it was the department received the accounts and when they certified to them. The actual payments were made after that. I have no doubt at all that it takes probably a week to get through the ordinary red-tape of the Auditor's office and for the cheques to issue. The cheques are made several days after the certificate of the engineer. I have already alluded to the February pay-lists received in March, which carried on their face quite sufficient evidence of fraud. But when we get to the March pay-lists, we find that there was one pay-list for $73,013 certified to by the chief engineer on the 24th of April, another for $10,129 certified to by the chief engineer on the 28th April, another for $7,263 certified on the 28th April, and another for $2,491 certified to on the 26th April, making a total of $92,897, every cent of which was certified to by the Department of Railways and Canals, and paid after the 25th day of April, after the receipt by the hon. Minister of Mr. Schreiber's report drawing his attention to this information, from which any shrewd business man would at once conclude that if there had not been fraud, there had been such a case as required, in the words of the Deputy Minister, the closest investigation before one dollar of the public money of Canada should be allowed to go into the hands of Mr. St. Louis. Then, what does the hon. Minister do ? I could understand some Ministers of the Crown who have from time to time graced some of the departments, and have been put there on account of their ability in some other direction, and who make no pretense to business knowledge, saying that they knew nothing about this matter, that it was a departmental matter, that they had left it to their subordinates, and that it had gone through in the ordinary way ; but I submit to this House that the hon. Minister of Railways is not a man who can avail himself of a plea of that kind. If there is one member of the Government for whom the claim has been put forward that he is a shrewd and capable administrator of his department, that member of the Government is the hon. Minister of Railways. It has been urged that he has made a business success of the Intercolonial Railway—that he is the first Minister who has been able to run that railway without a deficit. Most extravagant claims in this respect have been put forward on his behalf ; and he comes here and tells us that the Minister never certifies to these accounts, and puts that forward as a reason why this man St. Louis was allowed to put into his pocket $100,000 of the people's money under circumstances such as I have

detailed. After paying the money, the hon. Minister makes the most elaborate provisions for locking the stable door. After St. Louis had got the money, then the Minister said, "I will investigate this matter." But, Mr. Speaker, the case is worse than that. Of course, it is not necessary for me to point out that the hon. Minister's excuse for not certifying the accounts or knowing anything about them in the ordinary routine, amounts to nothing. The hon. Minister knows very well, and it was pointed out to him by the hon. member for Queen's, that it was his duty, as soon as he got the information contained in Mr. Schreiber's letter of the 25th April, to take immediate steps to stop the payment of these accounts. He did not do so; he made no effort to stop payment. The hon. Minister knows very well that long after the commission were appointed, and while they were at work taking the testimony, in addition to this $92,800 which was authorized to be paid by the direct authority of the hon. Minister himself, another sum of $105,000 was paid out by the Government of Canada to Mr. St. Louis. Let me inquire for a few moments into the circumstances under which that payment was made. In referring to that, the hon. Minister says: "I understand that this resolution is a charge against me personally. In answer to that I wish to point out that that $105,000 was not allowed to be paid by me personally." He should have come out boldly and told us the fact. What is the fact? The fact is that that $105,000 was paid out by the department in the absence of the Minister of Railways, by the order of Mr. Mackenzie Bowell, now Premier of this Dominion, who was then acting Minister of Railways. But that is no excuse whatever for the hon. Minister of Railways. He cannot plead in answer to this charge, that the wrong was done by Mr. Mackenzie Bowell, because if he had done his duty, if he had taken the ordinary precautions which a business man would take under the circumstances, and had issued an order that no further money should be paid until the matter was investigated, neither the acting Minister of Railways nor any other gentleman coming into the department would have paid the money. But the matter was put to the acting Minister of Railways in this way—that the only question in dispute between the department and Mr. St. Louis was the question of overtime; that Mr. St. Louis was claiming that he was entitled to be paid for his night work at overtime prices; that the department were disputing that claim; and that this $105,000 was due to Mr. St. Louis, according to his account, over and above the $60,000 which was held back for overtime. I have no doubt that the acting Minister, not knowing anything about these other matters to which I have referred, thought it was fair and reasonable that Mr. St. Louis should be paid the $105,000 as long as enough money was kept back to meet the disputed claim for overtime. I say that much in order to be fair to the acting Minister of Railways, although it must be pointed out as a very peculiar circumstance that an acting Minister of Railways should come into a department and authorize the payment of $105,000 on pay-lists which were never certified to by the chief engineer, but which the chief engineer distinctly refused to certify to. In Mr. Schreiber's evidence, at page 164, will be found just what was done in regard to that matter:

Q. I would like to know the position as to the amount that you have certified, and the amount you have not certified?—A. I have certified to $124,035.85.

Q. What is the amount claimed?—A. The amount altogether is $271,085.09.

By Mr. McMullen:

Q. And the amount paid?—A. The amount is $229,035.82, but of that $229,035.82, $124,035.85 was certified by me and $105,000 was paid on account on the order of the acting Minister.

And the statement on page 451 shows that this $105,000 was never passed by the Deputy Minister. So we have this most extraordinary position of affairs: that the Minister of Railways had on the 10th of March full notice that matters were being conducted in a most extravagant manner, in a manner sufficient to eat up all the appropriation in seven or eight days; that that went on from time to time; that the only reason full information did not come to the department was the deliberate refusal of Kennedy to furnish the necessary information; that on the 25th April, the Deputy Minister reported to the Minister that the amount spent on the bridge was so large that the matter required the fullest and closest investigation; that after the 25th April, amounts aggregating to $92,897, which had been passed by the engineer, were paid out to Mr. St. Louis, with the knowledge and concurrence of the Minister of Railways; that afterwards, a commission was appointed on the 17th May, and sat for the purpose of investigating into the whole question; that Mr. St. Louis went to Ottawa, accompanied by Mr. Emard, the law partner of the Minister of Public Works, and succeeded in getting from the Acting Minister of Railways, $105,000 more for accounts which Mr. Schreiber had deliberately refused to certify. This amount was paid out by the Acting Minister of Railways overruling the chief engineer, and while the matter was under examination by the commissioners. How can it be contended that the Minister of Railways is not to blame for these frauds upon the Government? He had every opportunity of stopping them, and of refusing to pay the money until it was proved, beyond the possibility of doubt, that the money was due. Under these circumstances, it was no doubt the duty of the Minister of Railways to say to Mr. St. Louis: I will not pay you a

solitary dollar until you prove your claim against the Government in a court of law, until you show that this work, which is costing us more than double what it should cost, was really done, until you show that the labour you pretend to have furnished was really furnished. But the hon. Minister chose to take the opposite course, and he comes here and says he knew nothing about it, that the custom of the department is for him not to certify to the accounts, and that the accounts went through in the ordinary way. So much for that. There is this additional point, that since then the matter has been investigated by the Public Accounts Committee, that it was brought before the House in the dying days of the session, when many members had left, and, consequently, there was not a full discussion upon it, but that the Minister of Railways satisfied the House, to a certain extent, at the time, by making the most solemn pledges that these malefactors would be prosecuted and, if possible, punished. Have the Government carried out their pledges? They waited until October, and began a prosecution against St. Louis. That prosecution was not successful. They afterwards indicted Mr. St. Louis before the grand jury, and that was not successful; and I gather from the statement of the judge before whom that preliminary inquiry was conducted and from the action of the grand jury that both the judge and the grand jury concluded that it was the Government who allowed the stealing to go on, and they refused to send to prison Mr. St. Louis for taking the opportunity extended to him by the Government of making that steal. That is the conclusion they came to, and I must say that that is the effect which the evidence has upon me. It does seem to me that Mr. St. Louis, when he took advantage of the opportunities freely extended to him by the Government—and you must remember what kind of a man Mr. St. Louis is. He is a man from whom the Government is in the habit of asking for favours; he is a man on whom the Government are in the habit of calling, from time to time, for the necessary funds to carry on election contests. What did Mr. St. Louis say? He said that he was in the habit of supplying the Government with campaign funds, and, consequently it was perfectly proper for him to take advantage of these opportunities extended to him by the Government, and let the Government furnish him from the public treasury sufficient money to make these contributions without himself being out of pocket. That is the conclusion of the judge who tried this case, and of the grand jury before whom Mr. St. Louis was indicted. That is the way in which the department has carried out its pledge. Here are a number of men shown to have been guilty of the grossest of frauds—Mr. Kennedy, the chief of all of them, and these different time-keepers; and here is the solemn pledge given to Parliament by the Minister of Railways that they would all be prosecuted. The Government waited until October, and selected the one man who, it would appear, the Government, from the beginning, intended should avail himself of the opportunities of getting hold of public moneys. They selected him and failed in their prosecution. Will they explain why they have not proceeded against the other men? Will they explain why they have not prosecuted Kennedy, and the different time-keepers? A year has gone by, and no effort has been made to proceed against these other men. When the Government do come to proceed against them, if they ever do, we will find, no doubt, that the evidence will not be available. I have only a word or two more to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not suppose this discussion is at all pleasant for hon. gentlemen opposite. I am very sorry for that, but the Opposition is not responsible for these facts. They occurred under the management of hon. gentlemen opposite. It, however, is the duty of the Opposition, when circumstances of this kind are brought to the knowledge of Parliament, to discuss them in this House, and if that discussion is unpalatable for hon. gentlemen opposite, I am sorry for them. I have only a word or two more to say with regard to this matter. The Minister of Railways, in concluding his remarks, reprimanded my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) for the manner in which he had approached this subject. He conceived it was the duty of the hon. member for Queen's to overlook any connection that the Government may have with charges in a matter of this kind and to aid the Government in hunting out the fraud, and punishing the delinquents. The hon. gentleman referred to the practice in England. He asked, could it be imagined for a moment that the Opposition in England, when frauds have been committed upon the Government, would think of attacking the head of the department? I must admit that they would not, because the circumstances are entirely different in England from what they are in Canada. I regret to have to make that admission, but when the hon. gentleman brings the matter forward it requires a little discussion. Such a charge would not be thought of in England, because such a thing as a Minister of the Crown using his position for the purpose of obtaining for his party campaign funds coming indirectly from the treasury of the country has, I am thankful to say, never been known. But is that the case in this country? Let us recall for a moment the session of 1891. Can any member of this House imagine the revelations that were made in 1891 with regard to the Government of this country

being equalled in the Parliament of Great Britain: can any member imagine the fact proven with regard to heads of the departments here being true of the heads of departments in England? We know, however, that the Conservative party has been carried on upon these lines—that it is the duty of every member who is elected as a supporter of a Conservative Government, to support that Government in every matter that they may bring forward, because no matter how bad it may be in itself, it is still greater calamity to Canada that the Liberal party should come into power. That is the doctrine that has been inculcated for years: that was the doctrine that was inculcated by Sir John Macdonald, their great statesman. Would it be possible to imagine in England a state of affairs similar to that proven to exist in the Connolly-McGreevy matter? Can we imagine Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Balfour ordering the prosecution of men who had been guilty of departmental fraud, and then, after the culprits had been sent to jail ordering them to be released because men in office, after all, were just as guilty as they? And can we imagine that in England, after all this had occurred, the Government would adopt as its candidate in its constituency one of these very men, and that he would be re-elected to Parliament as a supporter of the Government? Why, Mr. Speaker, the policy and practice of the English Government is diametrically the opposite of the policy and practice of the Conservative party in Canada. It is unblushingly acknowledged that this is the policy of the party. Why, Mr. Speaker, the principle upon which the Government is conducted was set forth, I must say in a manly way, I must say in an able way, I must say in a clear and definite way, in this House last session by the hon. Postmaster General. The Postmaster General pointed out that he had taken $25,000 from Senator Ross as a subscription for political purposes; that $25,000 Senator Ross obtained from a certain railway company, it being a portion of the money given to them by the Dominion Government at the instance of the Conservative party.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Where did you find that?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think there is any doubt about that, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman came out fair and square and said: I had a perfect right to that $25,000; I would do it again.

An hon. MEMBER. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN. He understands, and he is quite right and manly and straightforward in stating it that that is the principle upon which his party is conducted. He says: In the province of Ontario you were allowed to keep yourselves in power by gerrymandering the constituencies. I asked for a similar privilege for the province of Quebec, and if that had been granted to me and I had been allowed to gerrymander the constituencies in Quebec district as you have done in Ontario, I should not have had to go to Senator Ross for $25,000 to use in carrying this election. Such facts as these, Mr. Speaker, make it the unpleasant duty of the Opposition in this House to discuss matters of this kind when they come before us in the spirit in which I have discussed them rather than in the spirit in which they are discussed in England. If it were true in Canada as it is in England that the heads of departments refused to use their positions for their party interests in the way I have suggested, then politics in Canada would occupy the same plane as they do in England. Were it not for the policy of the Conservative party in using the construction of every great public work to obtain campaign funds for elections; were it not that even in connection with fiscal questions they have adopted a policy through which they are able to extract large sums from interested individuals in return for favours granted to them; and if it were not for this gerrymander, to which the hon. Postmaster General referred, the Liberals in this House would not be to-day condemning the Government for their extravagant administrative acts, but they would long ago have been in power in this Dominion.

Mr. CURRAN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, devoted his peroration to the hon. Postmaster General and some other gentlemen he has alluded to in connection with the charges which have already been investigated. It is not my intention to say anything more in that connection than that the hon. gentleman and others seem to imagine that by reiterating the same thing over and over again they will get the people of Canada to believe that even after the investigation that was held into the charges against the hon. Postmaster General before a tribunal which was marked by its severity, there is still some basis for their assertion. Before that tribunal not only the subsidies of this Dominion, but those of the local legislature, even those granted by the municipalities were investigated, and it was shown, that after adding all together and adding still further the amounts paid by the directorate, the contractor of the road had paid out of his own pocket over $400,000 in building the road. And yet, it was out of the Dominion subsidies that this $25,000 was alleged to have been paid. No man, I believe, who wishes to look into the matter impartially can come to any other conclusion than that the charges against the Postmaster General were entirely without foundation. Now, I wish to say a few words on this occasion, not so much to take part in the discussion with regard to the conduct of the Department of Railways and Canals,

as because the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, referred to me in one or two particulars, in connection with which I wish to say a few words. The hon. member for Queen's told us that this subject had been brought before the Parliament of Canada last session, at the closing hours of the session, that the evidence had not all been printed, and that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had not perhaps laid this case before Parliament in as perfect a manner as he could have done had all the evidence been printed. But I will say this for the hon. member for South Oxford, that in presenting his case he came straight from the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee, that he had also before him the printed evidence that had been taken before the royal commission in Montreal; and if there had been anything in that evidence that reflected upon any member of Parliament, outside of the Department of Railways and Canals, that hon. gentleman would have noticed it, and would have brought it before the House. But from the beginning to the end of his speech last year, that hon. gentleman, who, I will say, does not strike below the belt, although he is not afraid to meet his opponents face to face, there was not one charge brought against me such as was launched yesterday against me by the hon. member for Queen's. Now, Sir, I wish to refer to these matters. I wish to bring out how they first originated, how they subsided, how they were wiped out, and how the hon. gentleman now seeks to revive them. What, then, was the first connection I had with this matter? The hon. gentleman insinuated that the political appointment, as he called it, of Mr. Kennedy, was a great crime on my part. Now, all I have got to say with regard to the appointment of Mr. Kennedy, is this: that as member for Montreal Centre it was my duty to lay before the Department of Railways the name of a gentleman to fill that office. But I did not act on my own motion. There are documents which show why and how I acted, that it was not upon my own recommendation that this appointment was made, but that it was made on the recommendation, not merely of Senator Drummond and of Mr. W. W. Ogilvie, president of the Board of Trade in Montreal, but of such prominent gentlemen of that city as Mr. McLennan, of the Forwarding Company, Mr. Thompson, also of the Forwarding Company, the Hon. Senator Murphy, and a host of other gentlemen, who sent to me strong recommendations in favour of Mr. Kennedy, whom I did not know personally at all, but whose father I knew. I placed these recommendations before the Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and he said then and there that whilst these recommendations were very good in their way, it was necessary that there should also be recommendations by men who were skilled in public works; and therefore Mr. H. J. Beemer, Mr. Parker, and a host of public contractors well known throughout Canada, sent in recommendations for this gentleman. But more than that. Even after all these recommendations had been sent in from public men and from contractors, the hon. gentleman who was at the head of the department, sent down word that Mr. Kennedy was to report himself at Mr. Parent's office, there to undergo an examination to see whether he was fit for that position. Under all these circumstances, then, Mr. Kennedy was put in charge of the canal at Montreal. He belonged to a good family, he had been working for Mr. Beemer and for other contractors, he had been carrying on public works, and managing large numbers of men. Mr. Parent, in speaking of him in this very investigation, said that he was a man of great energy, and of great pluck; and Mr. Schreiber, in his evidence, also said that he was a man with a great deal of snap, and was able to push a work forward successfully. Every man on the canal from Montreal to Lachine has signed his papers, certificates and testimonials, showing that during the time he was in charge of the canal, he had managed it well. It is true, my hon. friend from Lincoln mentioned that in the evidence before the commission it had been shown that he had been guilty of this one fault, which was certainly a very serious one that he had substituted pine for oak in the charges to the Government, that he had appropriated money for oak which should have gone for the purchase of pine, and that he had sent in the accounts in that manner. But it is proved beyond doubt by Mr. Trihey that in the whole of that transaction the Government did not lose one dollar, that not one dollar was added to the price of either one article or the other. Therefore, I say that it is not now, when the man is down and has been discharged from his office, it is not now, after he has been removed from that position which he had held for some years, that an unfounded charge of fraud should be levelled against him. I, for one, will say for him that, at all events, outside of this bridge business, he acted as an honest and efficient officer in the management of that canal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then the hon. gentleman differs from the commissioners, who say the contrary in their report?

Mr. CURRAN. I say that in the management of the canal Mr. Kennedy showed that he was an able man. The hon. gentleman made his speech, and I am going to make mine, and before I get through I will try and show indubitably where the hon. gentleman made an unjustifiable attack upon me in his speech yesterday. Now, Sir, having said that much with regard to this official, I want to point out what was my connection with this bridge undertaking. First of all, it is well

known that the bridge had been spoken of for several years before it came before Parliament. An agitation had been going on for a long time. At first there was a scheme for making a tunnel there. The Hon. J. H. Pope suggested it, but owing to opposition from the west on the ground that a tunnel would throttle the canal at its opening, and might thereby prevent enlarged navigation, the tunnel scheme was abandoned, and the policy was changed to constructing a bridge. Well, we had first of all a vote for $25,000, but there was nothing done that year. The next year we had a vote for $45,000, but nothing was done. But the agitation was going on all the time, and I kept incessantly making representations to the department of the need for a bridge, owing to the great danger that existed to both life and limb at that point. There was a large traffic, as well as a good deal of travel, over the old bridge, and I was afraid that some fine morning we should wake up and find that a terrible accident had occurred at that point. Well, finally the present Minister of Railways, in the session preceding the investigation of which we are now speaking, promised that if he could get a grant of $170,000, this bridge should be built, along with the required improvements in the Grand Trunk bridge, adjoining. Now, with regard to the management of the work, the fact is that I took no part whatever in having Mr. Kennedy put there as superintendent. I had no interest in that. Mr. Trudeau, who was then Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, spoke to me one day and said that Mr. Kennedy was doing his work admirably, but that there was no money to pay him for doing this particular work, and that he should not be asked to do it. Mr. Trudeau had been putting it off year after year, and I was afraid he was going to throw me off for another year, and I said : I do not think Mr. Kennedy will object to take up this work and do it without pay, or at least, to run his chances of getting paid later on. Well, that was all for that occasion. When it was announced by the press of Montrael that the Government was going on with this work in the months of December or January, there was a great deal of excitement. The public press came out with the statement that 7,000 men were to be thrown out of employment, that the canal was to be unwatered, and the mills would stop. A public meeting was called in the office of Mr. W. W. Ogilvie, and a discussion took place with the object of ascertaining if this work could not be carried out in the spring, by adding one month to the month that was always taken for unwatering the canal. At that meeting it was suggested that Mr. Kennedy should be entrusted with the superintendence of the work under the supervision of Mr. Parent, and Mr. W. W. Ogilvie and myself were appointed a deputation to come to Ottawa to lay before the department the views of the meeting, and have the time changed and the work carried on during the two months of spring. During our conversation with the Deputy Minister—we never saw the Minister, and Mr. Trudeau was then alive—he again mentioned that Kennedy would have no pay for that work, and it would be unfair to put it upon him. If Mr. Trudeau had told me what I afterwards discovered, that he would have preferred to place another man there as well as another engineer, as he did in the case of Desbarats, the position would have been different. Kennedy had no interest in going there and get not a cent for it ; he undertook the work, and that was all the responsibility there was about it. During the whole time the bridge was under construction, what connection had I with it ? In the first place, I never visited the work but once during the time it was going on, and that was on a Sunday when I happened to be in Montreal during the session. I never recommended a man for work. I was requested to join this Government by Sir John Thompson at the latter end of November. I came up here and was sworn in. From November till the end of December I was actively engaged in preparing for an election in my constituency, should one come on. I was elected by acclamation in the end of December. I came here to my office, Parliament opened shortly afterwards, and by that means I escaped, what naturally would have been inevitable, giving letters to many persons, because if I had been in Montreal no doubt people would have come to me, as they would to any other member of Parliament, and ask a recommendation for work. Nobody came to me. In the whole course of the investigation and in the hundreds of pages of evidence printed there is not one tittle of evidence from any source to show that I ever exercised any patronage of any kind. I gave a letter of recommendation to Mr. O'Connor, who had opened a lumber yard in Montreal, but he never sold so much as a box of matches to the department. The hon. gentleman said :

> The moment the Minister dispensed with the calling of tenders and began the work by days' work, that moment he began to open the door through which fraud could be perpetrated. Political influence then began to be brought to bear. Hon. gentlemen who wished to give employment to political friends, and who found they could not give this employment if tenders were called, found the door opened wide by the Minister himself by which they could pass through as many political proteges and friends as they liked, not tens or dozens, but hundreds of the political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite could be employed under this system of days' labour to an almost unlimited extent.

That does not apply to me or to any act of mine. I had no political patronage there, and I sought none ; and I challenge that hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman, when he talks about political super-

intendence of that canal to show from the beginning to the end of this evidence that I ever exercised one iota of influence, political or otherwise, in connection with either supplies to the canal or as to men employed in carrying on the work. Mention was made yesterday by the hon. member for Queen's, and also by the leader of the Opposition, to a letter which was handed to me by Mr. Kennedy's father in the city of Montreal. In that connection, I merely want to say this, that surely hon. gentlemen in making out this case, which, according to their own words, is "oozing at every pore," might have deemed it unnecessary to make a statement which they would have seen by reading the evidence that was before their eyes, sworn to by me before the commission in Montreal, could not be made out at all events as a charge against the Minister of Railways in this matter. I gave my evidence before that commission, and, regarding that letter, I swore that I had not shown the letter to the Minister. I distinctly stated in my evidence :

In fact, I think I did not ; but I spoke to him about its contents, and more particularly about this contract for hiring labour. He said the labour had been tendered for. I said I was not aware of it. He said, yes, it is, and Mr. St. Louis is up here about the difficulty you spoke of with regard to the classification of the labour.

I had never heard a word about the labour contract until Mr. Kennedy approached me in Montreal. I said : "I do not believe it : send me a letter." He sent his father with a letter, which is printed in evidence. I read it on the cars, and saw it was a most intemperate letter, that it was written by a man labouring under very great excitement, and I thought he had probably exaggerated, and, at all events, he felt sorely vexed. When I came into this House in the evening I went to the Minister's seat and spoke to him and asked about the contract ; and when I found that the contract had been made, and everything carried out, I admit, frankly here, whether I made a mistake or not, that I felt that this was an imprudent letter, that since the contract was a fait accompli, and everything had been carried out, since the Minister had made the contract, or his deputy had made it, it would probably be a very poor service to render Kennedy to show that letter, which was such a reflection on the conduct of the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRAN. I do not know whether that is a sign of approval or not, but I state the facts as they are. That was the reason, and no other, because I thought it would be injurious to Kennedy, why I did not show the letter. But when I found the contract had been entered into and extended I wrote to Kennedy a letter, which has been read, stating that it was his duty to certify to every piece of work done, that he must be careful to certify to nothing which was not absolutely correct in his judgment. I sent that letter with those instructions, at the same time telling him what had been done, and what I thought it was his duty to do. That was what took place with respect to that document. I imagine if hon. gentlemen opposite had been able to make anything more out of it, they would have done their best to do so. At page 2976, the leader of the Opposition, in the debate, when speaking in connection with the statement that Kennedy had telegraphed here after having received that letter, said :

One of my friends beside me read that this afternoon, and the Minister said : How could I know it, but my friend was able to point out at once the answer of the Solicitor General to Mr. Kennedy, and the Solicitor General wrote :

My dear Mr. Kennedy,—I have seen the Minister of Railways and Canals and found that all has been tendered for, including labour for the carrying out of the work of the bridge.

That is true, just as I have stated it.

Therefore, Mr. Kennedy's complaint was taken to the Minister and apparently the Minister answered : Well, what is there to complain of ; everything has been done by tender and there is no more to do about it. Sir, there is more than that also. It is in evidence that the Solicitor General on the same day wired to Mr. Kennedy, after he had received a telegram from Mr. Kennedy that he was coming here.

"Don't report to the department before you see me."

Kennedy was on his way to Ottawa. He was met at the station, as he says himself, by the Solicitor General and by Senator Drummond, and instead of going to acquaint the department, still more of what was going on, he was sent back to his work, and the same system continued, and St. Louis was able to plunder the department even after the notice of the Minister had been brought to this fact by Kennedy, one of the supervisors of the work.

Now, under all the circumstances, would it not have been fair that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) should have stated what did take place. Why did he not say, that I had shown in my evidence, and that Mr. Schreiber had admitted, that when I received that telegram I went over to Mr. Schreiber's office and I informed him that Mr. Kennedy was coming up, and Mr. Schreiber turned around to me and said: If he comes up here he should be dismissed. I felt a little annoyed at such a reception, and, seeing the condition of Mr. Schreiber's mind, seeing that all these contracts had been made, seeing that the contract had been extended, I felt that if Mr. Kennedy came up here, that he would be dismissed from his office. I met Mr. Drummond at my office a few minutes afterwards, and he told be that he had also received a telegram from Mr. Kennedy which was to the same effect as the one I had received. We both met Mr. Kennedy, we advised him not to do as he said he intended to do, namely,

give up the work. We told him it would never do to give up the work then, that he must carry it out to completion, and not leave the navigation of the country closed on the 1st of May, which would have cost millions of dollars to our trade. We induced him to go on with the work. I regret I did not allow Mr. Kennedy to go to the Deputy Minister, and let the results be what they might, they could not be worse than they are, so far as poor Kennedy is concerned. I am very sorry indeed he did not go to the department then and see the Deputy Minister. In that statement which my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition made, he would seem to throw on to Senator Drummond and myself, the imputation that we prevented this man from going there in order that Mr. St. Louis might "carry out his plundering," as he says, the same as before. Mr. Speaker, that statement was made before. It was published in the press of the country. I was attacked by newspapers, and I waited until I got a newspaper which had the courage to come out straightforwardly and say what it meant about it. That newspaper was the daily "Witness," of Montreal. It undertook to state in print, that I had conspired with the Minister of Public Works to have this contract made, and that it was made for the purpose of getting funds for election purposes in the general election. The Montreal "Witness" stated that I, conjointly with the Minister of Public Works, made friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, so that we might get up this election fund. Well, I was perfectly ready to meet them. I brought them before a court of justice in Montreal, and I compelled them to make this declaration, which I now have the pleasure of reading to the House :

In an article published in July last reflecting upon the excessive amount of money expended by the Government on the construction of the Curran Bridge, the name of Mr. Curran, M.P., was menioned, the question being asked : Whether Mr. Curran and the Government were anxious to spend the money and build the bridge in order to make friends of the mammon of unrighteousness so as to be ready for the next elections. It is scarcely necessary to say that there was not the slightest intention to suggest corruption against Mr. Curran, and we should regret very much if our remarks could be construed so as to reflect upon that gentleman's character.

That settled the business so far as the press was concerned then. I am satisfied that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition would not state that I had conspired either with the hon. Minister of Public Works, or any other hon. gentleman in this House, but that was his insinuation, and I repudiate it now, and I challenge any gentleman, no matter who he may be, to say that there is in this evidence, or that he can produce any evidence to show that I was connected with these contracts in any shape or form or manner whatever. Now, the next point, and the most serious charge, was made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). He went on to speak about the dismissal of Mr. Desbarats, an act which I, for one, certainly exceedingly regret, in connection with this contract. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) at page 2902 of the "Hansard" states in almost plain words, that I was instrumental in having that young man removed from his position. That was a most extraordinary statement for the hon. gentleman to make. He says :

Now, what did the Government do next? They had a gentleman in connection with that work, who was connected with it from its inception, and whose name was Desbarats. Mr. Desbarats, as the report shows, was sent to Montreal in September, 1892, to examine the site of the bridges. The first plan was prepared by Mr. Desbarats under Mr. Trudeau, late Deputy Minister, and the second and third plans were prepared in Montreal by Mr. Desbarats and Mr. Parent. Mr. Desbarats remained in Montreal from November till the 1st of March. Mr. Desbarats was dismissed, and why ? There was no living public official in a position so thoroughly to understand those works as Mr. Desbarats. He had prepared the original plans, he had prepared the extensions, he was in a position to check them, but Mr. Desbarats had done that which was an unpardonable sin ; he had interfered with the politicians who were connected with the construction of this bridge. We had here a Mr. Kennedy, a political supporter of the Government, a protege and friend of the Solicitor General, a gentleman who was appointed to his position as superintendent of the canal at the instance of the Solicitor General and Mr. Ogilvie, and a Senator whose name I forget.

An hon. MEMBER. Senator Drummond.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, Senator Drummond, Mr. Ogilvie and Solicitor General Curran had Kennedy appointed to the position. Mr. Kennedy thought he was going to have a free hand, to run matters as he liked, to spend what he liked, and to distribute the ill-gotten gains which were to come out of that bridge as he liked ; and Mr. Desbarats, as I say, committed the unpardonable sin of attempting to keep a check upon Mr. Kennedy. * * * No sooner had Mr. Desbarats made himself objectionable to the political superintendent of the work, than within two days afterwards he received his dismissal from the department. On the 6th February, two days following the attempt made to check the men employed, Mr. Schreiber writes to Mr. Parent a letter intimating that the subject of the pay-rolls has been under consideration ; that the Minister has given no authority for Mr. Desbarats' salary to be increased from $105 to $150, and that he is to be dismissed. Parent writes back, protesting in the most vigorous language against Desbarats' dismissal, and pointing out reasons why he should not be dismissed. But he receives scant courtesy at the hands of the department, and Mr. Desbarats' dismissal, which was intimated on the 6th, is authoritatively announced on the 14th, and at the end of the month he leaves the work. From the date he attempted to keep a check, he was ordered off the works by Superintendent Kennedy ; and from the date the department endorsed Kennedy's action as against Desbarats, from that date Desbarats continued to perform his duties

perfunctorily. Of course, he interfered no more.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) insinuates the accusation that the very moment Mr. Desbarats undertook to check this work, the political superintendent, through his friend, and protector, the Solicitor General, and others, had him removed. Why, Sir, in the course of the evidence that was brought out before the Public Accounts Committee, we had this matter disposed of beyond peradventure, and the hon. gentleman knows it. He must have heard it or read it, because it was one of the points brought prominently before the public, and on which newspaper articles were written. We have the letter of Mr. Schreiber, on page 119 of the evidence, in which he gives as the reason for Mr. Desbarats' removal that there was an engineer there who had nothing to do, and that therefore Mr. Desbarats' services were not required. I then asked him :

Q. Before you leave that. Was that the first move made with regard to Mr. Desbarats' removal ?—A. On the 6th, the letter previous to that, yes.

Q. And you heard the evidence of Mr. Desbarats here ?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you hear what he stated with regard to influence having been used towards having him removed ?—A. I did.

Q. Was there any foundation for that whatever? —A. Not the slighest, as far as I know. Not the slightest, in any way whatever.

Q. Did any person of those mentioned—myself, Senator Drummond, W. W. Ogilvie, or any other person, interest himself in any way, directly or indirectly, by word of mouth, correspondence, or in any other way, induce you to remove Mr. Desbarats ?—A. Not in any way whatever that I ever heard.

By Mr. Haggart :

Q. Or from me ?—A. Or from you either.

So, we have this sworn testimony, given before the Public Accounts Committee, that no interference ever took place either by me or by anybody else. I could not have done any such thing. I knew Mr. Desbarats' father ; he had been an old college mate of mine, and an old political supporter ; my relations with him were most intimate, and I would be as likely to injure my own son as to injure Mr. Desbarats' son. Such an idea could not enter my head, and when I heard of his removal from the works, I said I was extremely sorry for it. He was a young gentleman I had the highest respect for, and I had always been friendly with his family.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CURRAN. Mr. Speaker, before recess I was dealing with the charge that I had attempted in some way or other to have Mr. Desbarats removed from the position he held upon the Lachine Canal bridges, and I quoted from the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee to show that not only had I not done so, but that nobody whose name had been mentioned, and no one in authority, had interfered with Mr. Desbarats. I was pointing out the unlikelihood of any such course on my part, and I also expressed my regret that such a removal should have taken place. But, Sir, that did not prevent those who were seeking to inflict an injury upon me from continuing their work, and certain newspaper correspondents in Ottawa undertook to publish in the press of Montreal the statement that the young man in question had been removed at my instigation, because, as they alleged, he had been interfering with the superintendent of the canal and had been preventing him from having his own sweet will. Under these circumstances I was very much delighted indeed to find one of the public journals making this allegation in such a way as to enable me to have the matter investigated before the courts. "La Patrie," of the city of Montreal, made this charge against me, and I lost no time in giving the publishers of that paper an opportunity of proving their charge, if they could do so. If they had any information that had not been brought out before the Public Accounts Committee, no matter where they could obtain it, I wished to give them the opportunity of stating before the public of my native city what that information consisted of. I took an action for libel against them. I had notice of that action served upon them, and in due course, on the 22nd of June, 1894, the following article appeared in "La Patrie"—I shall first read it in French, and afterwards I will read an English translation of it :—

Dans le numéro de la *Patrie* du 9 courant nous avons publié un article intitulé "Pont Curran" dans lequel nous avons commis une injustice envers l'honorable M. Curran, solliciteur général du Canada.

Au cours de cet article basé sur un rapport d'Ottawa, nous avons dit que l'honorable M. Curran s'était occupé de faire destituer M. Desbarats, ingénieur au canal de Lachine, et nous avons appris depuis que ce rapport était absolument faux et que l'honorable M. Curran n'avait rien dit ni fait contre M. Desbarats.

L'article en question a été écrit sur des informations dénuées de fondement. M. Curran est un adversaire politique que nous désirons traiter loyalement. L'honneur de nos hommes publics doit être mis à l'abri d'attaques mal fondées et c'est un plaisir comme un devoir pour nous de remédier autant qu'il nous est possible à toute injustice que notre article a pu causer à l'honorable Solliciteur général tant personnellement que comme représentant du peuple.

In our issue of "La Patrie" of the 9th instant, we published an article under the heading of "Curran Bridge," in which we committed an injustice against the Hon. Mr. Curran, Solicitor General of Canada.

In the course of that article, based on a report from Ottawa, we stated that the Hon. Mr. Curran had undertaken to procure the dismissal of Desbarats, engineer at the Lachine Canal. We have since learned that this report is absolutely false and that the Hon. Mr. Curran neither did nor said anything to the detriment of Mr. Desbarats.

The article in question was written upon information absolutely without foundation. Mr. Curran is our political adversary, and we wish to treat him loyally. The honour of our public men must be safeguarded from unjustifiable attacks, and it is a pleasure, as well as a duty, for us to remedy as far as it is possible all the injustice that our article may have caused the Hon. Solicitor General as well personally as in his capacity of a representative of the people.

That caused a cessation of those malicious attacks for the time. I seized upon the first opportunity when an allegation was made that I had something to do with a contract, of the existence of which, at the time it was made I had not the slightest knowledge, to bring the publisher to an account. As I stated in the early part of my discourse, a certain newspaper having made the allegation that I had sought to create a political fund for election purposes, I brought the newspaper to time at once for the libel, and procured the apology which I read to the House this afternoon. It was not long until once more, without justification, without the slightest tittle of evidence, these insinuations were again revived. The report we have here—a book of several hundreds of pages—shows that the investigation was most thorough. Yet every attempt to connect me with this scandal signally failed. Despite all this, the charges were again revived. In the Toronto "Globe," after a length of time, various items appeared, and at the time the city of Ottawa was receiving our delegates from the sister colony of Australia, when it was important that those gentlemen should go back with a good opinion of our public men, and a favourable impression of our country, there appeared in the notes and comments of the "Globe," referring to the Canadian delegates, a paragraph stating that the delegates would not want to share in paying any bill certified to by Mr. Curran of the bridge. The man who wrote that must have known that I had nothing to do with certifying any bills for that or any other bridge. It was a malicious fabrication. I did not see it myself, but a friend of mine, Mr. Gorman, of Ottawa, a lawyer, undertook to write to the "Globe" concerning this and other scandalous attacks made upon me by that journal. Mr. Gorman wrote as follows:—

I beg to respectfully protest against the insinuations in two separate items of your "Notes and Comments" in yesterday's paper, against Hon. J. J. Curran, Solicitor General. In the first item, you say, in speaking of the colonial delegates, that they will not want a share in paying the bills certified by Mr. Curran of the bridge; and in the second item, you speak of the "Curran scandal," in the same category as the "Caron-Langevin scandal." The apparent object is to lead uninformed people to believe that Mr. Curran has had some connection with the boodling in the erection of the Wellington bridge at Lachine, which is commonly known as the Curran bridge on account of its being built in Mr. Curran's constituency, and his having obtained the passage of the grant for its construction. Now, it is well known that Mr. Curran had no connection, directly or indirectly, with the building of the bridge or the certifying of the bills in connection therewith, and that, while the exposures that have been made of the misappropriations and overcharges are, and may properly enough be referred to as the "Curran bridge scandal," it is neither true in fact nor fair to Mr. Curran to speak of them as the "Curran scandal," nor to refer to that gentleman as "Mr. Curran of the bridge." I trust that your usual sense of honesty in dealing with political opponents will prevent any such unfair insinuations in the future.

The "Globe," in reply, said:

In justice to Mr. Curran and the "Globe," we think it well to do a little more than Mr. Gorman asks, and to say that we have no desire to connect Mr. Curran's name with the bridges in any way that would mean discredit to him. The works have acquired the name of the Curran bridges, but, now that a scandal has arisen in connection with them, it would be only fair not to continue to connect his name with them. At the same time we hold that the entire Government of which he is a member, is responsible for the loss to the country.

That was a statement vindicating me once more, and made from the most important journal published in the Liberal interests in Ontario. Wherever I was able to lay my hand upon a charge, whenever I could bring the thing home to those who made it, whenever I had the opportunity of coming face to face with the man who made it, or the newspaper that published it, I was anxious that the matter should be fought out before a jury of our countrymen, and that the miserable innuendos and covert accusations made in various quarters, should be dispelled and settled forever. I have shown you, Mr. Speaker, that, so far as I was personally concerned, I have, on every occasion, sought to vindicate my character, and I think I have succeeded. In this connection, I will merely say, that I have been in public life now a considerable number of years. I have been elected and re-elected again and again, in my present constituency. Those who have sent me here by such overwhelming majorities are not all Conservatives. On the contrary, in hundreds of cases, they are men who differ from me in politics, but who have confidence in me, personally, and send me here to represent them. I have sought, ever since I have been in public life, to act, on every occasion, the part of an honest man. There may have been other directions in which I have not been very successful, but I can say this, that I have never touched public money. No man can lay on me the brand that I have been connected with scandal of any kind whatever. I have sought to preserve my good name, and if I have nothing else to leave my children, I can, at all events, hand them down the name of an honest man. To attempt to fasten, by innuendo, that which cannot be substantiated in the

light of day, in a fair and open manner, is a miserable and wretched piece of paltry political expediency. I have sought from the beginning to meet in every way any charge fairly made, and have stood up here on account of the attempts made, again and again, to make it appear that with reference to some of the employees on the works in issue to-day I had been unjust towards them on race grounds, or was actuated by motives unworthy of an honourable man. I trust that I can face my fellow-men in any other part of the Dominion, and appeal to them to say whether, in my career, I have not always been a peacemaker, whether I have not always sought to cement together the people of this Dominion in one harmonious whole, whether be they English or French, or to whatever race they may belong. I have not ever sought, by every means in my power, to make our people feel that this is our Canadian home, and to instil into the youthful mind the generous aspirations which make a great and happy people.

Mr. TARTE. The motion of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) asks the representatives of the people to censure the Minister of Railways and Canals for the wrong-doing committed in the execution of certain works on the Lachine Canal in 1893. The wrong-doings are admitted on all hands. They have been admitted by the Minister himself, but he puts in a plea that he is not guilty, because he is not responsible. Well, I want to ask: If the hon. gentleman in whose department the works have been executed is not responsible, who is responsible? Sir, not many years ago, quite a different doctrine was upheld in this Parliament. In 1891, the Privileges and Elections Committee held a very important inquiry in which I took a certain share. There was a report made, and accepted by the hon. gentleman himself, and in this report I read as follows:—

The charges against Sir Hector Langevin, as already intimated, having been as above set forth, the committee would observe, that in the course of the investigation an effort was made to connect him with the wrong-doing of others who have been reported against as directly connected with fraudulent conduct.

Your committee, therefore, report, that the evidence does not justify them in concluding that the Minister knew of the conspiracy before mentioned, or that he willingly lent himself to its objects.

Well, Sir, the report was made, as I have pointed out. The Minister, in spite of the fact that he had been exonerated to the degree I have just indicated, was obliged to step out of office, and he has since remained out of office. I want to know what is the difference between that case and this. We are face to face with the admission that wrong-doing has been committed. But the Minister pleads that he is not directly connected with it, that he has not been a party to it, that he had no share in it. Sir, the constitutional doctrine is that every Minister is responsible to this Parliament. There is no other possible doctrine. More than that, the whole Government is responsible to this Parliament. But the Minister, after having set out with an unconstitutional plea, gives us another plea. He says: I did everything I could to ensure the due completion of the work: I have employees under me in the department to whom I gave the strictest possible orders, and when I found they were guilty of wrong-doing, I dismissed them. Sir, in 1891 some of the employees who were found guilty were discharged, but that did not prevent the Minister being discharged also. Is it true that the Minister is not directly, as an administrator, responsible for what took place? I do not want to be unfair to him; quite the reverse. But the facts are there. I claim that the hon. Minister and his department undertook to direct and supervise the works themselves. Great stress has been laid upon the fact that Mr. Parent had been for thirty years an employee of the Government, and had always been an honest and efficient officer. Mr. Parent was the superintending engineer of our canals—Beauharnois, St. Ours, Lachine and Chambly. When these Lachine Canal works were decided upon, it was arranged and agreed that Parent should not have charge of the works. Who then had charge? The man in charge was an officer specially appointed by this Government. I think the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, although he may have followed the investigation closely, has forgotten a good many of the facts in this case. If you look at page 50 of the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee, you find that Mr. Desbarats, who had been appointed resident engineer in charge of the works in October, 1892, made the following statement to the committee:

Q. By whom?—A. By the chief engineer before I left here, and by Mr. Parent in Montreal, that Mr. Kennedy, the superintendent of the Lachine Canal, was to act as purchasing agent for the works and was to act as overseer and general foreman—to have charge of the men—of their distribution and of the general arrangement of the men on the works, and to supervise them.

Now, Sir, if you look at page 195, you will find the following stated by Mr. Parent:

Q. What did take place?—A. Well, I told you, first of all, that Mr. Kennedy organized the whole thing, as overseer of the works. He was overseer, and had been appointed specially by the Government to that effect, and he organized his own staff.

At page 196, Mr. Parent testified as follows:

Q. Was he appointed on your recommendation?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know who recommended him?—It was Mr. Curran, I believe, the Hon. Mr. Curran.

Now, there is a letter written by Mr. Parent

to Mr. Kennedy on 28th November, 1892, which reads as follows :

Dear Sir,—I am directed to inform you, that, as superintendent of the Lachine Canal, you are requested to act as overseer in connection with the substructure of the new bridge across the Lachine Canal to replace the old one at Wellington Street. You are requested to assume the responsibility of performing said work with the least possible interruption or impediment to traffic or water power. You will make all necessary arrangements for purchase or hire of the material and plant required, engage the necessary labour generally, and superintend the execution of the work in accordance with the plans and directions which will be furnished you by Mr. G. J. Desbarats, engineer in charge of construction, with whom you will consult as to all matters of detail. All more important matters should be submitted to me for approval.

E. H. PARENT.

To E. Kennedy, Esq.

Further in his evidence, Mr. Parent says :

Q. When it was decided to build the works on the canal, did you recommend Mr. Kennedy as the overseer for the same works ?—A. No, sir.

On page 197, in the course of Mr. Parent's evidence, the following appears :

Q. In Mr. Curran's evidence, page 249, I find the following words, given in Montreal, before the commission :—" When he went out in the passage, we met Mr. Kennedy, and he said : I don't want to undertake that work as a contractor, or something of that kind. Mr. Ogilvie said to him : That is all right now ; you take charge of the work, and you put it through and have our water back in the canal by the 1st of May, and you will make a name for yourself."

Again, at page 198, still continuing Mr. Parent's evidence, the following is reported :

Q. As a matter of fact, did Mr. Kennedy take full charge of the work ?—A. He did.

Q. Did you appoint the time-keepers ?—A. No ; Mr. Kennedy appointed them himself.

Q. Did he make any report to you about these appointments ?—A. No ; only in conversation.

Q. Was it not your duty to ask for this ?—A. Well, I did ask and never got anything.

Q. You say that you asked and never got anything ?—A. I never got any information that I asked for. On several occasions I wrote to Mr. Kennedy to keep me posted on everything that was going on. He said he had no time to scribble.

The Minister claims that he is not responsible, that Mr. Parent was in full charge of the work. Well, Sir, if hon. members of the House will kindly listen to what I am just going to quote from Mr. Parent's evidence, they will be able to estimate the value of the hon. Minister's contention :

Q. You received a letter from Mr. Kennedy, which has been produced here, in which he complained about Mr. Desbarats, and stated that, if any man dared to report to him or to anybody else except to himself (Kennedy), that that man would be dismissed immediately ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you report that state of affairs to the department here in Ottawa ?—A. I did, verbally.

Q. To whom ?—A. To the chief engineer, and, I believe, also to the Hon. Mr. Haggart, that I could not control Mr. Kennedy, that he would not carry out orders.

Well, Sir, in face of such evidence, is it possible to claim that Mr. Parent was in charge of the works ? As a matter of fact he was not in charge of the works. Mr. Parent acted, there is no doubt about it, the part of a weak man. He was guilty of a great deal of weakness, there is no possible doubt about it. He allowed himself to be overpowered, and that circumstance should be taken into account. He was dismissed from his office. Now it seems to me the Minister should not have made, under these circumstances, the accusation against him that he did. But, Sir, Mr. Kennedy was so much the boss of the work, he was so much the master of the whole thing, that he dared to write a letter in which he threatened every one who would not obey his orders, with instant dismissal. That letter has been read, it will be found at page 140, but I want to call attention to it again because the Solicitor General has given it a version that I cannot agree with at all. In that letter Mr. Kennedy writes :

I beg leave to acquaint you of the scandalous manner in which certain things have been conducted on the Lachine Canal.

Sir, the Solicitor General had admitted having received that letter, but he says he did not communicate the letter to the Government. Well, we must take his word for it, but it seems to me he has been very imprudent in giving it. If he was not exactly a member of the Government, he was at any rate very near being one. He has to-night spent an hour in saying : " What had I to do with it." In face of his own admission that he was made cognizant of the fact that a scandalous state of things existed, how can he say to-day : " what had I to do with it " ? Sir, he is the most responsible member of the whole Government, in my opinion. He was bound in honour to take that letter to the Minister, but he did not do it. He says that he kept the letter to himself for fear that poor Kennedy might be ill-treated. Let him be responsible for what he has done. Not only was Mr. Parent not in charge of the works, but I say that the Minister himself took charge of the works. An engineer was appointed to the works, as I have said, in the month of October, 1892, Mr. Desbarats. He had previously been engaged in making the plans for the works, in which he spent several months. He was appointed by Mr. Trudeau, and went to Montreal, but it was not very long before he quarrelled with the ill-treated Edward Kennedy. The evidence on this point, I think, is deserving of some attention. If you turn to page 67, you will find this :

Q. Had you any difficulty in checking this time, and when did that difficulty arise ?—A. About the beginning of February. Up to that time I arranged with Mr. Kennedy to receive every

day the lists from his time-keeper, showing the number of men on the works, and what work they were employed at. After that time he wrote Mr. Parent, refusing to furnish me with the lists of time any longer.

Q. That is up to the 18th of February ?—A. About that time ; the beginning of February. After that I received no further lists from his time-keepers, and I went around the works and got an idea of how many men were on the works, but I had nothing to check. I never saw the list. I did not check his list.

Q. Had you any conversation with Kennedy personally about this matter of checking the time-lists ?—A. Yes, several times.

Q. Why did he refuse ?—A. He said he was in sole charge of the work ; he said he was wholly responsible for the execution of the work, and he did not wish anybody to come and interfere on the work in any way with him.

Can the English language state a fact any clearer than that ? Then, again, we read on page 69, in answer to Mr. Lister :

Q. How did they get disagreeable ?—A. Because he objected to my going around. Anything he did on the work he was always objecting that I was interfering with him, that he had full control and nobody should be allowed to interfere with him. What I considered my strict duty, he objected to as interference in his work.

Again, I ask can anything be clearer than that ? Well, Sir, it was claimed last year, as it has been claimed this year, by the Minister and his friends, that Mr. Desbarats was never dismissed from the work. I do not want to detain the House very long on that point, but still it seems to me that it is so clear that he was dismissed, that it cannot be honestly contradicted. Let us take Mr. Desbarats' own evidence. He surely knew how he was treated. On page 74, we read :

Q. When you were relieved or dismissed, were you relieved from the employment of the Government altogether ?—A. Not at that time. My instructions, when I went down to Montreal, said that, when I would be through with my work at Montreal, I was to come back to the department at Ottawa. When I received my notice of being relieved on the Wellington Street bridge, I supposed I was to come back to Ottawa. I came back at the end of the month and reported to Mr. Schreiber, and he informed me I was out of employment.

Q. You were actually dismissed ; my use of the word was correct ? You returned thinking you were only changed from the Lachine Canal to employment here. When you came home, you were relieved altogether ?—A. Yes.

Q. How long did you remain out of the Government employ ?—A. About a month.

Q. Then you went to British Columbia, did you ?—A. Yes.

Q. You have had employment from the department ever since, and now ?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Tarte :

Q. How long had you been employed before ?—A. I had been in the Government employ about fifteen years.

Q. Nothing against you at all ?—A. I think not.

Q. No complaint at all ?—A. No complaints.

Well, Sir, the letters and the dates connected with the dismissal of Mr. Kennedy, are very interesting and important. I pointed out a moment ago that the trouble between Mr. Desbarats and the ill-treated Edward Kennedy began early in the month of February. The trouble arose because Mr. Desbarats, as he says, wanted to do his duty, he wanted to check the time-lists, he wanted to have an account of everything that was going on. Mr. Kennedy wrote to Mr. Parent, on the 4th February, a daring letter, in which he said that every man that would report to any one else than himself, would be immediately dismissed. What took place on the 6th, two days after Desbarats' reply to the ridiculous charge made against him by Mr. Kennedy ? A letter was written by Mr. Schreiber. The letter was read last year, but it deserves to be read again this year. It is as follows :—

Ottawa, 6th February, 1893.

E. H. Parent, Esq.,

Supt. Engineer, Lachine Canal, Montreal.

Dear Sir,—The subject of your pay-rolls in connection with the Wellington Street bridge has been under consideration, and it appears that the hon. Minister has given no authority for Mr. Desbarats' salary being increased from $105 to $150 per month, and I am to return the pay-roll for correction, and I am further to ask who employed an office boy, and by what authority it was done ?

The work of looking after the Wellington Street bridge should be done from your office without extra cost.

Yours truly,

COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER.

On the same day, 7th February, Mr. Parent answered that Mr. Desbarats had been appointed to the position by Mr. Trudeau, and Mr. Parent adds that Mr. Desbarats is absolutely necessary to him. On the 9th Mr. Parent wrote again, stating that in the condition of the work, Mr. Desbarats is an essential and necessary man. Here is what took place then. On 13th February, Mr. Schreiber wrote :

The department does not take the same view of this matter as you do, and I quite agree that one engineer can readily attend to the giving of the lines and levels at the bridges in Montreal, and look after the Lachine drain matters, and one only can be kept, and that is Mr. Papineau.

As a matter of fact, from the very day that Mr. Kennedy made a complaint against Mr. Desbarats, that engineer was dismissed. In face of these facts, how can hon. gentlemen opposite say that Mr. Parent was in charge of the work ? I say he was not in charge of the work, nor was Mr. Desbarats, but the work was in the hands of Mr. Kennedy, under the direct supervision of the Minister and his department. The department did more than that. After having dismissed Mr. Desbarats, they sent down one of their leading officers, Mr. Douglas. On 16th February, Mr. Douglas was in Montreal and examined the work, and made a report. It cannot be disputed that the Minister took charge of the work

himself; and the Minister says he is not guilty because he is not responsible. I think we need not discuss that matter further. But the Minister pleads that he has done everything possible to punish the guilty parties. So far, the Government have not been very successful. The Minister of Justice has made very violent speeches in the House, but his speeches and actions have not had very great effect. He has actually charged a judge in Montreal with miscarriage of justice. I ask if the miscarriage of justice does not rest with hon. gentlemen opposite? In 1891 we were face to face with a similar condition of affairs. There was wrong-doing discovered, and there were guilty men. Prosecutions were instituted in Ottawa. Why was Mr. St. Louis not prosecuted here? When it was announced that Mr. St. Louis was going to be prosecuted, we ascertained by the public press that some of his friends visited Ottawa and represented that it would not be fair to try St. Louis here. They preferred to have him prosecuted in Montreal, because Ottawa is not a safe place for guilty men. The Government know that here the Ontario Government can interfere, that they did so in the McGreevy, Connolly and Langevin transaction. There was no fear, however, they thought, in Montreal, far from it. I do not want to brand Mr. St. Louis as a guilty man—he has been found not guilty, and we must take the verdict as it is, but, at the same time, we must look at the facts as they are. I want to know who the guilty parties are, if there are such, as the Minister says, and why they have been dealt with in a different way. It has not been, so far, explained, and, in fact, it cannot be explained except in this way, that the Government did not want their political friends to be exposed as they had been exposed in the past. The Minister of Justice failed in Montreal, and why? I know something about this case, living in Montreal, and having followed this case closely before the Public Accounts Committee. There has been a widespread feeling that Mr. St. Louis has been singled out as one among a lot of parties of being guilty. It is said that the Government have been looking for guilty men. I am surprised they have not read with more care the report of their own commissioners. There is Mr. Kennedy, who has a career and a past. What do we find at page nineteen of the commission's report? That in his dealings with the Department of Railways and Canals, Mr. Kennedy had been guilty of fraud to a pretty large extent before his connection with this work on the Lachine Canal. What does the report say?:

A break occurred in the banks of the canal in June, 1891, a short distance above the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge near Lachine. The repairs were made by the lockmaster, Enright, and his men; the time was given by Enright to Baillairgé, on his visits to that part of the canal, as the custom was. Baillairgé did not himself see the work executed.

For this break, the amount of men's time furnished by Enright was $39.44. In addition, there was the cost of procuring stone for this repair. The pay-list for the time, as furnished by Enright, was prepared in the usual way. Subsequently, Mr. Kennedy ordered Baillairgé to make another pay-list for the break, inserting names of men working on other parts of the canal, which increased the amount to $582.69. According to Enright's evidence, the riprap of the bank had given way for 15 or 20 feet on each side of the canal. The value of the work done was about $100.

Here is a party who is known to hon. gentlemen opposite. They are looking for guilty men. Here is a clear case. I have seen officers dismissed and punished for a great deal less than that. Let us go on:

A break occurred in the canal bank at the Montreal woollen mill, just above St. Gabriel lock, which has cost $15,209.78, less $980 worth of timber used on Wellington bridge, and some material left on hand. An appropriation was made for this work, amounting to $17,000.

Three thousand dollars has gone into the pockets of somebody whom we do not know. The Government should have inquired into that. Well, Sir, that report is full of evidence against Mr. Kennedy. Here is one charge, for instance:

A large amount of plank has been charged to the "box drain," 356,081 feet, b.m.; of this only 18,714 feet, b.m., was used in the work. It is shown from the evidence of Mr. T. H. Trihey, that, of the plank above mentioned, 220,000 feet, b.m., was never purchased or delivered, though the account for this quantity of timber is certified to by Mr. Kennedy and other canal employees.

What have the Government got to say to that evidence, which has not been contradicted by anybody? Here is a case of clear stealing, just as clear stealing as the one of one and a half million feet of timber from the canal. I say one and a half million feet, but there is more. If there was a proper and careful examination into the amount of timber that was used in the Lachine Canal it would be found that it did not amount to more than 500,000 feet. There may have been two million feet of timber stolen, but we do not know where it is and nobody has been punished yet. I do not want to pronounce Kennedy, any more than any other man, guilty before he has had his trial. But I can explain to the hon. Minister of Justice why he has not succeeded in the prosecution. It is, first, because he has not chosen the place he should have chosen, and secondly, because he has caused public sentiment to believe that he prosecuted only one man and made an exception in favour of other men. A great deal of useless talk has been indulged in during this debate. We have been told by gentlemen opposite that on other occasions wrong-doings have been committed. There is no doubt about that, but as the leader of the Opposition has properly

asked: What have we got to do with that? Sir, if the Curran bridge stealings have been rendered possible, it is because the Government have set the example of forgiving the guilty men in the past. We had a great inquiry here in 1891, and the whole House was unanimous in declaring that the guilty men should be punished, but what did actually take place. The guilty men were found guilty, they were put in jail, but not for a very long time, and they were reprieved after a few weeks of suffering. They were civilly proceeded against by the Government to recover $600,000, and the Government after having waited for two or three years, has settled the case without receiving any money. It has been proved, and it has been admitted, that the men who had been unanimously declared guilty of fraudulent transactions by this Chamber were deep in the very councils of hon. gentlemen opposite. When it was announced that an election would take place in Quebec West, we saw the hon. Postmaster General, who in former times may not have had the same friends, going down to Quebec and advising with his friend Mr. Nicholas Connolly as to the best means of choosing the best candidate for that constituency. In face of such a state of things, and when the doors were wide open in the Lachine Canal works under the contract, the people who were tempted to steal said to themselves: After all, $1,000,000 were stolen in 1891, the guilty men have been put in jail, but they remained there only for a short time, and they have been elected to Parliament since. They naturally concluded that if for $1,000,000 stolen there was only to be got three months in jail, it would be very much less for stealing a quarter of a million, and they set themselves to try. They have tried, and they have got off scot free. I do not know if such a state of things is going to last very much longer in this country. The Government have a very powerful press and a very strong party. Through their press they address themselves to public sentiment, and on many occasions they have been lucky enough to make a certain part of the public believe that the thieves are the honest men and the honest men are the thieves. Yet, Sir, knowing the public opinion of my province as I think I know it, I state here on the floor of Parliament, that if we had a general election to-morrow the Government would be wiped out of existence, and even Conservatives admit that I speak the truth. There is an end to the defiance of public opinion. The Government have a powerful press, but as long as our voices are strong enough to go from county to county, we will be able, I hope, to cope with the subsidized press of hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Solicitor General has passed a great deal of eulogy upon himself. I do not want to interfere with the good opinion he has of himself, for he assuredly believes that he is the purest man of the pure Government we have to-day. He has boasted that he has brought actions for libel against newspapers that were criminal enough to mix his name with the Curran bridge. Well, Sir, those bridges have been named, not by us, but by public sentiment: The Curran bridges. As a matter of fact they are the Curran bridges, and for this reason: The hon. gentleman may have got from some newspapers some lines that have pleased himself, but there is a fact that he is not able to destroy. He is the very man who appointed Kennedy to the supervision of the work, and I charge him with lack of courage and manly feeling, in that he should have closed his speech by saying: About the merits of the case, I have nothing to say. He had only findings about himself to give to the House. Well, Sir, the merits of the case are known; it is a scandalous transaction, and the merits of the case belong to a large extent to the hon. gentleman. The Minister of Railways and Canals is constitutionally, and in a parliamentary way, responsible; there is no doubt about that. The whole Government are responsible for this transaction. But the man who is directly responsible to public opinion in Montreal is the hon. Solicitor General himself. He says he has taken an action for libel against newspapers. He has been very lucky in finding some newspapers which had not time to argue the case with him. But I would remind him that the Montreal "Herald" has been threatened by him, and it has answered with a plea which I challenge the hon. gentleman to meet. The Montreal "Herald" has stated that the hon. Solicitor General is responsible for everything that has taken place, and it has expressed its readiness to go on with the case if the hon. gentleman will go on with it himself. Now, Sir, my main object in rising was not to defend Parent, because his weakness cannot be defended; but my main object was to protest against the cowardly attempt—I beg to be allowed to use the word—to stamp the man as a dishonest man when he is not a dishonest man. The Government, for their own political purposes, overpowered him and appointed Kennedy in his place. One hon. gentleman has said that there was not merely one guilty man, but a conspiracy. Well, I ask if that conspiracy would have been possible if that man Kennedy, who signed all the pay-lists, had not been there. He put his name to every document, and when Mr. Desbarats wanted to see them he objected—why? Because he wanted to defraud the public treasury. And, Sir, the hon. Solicitor General has been mean enough to rise in his place and accuse Parent when Kennedy is the real culprit. I say that if any man should be proceeded against criminally, it is the hon. Solicitor General himself, because the man who hides

a crime is just as guilty as the man who commits the crime; and the hon. gentleman has been imprudent enough to admit that he screened from his own colleagues the letter he received from Kennedy, which appears on page 140 of the evidence, in which this scandalous transaction was denounced. I take my seat, Sir, feeling that I have discharged a public duty.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss several questions which have been very ably treated in the course of this debate. For instance, I do not intend to discuss the conduct of the hon. Postmaster General. What his conduct has to do with the matter we are discussing, it is hard for me to conceive. Nor do I intend to discuss the guilt or innocence of the hon. Solicitor General, or whether he should or should not be placed in the pillory. Nor do I intend to discuss the details of the work, a discussion for which my knowledge and experience unfit me. But, Sir, I intend to give a reason for the vote which I shall give on the present occasion. The question before us resolves itself into two parts. We are asked, in the first place, to pass a vote of want of confidence in the Government and to change the position of parties in this House; and in the next place, we are asked to condemn the hon. Minister of Railways. In regard to the latter, it is now, I believe, this very day, just 680 years since Magna Charta was passed, and a principle of English law as old as Magna Charta is that no man shall be placed on his trial twice for the same offence. Now, Sir, what is the case here? Last session we had a resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) almost identical with the present one—reciting the same reasons for coming to almost the same conclusion, with this difference, that instead of condemning, as this resolution does, the Minister of Railways personally, it condemned the Department of Railways and Canals. Now, a question of parliamentary law has been, I think, needlessly raised by the hon. gentleman who last spoke, and by some other hon. gentlemen. It is contended, as though anybody doubted or denied it, that a Minister is responsible for his department and the officers of his department. Why, Sir, nobody doubts that every Minister is responsible for his department and the officers of his department. Not only that, but nobody doubts that the whole Government are responsible for the Minister as long as he remains a member of the Government, and they are inferentially responsible for his department. Therefore, there is no question as to the position in which the hon. Minister of Railways stands here today. He stands here as a member of the Government, and in the assailing him hon. members are doing two things: they are wantonly raising an issue that was really raised in regard to the hon. Minister last year, and are attempting to put him on trial a second time, and they are challenging the confidence of the House in the Government just as they did last year. And, Sir, my hon. friends on the Opposition side of the House, in challenging the confidence of Parliament in the present Government, seem to me to be very imprudent. They assure us—we heard it but a moment ago from the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), whose accents are still vibrating in this Chamber—that they are about to cross to the other side of the House. So that this motion brings before us this issue: are we prepared to say that we will dismiss the men who now occupy the treasury benches and allow some of the men on the Opposition side to take their places? Not merely are the Opposition guilty of the imprudence of challenging a comparison with the present Government, but the hon. member for Wellington went the length of picking out some members of the Government and saying that they were not of the stature that statesmen should be. He forgets that by saying that he raises the question: What sort of men would be put in their places? Not merely do they challenge a comparison of that sort, but the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), with a temerity that would not be unwonted with him, or with an ignorance that would be reprehensible in a man of his experience, said that he defied anybody to produce a single instance in which the late Alexander Mackenzie had let a contract without a tender. Why, Sir, I will reply to his challenge at once, and give him an instance where he let a large and valuable contract without tender. Not only that, but I will give him instance after instance where he practically let contracts without tender. I can give instances where he let contracts without having Orders in Council for them, as he was bound to have by statute, for he did not let them to the lowest tenderer. If we have to go into questions of that sort, I rather think that in the end the issue between the present Government and the possible Government our friends would give us, if we were to let them into power, would be so stated that from the point of purity, which is one of those raised in the speeches, though not actually in the motion before the House—our present Government may defy comparison. And from the point of view of efficiency, which is raised in the motion before the House, I do not think we should gain an advantage by the change. When hon. gentlemen in the Opposition ask us to put them on the other side of the Speaker, the question arises: Will they give us an abler and more honest Government? There are two ways of coming to a conclusion. We can either look to their past and judge by that what would be their future; or we can look at them as they are, and pick out from among them the men who would be-

come Ministers of the Crown. If we go to the past, what do we see? Do we see a guarantee there that if we let the Reformers into power we should have an abler and more honest Government? Not at all, because since they obtained office in 1873, man after man of first-class eminence has passed away from them, but none have come into this House to take their places. Mr. Dorion, one of the greatest men Quebec has produced, a great statesman, a great jurist—where is his place to-day? Has it been filled? Mr. Blake, one of the greatest men Upper Canada has produced—his place, too, is empty. The late Hon. George Brown—where is the man to fill his place? Tom Moss, a great jurist and a man of real genius, who adorned these benches in 1874-75, in the early days when the Reform party came here flushed with victory—how is his place filled to-day? What has happened is this, that man after man in the foremost rank of the Reform party has, in the lapse of time, fallen out; and although I grant that statesmen still remain in that party, they are the statesmen who sat side by side with the men I have mentioned; and the places of these men, so far as their ability and capacity is concerned, are as empty to-day as if the constituencies they represented no longer returned representatives.

Mr. SCRIVER. As empty as they would be if they had returned Tories.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not at first catch what my hon. friend said, and did not understand that he was making a witticism, and the next time he does so, I would ask him to pass me over a little note of it, so that I should be prepared for the joke. I will come back across the House and look to the past of the Tories. Great men have fallen away from our ranks, eminent men have departed from us, but the same thing could not be said of the Conservative side of the House as I have said of the Reform side. Other men have come in, able, brilliant, gifted men; and I see some of them on the treasury benches and some on the back benches. I see future statesmen, men who are jurists of distinction here to-day, and men who will be well capable of taking the positions of the great men who have passed away from the Tory ranks; so that, Sir, if we apply that test, we should not be ready to give power into the hands of our opponents. But let us go a little closer. When I consider the part which an Opposition has to fill, I cannot help seeing how little our friends to the left of the Speaker make of it. Year after year, as I sit here, I observe that they make no impact whatever on the ranks of the Conservatives and no impression whatever on the House, and add blunder to blunder. This last motion of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is one of their latest, and also one of their crowning blunders, because he has made it patent to the whole Dominion to-day that the Opposition has nothing new to bring forward, and has to hark back to the old motion of last year in order to make believe that they have some scandal to bring against this Government. I am reminded sometimes, when I look round on my friends in the Opposition—because I am very close to them—of the celebrated scene described by one of the old Hebrew prophets. The prophet is led to the borders of a great valley of dry bones, and the spirit says to him: Son of man, can these bones live? Now, Sir, what happened? A miracle was performed. Flesh came to the bones and gristle to the limbs, and they stood up, an exceeding great army. But the prophet who, on that occasion, brought that about, because he was told to prophecy to the dry bones, had an advantage which I should not have if I were told to prophecy to the dry bones that I see around me. I will tell you what advantage he had. The great writer goes on to describe the immense valley of dry bones, and says—here the description would in no sense apply—they were exceeding many; but he goes on to add—and then the description applies—lo! they are exceeding dry. So if you make a comparison between the Grit Government 'in posse' and the actual Government of the Conservatives of to-day, admitting that we have had great losses, admitting that some of those who have taken the places of the men who have passed away could not have the same amount of experience—admitting that we may see gaps and miss a grandiose figure here and there, yet we have a Government that has the confidence of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, it has, as you will see by and by, and it may be that a very short time will give that grandiose and venerable tinge which marks some of the Governments of the past. My hon. friend (Mr. Scriver) feels so truly that what I am saying is sound that he looks pleased.

Mr. SCRIVER. I wonder what it all has to do with the question.

Mr. DAVIN. I will show him what it has to do with the question. This is a motion of want of confidence in the Government. If I vote for that motion, I vote for turning out this Government. But, to use very vulgar language but very forcible, I want to know, if I am going to throw out the water I have, what sort of water you will give me to replace it. If I help to turn out the men now in office, what men will you put there? If I were to descend to the method of discussion followed by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) I might discuss, personally, these hon. gentlemen. But I am not going to be personal. I respect my colleagues in this House of the Grit persuasion as well as those of the Tory creed. Take the leader of the Opposition. Whe-

ther before his face or behind his back, no word falls from my lips concerning him except such as expresses my appreciation of his charming character and exquisite urbanity. Sir, every one of us on both sides of the House honours the leader of the Opposition. Nevertheless, I am not sure, with our rugged and robust Tory conception of what the leader in the Dominion of Canada should be that he is quite the figure for Romeo. I might go on indefinitely, and consider the fitness of these hon. gentlemen. For instance, I suppose the hon. member for North Wellington would be in the Ministry. And he would be a graceful figure. I suppose he would be Minister of Railways. Or if we had a department for superintending the department of the Auditor General, he could be placed there. But after you have taken away one or two striking figures, you have a very poor crowd to march through Coventry with. Let us go back a few years. We were challenged by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) to produce a single case in which a contract was let by the Mackenzie Government without tender. Sir, I turn to the report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Commission, contract No. 11—steel rails. This contract was the result of offers by Messrs. Cooper, Fairman & Co., without competition. Now, Sir, I turn to page 207 and I find:

The evidence shows that there was no such rise in the market price of rails as that which, in Mr. Cooper's letter to Mr. Buckingham——

Secretary to Mr. Alexander Mackenzie.

—of the 14th January, is stated to have taken place, and no such advances in Mr. Cooper's letter of the 29th December, 1874, to Mr. Mackenzie, was mentioned as probable after New Year.

* * Mr. Mackenzie stated——

I shall have to refer to this again, as it bears upon another point of the controversy.

--that in awarding contracts, his "decision was invariably not only in concert with, but in acquiescence of the views of the department," in consequence of which statement Mr. Trudeau, who had been the deputy minister at the time of this contract, was recalled.

That contract was one that was let without tender. Turning to pages 190 and 195, I find reference to contract No. 8. Notification had been made by Mr. Braun, the secretary of the Department of Public Works, and in regard to that, the chairman of the commission says:

This notification is made as if Cooper, Fairman & Smith had made more than one tender on behalf of the Mersey Steel and Iron Company, which was not the fact.

I want to call the attention of the House to what is here told that they received the contract, not merely without tender, but in a surreptitious manner:

In this and in many other instances throughout the contracts concerning steel rails and bolts and nuts and transportations, it appears that an understanding existed from time to time between this firm and the Department of Public Works, beyond that which is conveyed by letters or paper on record. The tenders above set out as made by Messrs. Cooper, Fairman & Co., relate to delivery at Duluth, Thunder Bay, French River, Liverpool and Vancouver, none of them being named in the advertisement as places at which delivery would be accepted. After the tenders were received, Mr. Fleming describes the effect of some of these tenders in his schedule of the 19th November, as if it was then expected that the department would entertain them, though no competition had been invited except for delivery at Montreal. There was, in fact, not more than one tender in the name of the Mersey Company. The other tenders were by Messrs. Cooper, Fairman & Co., in their own name, and were not for delivery at Montreal.

The proceedings which followed this notification of the 2nd December, show that it was thereby intimated, that not only the offer made in the name of the Mersey Company, for 10,000 tons to be delivered at Montreal, but also the offer of Cooper, Fairman & Co. for an additional 10,000 tons, with a price for delivery at Duluth and French River, was accepted, though no competition had been invited for the points thus named by Messrs. Cooper, Fairman & Co., and the Messrs. Perkins, Livingston, Post & Co. had made an offer of delivery at the same points, lower than that of Messrs. Cooper, Fairman & Co.'s tender.

According to the above-mentioned letter——

I am still reading from the same judgment, page 193.

--of the 4th December, 1874, Mr. Fairman, of Cooper, Fairman & Co., intended to leave Montreal for England, and in his evidence before us he stated, that he was in England, and heard from the president of the company that they would not execute the contracts as sent to them; but he knew of no authority from the Government which permitted a new one to be executed in a different shape.

* * * * * * * * * *

We find that a tender made by Messrs. Cooper, Fairman & Co., in their own name, for delivery at points other than those at which competition had been invited, was accepted, and that its terms were included in a proposed contract with the Mersey Company for 20,000 tons of rails; that the Mersey Company refused to comply with these terms and elected to execute a contract for the rails alone, without the accessories named in the tender on which the contract was based; that the action of the department throughout the negotiations with Cooper, Fairman & Co., concerning maters connected with this contract, was calculated to give, and did give, that firm an undue advantage over other competitors in subsequent transactions; that, in obtaining this contract in its final shape, the contractors—the Mersey Steel and Iron Company—got no undue advantage, and that in awarding it the department purchased the material covered by it at the lowest available offer.

And all through, Sir, you will find that this Cooper, Fairman & Co. firm, in which there was a person of great interest to the Prime Minister gets an advantage every time, and that in this case it got a contract for 5,000 tons of steel rails without any competition whatever. Now, at page 177 is the finding

regarding contracts 6 to 11. The commission says :

The evidence leads us to the following conclusions :—That a large portion of the 50,000 tons now under consideration, was purchased without any defined view as to the times at which they would be wanted, and without reference to those times, but solely upon the ground that the rise in the price of rails was to be expected ;

That such purchase was made by direction of the Minister of Public Works, without the authority of an Order in Council.

Now, if you turn to the Act you will find that the Minister ought to have had an Order in Council for doing what he did :

That the said purchase was urgently recommended by Mr. Fleming, the engineer-in-chief, for the alleged reason that the rail market was not likely to be thereafter so favourable to purchasers as it then was ;

That the Minister adopted without question the view of Mr. Fleming upon the probable future state of the rail market.

* * * * * * * * * *

And later on :

That, if the foundation of Mr. Fleming's recommendation had been inquired into, he could not have done sufficient to induce an ordinary business man to purchase on speculation at that time steel rails at the price paid for these.

It is fresh in our memory how much was lost by this transaction, and here is a diagram pointing out how all these rails, most of them not needed, that were brought there at great expenses, were bought at a price of between £10 and £11 a ton and left to rust at Thunder Bay and at Vancouver. They were bought in a falling market, which went down to between £5 and £6 in 1878. The calculations of the amount that this country lost for ever in consequence of that steel rail transaction, on these five contracts, have been made again and again, and exposed before the people. I have shown that some of these contracts were made without tenders, replying to the challenge of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), and I have indicated a state of things that was extraordinary. I remember well with what a surprise it came upon me. I did not belong to any party at the time. So far as party politics in this country was concerned, my mind was a tabula rasa. But I remember that when this Government got into power, before the sense of newness in their ministerial clothes was gone, they had entered upon an orgie of corruption whose rank offense smelt to heaven throughout the Dominion. I knew something then of politics generally, and I moved by spontaneous indignation wrote an article in one of the periodicals of the time, assailing the Mackenzie Government. I remember the article was quoted in the "Mail" newspaper and attributed to Mr. Goldwin Smith. I suppose because they thought it would add to its effectiveness rather than gifting me with the style of diamond point of that gentleman. Scarcely had they come into power when they had lost the confidence of Canada, partly because of their corruption, which developed rapidly, but partly also because of the glaring incapacity which characterized every step of their administration and every movement of their policy. So that when they challenge our confidence in the present Government by a motion of want of confidence on a still scent like this, we have a right to go back to the past, and to look into the future : and if we go back to the past and look to the possibilities of the future, and compare the conditions of both sides at present, I do not think we will be ready to change an efficient Government for a possibly inefficient Government such as the Opposition would give us. Now, there is one point connected with the details of the conduct of the Minister of Railways that I want to bring forward. The Minister of Railways is condemned because he took the advice of Mr. Schreiber in calling for tenders for labour. It certainly was an extraordinary advice, and as the leader of the Opposition pointed out in his speech, the Minister of Railways seemed himself to have been staggered by it. Sir, I suppose there are two propositions that can be laid down in regard to the deference that a Minister should give to the officers of his department. In a department like that of Railways, or Public Works, in any department where scientific men or experts are employed, I think we may lay down the proposition that on any scientific question, on any question where expert knowledge is necessary in order to form an opinion, the Minister ought to defer to the officer who has the requisite expert or scientific knowledge. In the next place, where it is a pure business question upon which a man unskilled in science, not an expert, can form an opinion as well as any scientific man or any expert, then we may expect, and we ought to expect, that the Minister shall give us his own judgment. We do not look to the officer then, we do not look to the expert or the scientific man, but we look to the Minister, and we are entitled to his opinion. But, Sir, are hon. gentlemen opposite, who followed the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, in a position to condemn the Minister of Railways or any other Minister if he deferred absolutely to the advice of an officer of the department, even on a business question ? Let me read to you what Mr. Mackenzie said when examined on that question. It is found on page 169 :

Mr. Mackenzie was asked what appeared to be the reasons in support of the view that the price of the day made it expedient to buy on this occasion. He said he knew of none except the fact, and being asked what that was, he said the price had reached a lower point than it had ever reached, and that Mr. Fleming thought it likely to rise.

Having bought this 50,000 tons of steel rail and subjected this country to the loss of a

million dollars for ever, he was asked, What on earth made you buy the rails, then? He made answer that he supposed it was the price, it was thought the price was good; although in 1868-69 and 1870, rails had gone down some 300 per cent lower than they were at that time.

An hon. MEMBER. You had better go back to 1850.

Mr. DAVIN. But you don't see the argument. The argument is this, that if in previous years they had gone much lower than they were then, it was an absurd thing to buy 50,000 tons of steel rails that you did not want at a price three or four times higher than they were before. As a fact, we know that they were lower; and he was asked the question why he did this? Now, one of two things. I am not going to reflect on Mr. Mackenzie. I respect his memory. I am not going to be guilty of the conduct of those barbarous ages that exhumed men and gibbetted them afresh. I am not going to do anything of that sort: but I say that we are discussing a great question here in which the fate of the country is involved, and we have to speak plainly. One of two things, either there was corruption or inefficiency in the purchase of this 50,000 tons of steel rails. When pressed on this point, he said:

He knew of none except the fact, and being asked what that was, he said the price had reached a lower point than it had ever reached——

Which of course was not correct:

—and that Mr. Fleming thought it likely to rise. The tenor of his evidence was, that throughout this matter he leant upon Mr. Fleming's judgment concerning the state of the market, and its probabilities in the future, and being asked whether he had not deemed it expedient to inquire into Mr. Fleming's reasons more deeply than merely by hearing what was his conclusion, his answer was: "Well, of course, I adopted his reasons." Mr. Fleming stated that he had no doubt that he had said to Mr. Mackenzie: "You cannot purchase too many rails at that price."

So here we have the late Prime Minister of the Reform party stating that in committing this extraordinary act of folly, or this extraordinary act of corruption, he was guided absolutely, although it was as much a business transaction as weighing out a pound of sugar, by the advice of his officer. Now, applying that to the Minister of Railways. What the Minister of Railways did was to take the advice of Mr. Schreiber on a matter of a quasi business character, but also on a matter that an expert could best speak of. And when he said to Mr. Schreiber that this way of getting labour seemed to him a most unheard of way, that he could not understand it. Mr. Schreiber told him, as you will see by the evidence, that it was a common way, that it was well-known, and that it was the best way of getting the labour. The Minister of Railways was anxious that the work should be rapidly done, and if he had refused in that case to be guided by the advice of his officer on a quasi business and a quasi expert transaction, and if the work had been delayed, he might fairly be condemned. So that if you are to justify Mr. Mackenzie at all then you must triumphantly justify the Minister of Railways. Unless you are going to condemn Mr. Mackenzie as absolutely guilty or absolutely imbecile you must acquit the Minister in taking the advice of Mr. Schreiber of the least possible fault of judgment whatever. I will go thus far into the transactions to deal with the letting some work without tenders. Section 13, of chap. 36, of the Revised Statutes, says:

The Minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of work, except in case of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

That last part if we wish to use colloquial language, lets out the Minister entirely from the sweeping condemnation that in regard to this one matter was brought against him by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). But in regard to steel rails, and contracts which were given to tenders two or three steps higher than the lowest, what are we to say of the late Premier of the Reform party, when in the very next section of the Act we are told that under such circumstances you must get an Order in Council, which he did not get. So that unless hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to condemn the late Reform Prime Minister, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, they cannot in these two points condemn, nay, they are bound owing to their adoration of the memory of that able man, on these initial stages of these unfortunate transactions, to endorse the present Minister of Railways. Let me say one word as to why mainly I have been impelled to speak on this matter. I have shown there is nothing new in the present motion. It is practically the same as the motion brought forward last year by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I marched out of that door, and did not vote on it. I would not vote want of confidence in the Government.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Certainly, I would not vote want of confidence in the Government, and I would not vote approval, with what light I had, of the transactions that had taken place in the Railways and Canals Department. Why do I rise to-night and speak, and speak as strongly as I can against the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)? I will tell the House why. It is not merely that there is nothing new in that motion—aye, there is

something new. There is a good deal of truth in what the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said, that this is a rehash of the joint of last year. But there is something new and spicy in it, and that is the spice of personal malignity. I say this, that the fact that I see personal malignity against the Minister of Railways is chiefly the reason which has impelled me to come here and protest against this attack.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I hear a derisive cheer from the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). That hon. gentleman and his political kin will by and by get up and talk of being British subjects with British traditions. Where will you find in the history of the British Parliament a case in which a man has been arraigned once in Parliament, and Parliament has acquitted him, as this Parliament acquitted the Minister of Railways last year, and then cowardly, meanly, pettily and impotently, a member starts up and makes a similar charge, only more personal, an impotent sting in a malicious hand—and that is all it is.

Mr. CASEY. Allowing the hon. gentleman all poetical license, I think the words cowardly, maliciously, and meanly are unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the words, cowardly, and maliciously, are applied to an hon. member, they are certainly out of order.

Mr. DAVIN. From what you know of me, Mr. Speaker, I need hardly say it is impossible that I should apply those terms to any member of this House. I applied them to the sting, I applied them to the motion, and if applying them to the motion is out of order, I will endeavour to get some chromatic phrase which will express my meaning, and I certainly withdraw anything that is unparliamentary.

Mr. CASEY. I say, that those words applied to the motion apply to the mover. You cannot call a motion cowardly, and the term must be applied to the mover.

Mr. DAVIN. Is the hon. gentleman going to make a speech ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is discussing, I suppose, a point of order.

Mr. CASEY. And the other hon. gentleman will please keep his seat. For the credit of the House we must not permit these words to go on our records as permissible, and as such as may be used in debate. I must ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on this point.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not quite catch the point attempted to be made by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey), nor do I quite understand the distinction which the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has drawn between language applied to a motion and to a mover of a motion.

Mr. DAVIN. The easiest way is to withdraw everything unparliamentary. I make a clean sweep ; the smallest fringe or dust on the wing of a single phrase that is unparliamentary is withdrawn. I will go further and pronounce an eulogy on the hon. member for Queen's, and say that in the courage displayed in his motion he is only equalled by the diginity of his demeanour in debate ; and in regard to the hon. member who called me to order, he is the Rupert of debate of the Reform party. He enters in where angels would fear to tread, although there is nothing angelic about him. To return to our mutton, as the French say : I say, Mr. Speaker, that the chief reason that impelled me to take part in this debate was that this is a personal attack. The motion is accepted as a vote of want of confidence by the leader of the House. We cannot get over this, that it is not merely an attack on the Department of the Minister of Railways, as was last year's motion, but it is a personal attack, and it is very hard indeed to eliminate from a personal attack made, after sleeping over the subject for twelve months, with nothing new now introduced, the element of malice, and I recur to the statement I made, that under British law no man can be put on his trial twice for the same offence. The Minister of Railways was put on his trial last year and he was acquitted, and it is a paltry thing as it is an impotent thing, and I conceive it capable of being regarded, although I am afraid to regard it as malicious, for fear of being unparliamentary, but a merely vulgar mind might regard it as malicious to come forward at this hour of the day to make a personal attack on the Minister of Railways. But the Minister of Railways can laugh, and the Government can laugh at it. It is not merely the last but it is the greatest of the many tactical blunders that have been made this session by my hon. friends of the Opposition. From the word go, Ichabod has been written on everything they did. The stars in their courses have fought against Sisera. They have made mistake after mistake, and I repeat, this is their crowning blunder, for it is an evidence to the people of the country that they have nothing to give them now but scandal, and that in the way of scandal they can only give them cold mutton.

Mr. CASEY. I must acknowledge the compliment paid me by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) that I have the courage to rush in where angels fear to tread, but I never knew before that angels had any special timidity about treading on the hon. gentleman's corns. I must say that my interruption of the hon. gentleman's speech was purely for the sake of preserving the precedents of the House, and not because it mattered at all what the hon. gentleman

might be pleased to term, the conduct of this side of the House. But, Sir, what I rose for on this occasion was to consider, rather the remarks of the Minister of Railways, than those of the poet of East Assiniboia.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order now, as it is a case of order. Is that a proper way to refer to an hon. member. I think he should refer to the hon. member for West Assiniboia, and I ask the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) must refer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) by his constituency.

Mr. CASEY. I beg to apologize, Sir. I am aware that in alluding to the hon. gentleman as a poet, I not only did what was unparliamentary, but what might hardly be considered true. I therefore, in the most unreserved fashion beg to withdraw the statement that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is a poet. I intend, Sir, rather to discuss a business matter now.

The Minister of Railways, at the close of last night's debate, condescended to answer on the question of his responsibility in this matter, and that is the only point I care to discuss. I rather sympathize with the poor man who had found himself in such a false position. He (Mr. Haggart) told us in the most lamentable voice that it is a great pity that attacks should be made upon him, and that he is the last man who has anything to fear, or to be responsible for, in these transactions. He admits, as he admitted last year, that the whole affair is a clear case of steal, but he says that the blame should not be laid on him. That is the question which the House has to discuss.

We all know that it was a case of steal,but we want to know who was responsible for allowing this steal, and we hold that the Minister of Railways, and the Government of which he is a member, are responsible, not only for permitting these steals, but as we believe, for arranging things purposely so that this stealing should be possible. We believe that the facts of the case show that arrangements were made to make stealing easy, possible and convenient, and that the stealing was done by Mr. St. Louis for the purpose of making the application, which it was proven afterwards he made of that money, of contributing it to the election fund for the province of Quebec. The accusations against the Government are that they allowed Mr. St. Louis to steal this money for the purpose of having it put into the hat for the election.

Now, what does the Minister of Railways say in regard to his responsibility? He says that this is an attack, not upon the Government, nor upon him. In that he is mistaken. If he will read the resolution he will see that it is an attack upon him as head of the department, and therefore, upon the Government of which he is a member. He says:

It is an attempt to hold me responsible for all the acts and for all that has occurred with reference to the Curran bridge.

Certainly it is the intention to hold the Minister responsible for what goes on in his department. The Minister denies the charge that he violated the law by letting the contracts otherwise than by public tender, and he says:

In recommending to award the contract as I did, I recommended it for the reasons I gave in the memo. to Council, and it was the Council that approved of it.

But the Minister must be responsible for his recommendation to Council, and his recommendation was to take a course that is contrary to law. This work was not let by public tender, but by private tender, in a manner which appears to us to be highly suspicious. The Minister refers to section B, and he challenges attack upon that point. He said:

If he (Mr. Davies) or any one will make the statement that I had any concern with the Section "B" contract, I will give him all the investigation he likes for the purpose of inquiring into it.

In answer to that, it is sufficient to say that the year before last when the charge was made on the responsibility of a member of this House, the Minister refused to submit to an investigation. His boast now in regard to it is, therefore, very hollow. The Minister also says that the charge now made in the amendment is vague and general, and is merely a charge of incapacity and inefficiency. I think the boot is on the other foot. The charges are very specific, and the only defence that has been made is that of abusing the attorney for the prosecution on this side of the House. Now, let us come to the gist of this poor gentleman's complaints, and the sad way in which he calls for the sympathy of the House. He says:

If the officers of my department act wrongly, if frauds are committed on the Lachine Canal or elsewhere, if parties steal and defraud, if the supply of labour is conducted by a process of collusion between time-keepers on the work, am I responsible?

Well, I should certainly think he is responsible. He says, in effect, if my engineers allow people to steal, if the friends of the Minister of Public Works insist upon stealing with the assistance of the engineers of this department, am I to be responsible? Well, Sir, I am very sorry for it, but I am afraid he is responsible. If he cannot prevent stealing by the friends and relatives of another Minister, if he cannot induce the officers of his department to prevent such stealing, there is a course open to the Minister to remove all responsibility. Let him resign his

place as Minister of Railways, and he will not be responsible any longer. But if he, as Minister of Railways, is not responsible for the things which were going on in his department, I do not know what the meaning of responsible government is. The Minister further said:

Is the deputy head or engineer of the department responsible? All they can do is to find out what crimes are committed and see that the parties receive just punishment.

Is that all they can do? Is it all the Minister of Railways can do—to find out crimes after they are committed and then secure the punishment of them? I hardly think so. I think it is his duty to prevent these crimes.

In common with the House and the country I fail to see where the punishment comes in. It has not lit on Mr. St. Louis, nor has it lit on the engineers who allowed these frauds to be committed, beyond their dismissal; and I say that until the guilty parties have been punished, the Minister of Railways must be held responsible, even on his own contention. Then the hon. gentleman goes on to give a lot of explanations. He says:

Since I have been in the department, the Minister has not certified to payments, and the same is the practice in the Department of Public Works. The Minister does not know of payments being made. It is quite a mechanical process. The accounts are certified to by the engineer in charge of the particular work, they come to the superintendent engineer in my department, and, if they are within his knowledge he certifies them to be correct; then they go to the Auditor General, and he sees that the vouchers in regard to the work are perfect and complete. I never saw a single account paid, either by the Minister of Public Works or by the Minister of Railways.

He never saw a single account paid; he never inquired into the propriety of paying a single account, and he says he is not responsible if this money is wasted or stolen in the most glaring manner under his very eyes! But he finds a scapegoat. He knows that some one is responsible, and, as it is not the responsible Minister, he says:

The parties are paid by cheque from the department, and the party who is supervising and checking and is responsible as to the payments is the Auditor General.

Therefore, this vote of censure ought, I suppose to be directed against the Auditor General, and not against the responsible Minister of the department! Mr. Speaker, I hope it will not be unparliamentary to call such an argument as that puerile. If it is, I will say it is very childish to ask us to believe that the Auditor General, whose only business is to see that the payments are kept within the estimates and are made for the accounts for which they are voted, is responsible for such a waste of public money as occurred in this case, and that the Minister in actual charge of the work is not responsible. He refers to the fact that the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) had charged that the moneys were paid after the irregularities had been made known to the department. It is not disputed that the moneys were so paid; but the hon. Minister's only excuse was that he did not know about these payments, that he did not know that anything was wrong until after the commission was appointed. If he did not know that anything was wrong or suspected, why did he appoint a commission? And he goes on to say that he did not know much about it even after the commission had reported.

Well, Sir, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman, if he did not know that money was being stolen in the most flagrant manner after reading the report of that commission, I must say I do not think he is fit to fill his position as Minister of Railways. But I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman did know. Knowing his business capacity, I am satisfied that after reading the report of that commission he must have known that corruption was going on, that money was being stolen, and yet he permitted the payments to be made. He must have known that those payments were being made, and he did not issue orders to stop them. Then, said the hon. Minister:

The charge against me is a personal one, that the Minister is responsible for the amount. The Minister is not responsible. If he had supervision of moneys, he might be responsible. If I saw every amount paid, the position would be different; but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) knows I am not responsible, and that no payment was made by my authority after 26th April. After the assurance I have given him, he will relieve me of all responsibility.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that he will or that the country will. The hon. Minister may throw the blame upon whomsoever he likes; but after his acknowledgment that he did not know what was being done with the public moneys paid under this contract, that he did not know of the corruption that was going on—and even his statement in that respect must be qualified in some degree by the report of the commission—the country will believe that he was responsible for permitting what he did not perhaps directly authorize. It may be that the Minister thinks he has a defence which he does not like to present to the House. It may be that he feels that he has been unfairly used by some of his colleagues; it may be that he thinks that the relatives of one of his colleagues were getting rather too rich a thing; it may be that one of his colleagues managed, by some side influence, to get a rather better thing for a relative of his than the Minister of Railways was aware of at the time. It may be that he feels ill-used on that account, although he does not like to say so in the House. There again, is the remedy. If he thinks he was not treated as he should have been, as a member of the Cabinet, he can resign or insist on the resignation of his colleague. If he does not take this course, he is responsible. His reiterations in that respect will not save him from the consequences of what has taken

place. Then the hon. Minister makes the very weak argument that things would be very different in England, that if frauds were committed on the ordnance or supply departments, no charges would be brought against the officers of the departments. Would they not? I rather think they would. If the system of audit or the system of management prove wrong, would there be any charge, he asks, made against the political head of the department. Rather, the heaviest kind of a charge, the charge of inefficiency of corruption. But the Minister of Railways thinks not. He said:

No, not one member of the House, no matter how bitter an opponent he might be against the Government, would impugn the honour of the department without the most grave and serious reasons.

We do not impugn the honour of the Government without the most grave and serious reasons. When a Minister admits a clear steal of $200,000, or the reabouts, in connection with his department, that is a very grave and serious reason for impugning either the honour or business capacity of the head of the department. We do so impugn it, and we know that the country will be with us in that accusation. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says that this charge is being pressed with personal malignity on this occasion. I fail to see any trace of it in the motion itself, or in anything I have heard during the discussion. There is no such motive in my mind; I have no personal malignity against the Minister of Railways, and no malignity against the Government. But if responsible Government is to mean anything in this country, it is the duty of the country's representatives to see that open stealing cannot exist in connection with a department without the Minister in charge being held responsible.

Mr. MULOCK. Many explanations have been made of the matters complained of here. The last one advanced by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was somewhat an echo of that of the Minister of Railways, namely, that a Minister of the Crown is not to be held responsible if it can be shown that he has acted upon the advice of his department. The hon. member for West Assiniboia pleaded that as an excuse, and he further gave as another defence that the Minister had already been acquitted by the vote of this House last session. But, forgetting immediately that if the vote of this House were a discharge, that principle should apply to the predecessors of the Minister of Railways, he proceeded to review the political career of the late Liberal Government, and cited offences charged against that Government, and for which it had been tried, not only by the House, but by the country. Charges made nearly twenty years ago, passed upon by the final court of appeal in the land, he vamped up again so that evidently the conduct of the Liberal Government is never to be barred by any limitation of time. The hon. gentleman proceeded to give us his description of the men in office, and he was very profuse in his admiration of his colleagues on the right of the Speaker, forgetting that a short time ago, likewise from his place in the House, he had exhausted his extensive vocabulary in giving expression to his contempt or, at all events, to his opinion, in no respectful manner, of the character of the Cabinet, which he described as a Cabinet of antiques. And we all remember how graphically he described the character and position of one of those high officials on the treasury benches—the Controller of Customs. To-day, however, words fail him in depicting how brilliantly they fulfil his ideal of everything that is required to form an ideal Cabinet. He told us that he did not believe a Minister of the Crown should be held responsible for an act of his department, when he acted upon advice. In 1891, there was a motion offered to this House with regard to the transaction known as the Connolly-McGreevy affair. That motion, moved by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) contained the following paragraph with reference to the letting of public works:—

In addition to the foregoing reasons, the House has no hesitation in recording its opinion that, judged by the well-known constitutional rule which makes a Minister responsible to Parliament for the administration of the department over which he presides, the late Minister of Public Works, irrespective of the considerations dealt with in the last preceding paragraph, cannot be absolved from his ministerial responsibility, and in that regard merits the censure of the House.

What was the opinion of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia on that question? He never indulged in anything but superlatives, and for that proposition, three years ago, he had nothing but words of admiration. He said:

I had myself prepared an amendment, but when I saw that prepared by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I thought it was a better one than mine. The question whether the Minister is guilty is a small one compared with the immense issues at stake.

After making further uncomplimentary references to the then Minister of Public Works, he said:

The motion of my hon. friend from Simcoe is the best, and I intend supporting it.

But he always halts and fails to perform. He reverses the example of a former member who considered his opinions his own, but his vote his party's, the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia considers he owns both his opinions and his votes. After declaring that he would upport the amendment of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), he took to his heels and failed

to support it. He went out of the Chamber when called upon to make good his declarations, and probably to-night will be found doing the same. I should like to ask what possible excuse there can be for the transactions that took place in 1893, whereby a large sum of money was lost to the people of Canada; by alleging that other mistakes or errors, or whatever they may be called, had occurred twenty years before. I do not propose to be drawn away from the issue by wasting time upon any such unfair argument. My idea is that every Government which is unfaithful to the people should be made to give place to another, and that the people should continually exercise wise supervision and turn out a Government the moment it becomes incapable or untrustworthy. The hon. gentleman for Glengarry (Mr. McLellan) certainly dealt a most severe blow against this Government, which has been in office for so many years, for he said they were honest at the commencement only. If that be so, this Government has been falling from grace ever since 1878, and one can readily imagine how far it has fallen in the opinion of the hon. member for Glengarry. Stripped of all verbiage, what is the question before the House? In 1892 the Government represented to Parliament that it was necessary to rebuild a couple of bridges in Montreal, which involved an expenditure of about $175,000, and Parliament was called upon to place that amount at the disposal of the Government. The facts are that we have already expended $594,000 upon that work. I do not propose to cite controversial evidence or to make statements that I think can be, in the slightest degree, challenged. Therefore, in seeking to ascertain beyond controversy the amount lost, I will accept only the evidence offered by the defence. I consider it as a serious objection that the Government should have asked Parliament for $175,000 representing that that would be the total charge upon the country, and that that amount should have grown to $394,000 at least, actually paid out to date, with an unsettled claim for $60,000 or $70,000 more. Leaving aside the fact that the Government were not properly informed as to the nature of the work, or the proposed cost at that time, I would take the transaction as it developed subsequently. It was said that changes of the plans were made. There is no question of that. It is said that the original estimate of $175,000 was too small. I will admit that for the sake of argument. And I turn to one witness, about whom there can be no question. I refer to Mr. Douglas, the Government engineer who examined this work, and who, with his colleagues, the other commissioners, investigated the work and reported that, at the outside, it could have been built by competent contractors, less the superstructures, for $200,000; and adding the cost of the superstructures, the total cost of the work, performed under the same conditions, would not have exceeded $260,000. Now this is the highest sum at which this work has been estimated by any person, even on behalf of the Government. There were no engineering difficulties; the work was simply to pull down two old bridges over the canal at Montreal, one a bridge used for carrying railway trains and another for passengers and carriages, and to rebuild them in a manner more suitable to modern demands. The railway bridge was about 230 feet in length and 14 feet wide; the passenger and carriage bridge was some 48 feet wide. The work was simple, and it was to be carried on in a city of a couple of hundred thousand people supplying all material and labour that could possibly be required for the work. There has been paid out upon that work in cash $394,000. Taking the outside estimate of the cost of the work $260,000, and we have an admitted loss to the country of $134,000, even if the country is never called upon to make good the claim still outstanding and in litigation. Therefore, in discussing the question as to how this country came to lose $134,000, it is not necessary to refer to the expenditure in connection with the investigation into that loss Trials have taken place, suspected persons have been brought to trial, not only once but twice, and have been acquitted. According to the reasoning of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) the moment there was a failure of justice, and one of these accused persons was acquitted, the Government must never again attempt to secure justice against them. In discussing this question, as I said, I do not intend to use controversial testimony, and therefore will simply quote from the records of the Government themselves. What were the steps taken in order to secure the performance of the work? The resolution charges the Minister of Public Works with having disregarded business principles. No public tenders for the work were demanded, either for supplying material or for supplying labour. The best that could be said is that tenders were privately invited from half a dozen persons in the city of Montreal for the supply of a portion of the labour for one of the works, and that not the chief work. No tenders were invited for a large portion of the material—the lumber that went into the work. Over $45,000 worth of lumber was bought by private purchase without competition. Parliament voted the money for this work in May, 1892. The Government ought to have known at that time what they wanted; and yet we do not find that they have any definite plan matured for carrying out the work until about a year afterwards. First they proposed to have the canal deepened to 14 feet. After having had estimates upon that basis, they changed their specifications to 18 feet. Then, after wasting valuable

time and getting into the middle of the winter they changed the estimates again to 22 feet. Now, I ask any business man if that showed any great business aptitude in regard to public works? Not only were they changing their plans, which ought to have been more or less matured when they asked Parliament in the previous year for money, but they undertook the performance of the work at a very advanced period of the winter. Now, it should be borne in mind that this work was not a work of any pressing necessity. It had been asked for for years, it was simply become necessary in a relative degree, because of the increasing traffic in that district. But there was nothing urgent that it should be carried out in the winter of 1893 unless all the plans and arrangements had been completed for completing the work in an economical and efficient manner. Nevertheless, the Government seem to have neglected every business precaution and every business principle for performing the work in a reasonable way. Instead of commencing the work as soon as navigation closed about 1st December, they lost valuable time, and it was not until the second week of March, less than two months before the opening of navigation, that they began active operations. Now, Sir, having privately invited tenders for a small portion of the required labour—and the commissioners doubt the bona fides of the competition—this extraordinary plan for performing the work was assented to. I read for the information of the House, something which has already been read once but which will bear reading again, to show the sort of bargain which was made by one of the departments and ratified by the Government. I quote from the judgment of Judge Desnoyers as to the terms on which this contract was made:

Mr. St. Louis' contract was extremely favourable to him. He was allowed $4 a day for a foreman stonecutter, day time, and $6 a day for the same foreman for night or overtime; $8 for the same foreman on Sundays, and at the rate of $12 for the same foreman for Sunday overtime. He was allowed $5 a day for a double team, and $10 a day for the same double team on Sundays. He was allowed $2.50 a day for the use of a derrick, day time, $3.75 for the use of the same derrick, night or overtime, and at the rate of $7.50 a day for the same derrick for Sunday overtime, and so forth on the same scale for stonemasons, stonesetters and skilled labourers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am able to understand why there is an extra allowance for a man working at night or on Sunday; but I have never yet been able to discover any reasonable explanation for allowing $7.50 for the use of a derrick on Sunday, which derrick was only worth $2.50 for a week-day. The judgment of Mr. Desnoyers goes on to say:

It is no wonder that Mr. St. Louis' bills must have been tremendous, when it is remembered that the job lasted about four months, and that there were at times as many as two thousand men at work in the day time and one thousand five hundred men at work at night time. The men were paid alternately every week.

Then, after stating something which does not apply, the judge goes on to say:

In my opinion, the main causes of all the trouble in this matter are:

1. The exorbitant prices stipulated for labour in Mr. St. Louis' contract; and,

2. The almost unlimited number of men allowed on the said work, so numerous that they were in one another's way, and Mr. St. Louis cannot be held criminally responsible for these causes.

Now, how much did the Minister know of what was going on? And what really did go on. How did this loss occur? Judge Desnoyers says it was largely through the improvident bargain made for labour. In the month of May, 1893, the Government issued a commission to inquire into all these matters, and when the mischief was done, when the money was lost, the commissioners entered upon their investigation. The three commissioners were Mr. McLeod, Mr. Vannier and Mr. Douglas, Mr. Douglas being an engineer in the Department of Railways. They all agreed upon their findings, and they all signed the report, a copy of which I have in my hand. But not to weary the House, I will only quote a few passages from their finding, setting forth what in their judgment are some of the causes that have led to this large loss of money. On page 6, the report says:

On account of Mr. St. Louis' contract only calling for the supply of skilled labour, in addition to mechanics, and not including ordinary labour, as understood by Mr. Schreiber (vide his letter of 6th March, 1893), an arrangement was made between Mr. Schreiber and Mr. St. Louis on 14th March, 1893, to add to the contract that class of labour, at the rate of 15 cents an hour, a price recommended by Mr. Parent. Mr. St. Louis, in his evidence, stated that he did not agree to furnish all ordinary or good labourers at the above rate, but only "pick and shovel" men, the ordinary labourers were skilled labourers, and should be paid 18½ cents per hour, being the price in the contract for skilled labour.

Well, this is a new doctrine that the word "skilled labour" is to be construed as Mr. St. Louis construed it, and as the Government construed it, as including all other than men who were able to handle a pick and shovel, so that a messenger, or a man who attended to a cart, or did any other work except pick and shovel work, was to be treated as a skilled labourer. Then on page 8, as to the mode of constructing the work, the report goes on to say:

The force was larger than necessary, and was not fully occupied.

Then further speaking of Mr. Kennedy, the Government superintendent:

He acknowledged that he had too many men on the Wellington, &c., stated that there were too many of all classes of labour on the Grand Trunk, on account of their being no head.

* * * * * * * * * * *

On the Grand Trunk bridge, Mr. St. Louis was allowed to furnish the time-keepers, foremen,

stonecutters, masons and other labour without any selection, requisition and classification, by the superintendent or any other official of the Government.

* * * * * * * * * *

Time-keepers are charged as foremen or mechanics, whose rate was higher than is paid to time-keepers. Some of the clerks in Mr. St. Louis' private office are entered in the Government pay-lists, and received their wages from public money.

What supervision did the Government exercise over the employment of the men? The report says:

The only oversight or check of the number of men and time which Mr. Kennedy provided on the Grand Trunk was to send one of the Wellington time-keepers by day, and another by night, to count the number of men, without any attempt of classification or hours of work. It is acknowledged this account was not regularly made, or only three or four times a week, no record of it, although demanded, was produced before the commission.

No time-keepers for a force amounting at times to 2,000 men, and to 1,500 at night. Comment is unnecessary. Then the report goes on to say:

Although there is no direct evidence of fraud, other than a few possible cases, which the contractor stated were probably errors, naturally occurring in making up extensive pay-lists. Nevertheless, on the Grand Trunk bridge there has been every opportunity given whereby the contractor for labour or any of his employees, if so inclined, could defraud the Government by fictitious pay-lists and accounts.

Then on page 9, the report continues:

The evidence showed that, outside of the original bill of timber, and especially in the temporary and false works, a large quantity of inferior timber and lumber was invoiced at tender prices, spruce, hemlock and pine culled deals, hemlock, cedar and spruce timber not of the value of tender prices.

Now, it is to be borne in mind that this work was performed in the city of Montreal, within a short distance of the city of Ottawa, where the chief engineer of railways had his head office; that there was a telephone from the seat of operations in Montreal to almost the very chair of the Minister of Railways, and that there was every opportunity for the Minister and every one of his staff, at all hours of the day, to communicate with the work. The report goes on to speak of the timber, and here a most extraordinary state of affairs is revealed. 3,600,000 feet of timber are charged against the Government for practically temporary work. 3,600,000 feet, I am told, if loaded upon cars, would require 360 cars, at 10,000 feet per car, to carry it. These 360 cars would reach between two and three miles. If that lumber were to be extended upon a surface, it would cover some 80 square acres. All this was required to erect some temporary workshops and shelter for the men during the time the work was to be carried on. About one-third of this, it is said, has been lost, removed, and no doubt will ultimately have to be paid for by this country. Now, the Government invited tenders privately for some of this lumber, no doubt describing in the classification the kind of lumber. But there was no provision to show that they got the kind of lumber that was tendered for, and upon this point the commissioners report:

The temporary buildings and other false works, platforms, &c., were built on an extravagant scale, and it does not appear that provision was made for the greater portion of the temporary work in the bill of timber and lumber furnished those tendering for the supply.

The method of culling and delivery of timber was not satisfactory. The culler's books have not all been procured, and the carters' delivery tickets have been lost and destroyed; some of the accounts are certified by a culler who knew little about them, and who had left the work some time before.

Carts were sent for timber and lumber on nights and Sundays, when there were none of Henderson's employees in the yard to check the quantity taken. There was nothing to prevent timber and lumber being taken for private uses or carted twice before the cullers; the amount charged to the Government for material taken nights and Sundays, is said by Mr. Henderson and his foreman, Labelle, to have been obtained from the cullers and others at the bridges the next day. * * *

The large amount of timber purchased for so small an amount of work is extraordinary. There are only two characters of the work in which it could be used in the permanent works, and in the false or temporary works.

By calculations made from the evidence and plans, we estimate there could have been used of all kinds of the timber and lumber about 2,594,800 feet, b.m. The total quantity charged to the bridges is about 3,613,800 feet, b.m., which leaves a shortage of some 1,018,800 feet, b.m. We cannot ascertain where this latter quantity of timber and lumber was used, it is probable some of it never reached the works.

Making a calculation in another manner, taking the quantity of timber remaining on the banks, which was used in the temporary works, and adding to this quantity a liberal allowance for that portion wasted, used up or stolen, together with the timber and lumber in the permanent works, the sum of these quantities deducted from the timber purchased, leaves a shortage slightly greater than the quantity found in the previous calculation.

From the evidence it appears that a certain quantity of new timber was broken up and taken away by workmen, or burnt to keep themselves warm, also carted away or stolen.

Then the report continues:

Some of the timber and lumber was hauled in Government carts from Henderson's yard (240 loads), which should have been delivered by the contractor.

These are some of the facts the Government's own commissioners ascertained as showing how the great loss occurred. Then, as to the improvidence of the bargain made in regard to the employment of stonemasons and stonecutters, the commissioners go on to say:

The estimated cost of the stonecutting solely in cutters' hours for the bridges and lock No. 1, taking the ordinary rate paid for piecework, face measurement, would be about $6,000 ; the amounts rendered for cutters' hours amount to $39,896.04. Of this sum the contractor for labour would have paid his men, at the rate established by evidence, about $30,060, if the pay-lists were correct.

Yet we are to be told that a blunder like this, involving on this one item alone a loss of $30,000 is not to be charged against anybody. The report goes on to say :

If we take double the rate by piecework, viz., $12,000, as an equivalent for men working by the day for the Government, and other circumstances, it still leaves an excess of cost of some $18,000, which cannot be accounted for, which sum would be increased by the profit to the labour contractor.

Upon the Wellington bridge, by the hours charged for stone-cutting at the rate of wages paid by the contractor, the cost of stone cut is $12,516 ; the amount charged to the Government, including contractor's profit, is $16,715. The cost by piecework would be some $3,000.

Yet this is not to be regarded as a gross mistake, although it invovles a heavy loss to the country. The report contiues :

The Grand Trunk and lock No. 1, being mixed in time-keeping, are taken together, and the cost, at the rate of wages paid by the contractor, is $17,548. The amount charged the Government, including contractor's profit, is $23,180. The cost by piecework would be some $3,000.

If the Government adopted ordinary business principles, and had got the work for this one item down in a business-like way by contract, then the commissioners would not have found that instead of costing $3,000 it cost, in consequence of the method adopted by the department, no less than $23,180. There is a railway from the quarry where the stone was procured to the bridge works, and we all know that haulage by rail is infinitely cheaper than by team ; yet in this case cheapness was not to be regarded, there was no one looking after the interest of the country, so the stone was hauled twenty-two miles from the quarry by team. The Commissioners say on this point :

The contractor for labour, according to his accounts for the Grand Trunk, would have a profit of 50 cents a day upon a single cart, and $1.75 upon the same at night.

In addition to the necessary carting, carts and men were sent long distances to haul old wood to the yards of those connected with the works and others. It is probable that a considerable amount of cartage charged to the Government should have been paid by the contractor or others.

That one suggestion shows how negligent the representatives of the Government were of the public interest. The report goes on to say :

The Wellington bridge substructure should have cost $144,000. The pay-lists for labour alone, without taking into account materials and supplies, plant and false works, amount to $151,645.

The Grand Trunk bridge substructure should have cost $56,000. The pay-list for labour alone, without taking into account materials and supplies, plant and false works, amounts to $139,622.

The excessive cost of the work is to a great degree attributable to the cost of the Grand Trunk bridge, even when compared with the cost of the Wellington bridge. On the latter the evidence showed that there were more men than necessary, there was a great amount of loafing and idling, an excessive cost of cartage, stone being carted from Terrebonne, a distance of about twenty miles, with a railway siding running into the quarry and available to carry the stone at a much less rate ; carters idling, sent with an unnecessary number of men to load and carry lumber, an unnecessary number of foremen, and general extravagance in the conduct of the works.

On the Grand Trunk these charges were all operative to a much greater extent ; besides, there is the unexplainable cost of stonecutting, of masons' hours, of cartage, of other labour, and the unusual classification of skilled labour, the large percentage of the latter compared with ordinary labour, for all of which a large amount of money has been charged in the labour accounts.

Taking into account the entire number of causes mentioned, there still remains a large balance, for which we can offer no explanation, if the pay-list for labour or the time-keeping are not fictitious.

Then the commissioners draw certain conclusions, as follows :—

Taking items of work which have cost large sums, one of these—masonry : There were responsible contractors at the date when the rough stone was contracted for, who would have supplied the dressed stone on time and without delaying the work, at less rates than the Government could have done it by day's labour, even if there had been no labour contract which increased the cost, considering the manner in which the stonecutting and time-keeping was done. Masons are not occupied during the winter, and could have been easily obtained at a set rate by the Government without a contract.

During the season when this work was executed there is very little cartage to be done in the city of Montreal, a number of master carters, as well as others, had no employment for their horses and carts, and would have been only too willing to accept a fixed rate rather than have their horses idle. This was exemplified by evidence of carters worked on Sundays and nights at day rates.

One of the reasons of the heavy and unnecessary cost of cartage was due to the number of horses and carts unemployed at the season when this work was built.

For ordinary labour, the evidence shows that during the winter season there is always plenty of labour available, there were also many people thrown out of employment by the shutting down of manufacturing establishments on the canal during the progress of the work.

Skilled labour, such as carpenters, &c., is generally plentiful at that time of the year.

Yet we are told the explanation of this singular mode of procuring labour was the danger of strikes. Then the report goes on to say :

An excessive quantity of material and supplies were purchased. The plant was unnecessarily expensive and extensive. The temporary works, or false works, were too costly, even considering the method adopted in construction, which appears more expensive than might have been other methods of execution. The temporary buildings, &c., were on a scale for works ten times the magnitude of this.

Yet nobody is to be held responsible for these temporary works being of such magnitude. The report goes on to say:

Every effort appears to have been made to consume and utilize as much timber and lumber as possible, so as not to interfere with its being continually dumped upon the canal bank.

The labour force, carters, &c., was unnecessarily large and not fully occupied.

On the Grand Trunk bridge there was a large expenditure in cartage charged to the works, hauling timber and lumber long distances to the private yards of those connected with the works and others, even men paid by the Government were sent to unload and pile the stuff.

Carters and men were hidden so that the number unoccupied would not be too conspicuous. Forty or fifty men doing nothing in a lumber yard, their time being taken by a timekeeper in the yard, sent with carts for lumber which should have been loaded and hauled by the contractor. An unnecessary night force seemed to have been employed, to obtain the increased profit over day work. There was a wholesale classification of skilled labour whereby the most common and cheapest class of labour was charged as skilled.

Further on the report says:

For this condition of affairs and the results now known, the Department of Railways and Canals holds the local officers responsible, as occurring under their supervision, recommendations and reports. On the other hand, the local officers hold the department equally responsible.

Here a supporter of the Government says that it is St. Louis that is responsible, and the Crown says St. Louis is not responsible. The report goes on to say:

The general management of the canal has been characterized by great extravagance. Appropriations having been exhausted for repairs long before the end of the fiscal year, accounts have been withheld, and not forwarded by the superintendent for long periods after the material was delivered, apparently waiting for some appropriation to be available.

Labour and materials were charged to appropriations voted for another purpose.

The purchase of supplies and materials was extravagant, especially timber and lumber, which cover the banks. During 1892 and part of 1893 the timber and lumber supplied the canal amounted to $147,116; of this amount Henderson Bros. furnished $83,163. During the same period the timber and lumber charged to repairs, amount to $42,098, the balance was charged to special appropriations of income and capital. There seems to have been a mania on the part of the management for purchasing timber and lumber.

There is to some extent, and it is possible, material and supplies properly chargeable to the canal proper, were charged to the bridges. The store-keeping was more than bad, the store-keeper incompetent, the certificate of accounts a farce. There was no proper system of delivering or receiving supplies, nor books of entry or delivery, nor any proper check of material or supplies used. We are of opinion that the canal staff, as well as the system of management, require a thorough reorganization.

HENRY A. F. MACLEOD.
Chairman.
J. EMILE VANIER.
ROBT. C. DOUGLAS.

There is evidence about which there is no controversy, and I have not read, nor do I intend to read any evidence that is controversial. That represents the manner in which the work was performed, that is the judicial finding by the authorities sent by the Government themselves. That state of affairs began on the first week of March, and it continued at an increasing ratio until the work was completed on towards the 1st day of May. The question now arises, first of all: Had the Minister of Railways any knowledge of these methods, and if so, what knowledge? Now, at the very commencement of the work, on the 9th of March, the Montreal "Star" published an article referring to the method of carrying on the work, and that gave him notice. It was read in the House last night by the Minister of Railways, and it so warned the Minister that he called upon Mr. Douglas to make a report. Mr. Douglas went to Montreal, and he came back, and on the 10th March he reported the work as being done in a most extravagant way. Mr. Schreiber, the Minister's Deputy, was notified of this report, and on the 11th March he telegraphed to Mr. Parent, the local engineer in charge, to come to Ottawa and give an account of his stewardship. Mr. Parent came. Mr. Schreiber, the deputy head, asked him if the charges referred to in Mr. Douglas's report were correct, and he answered that Mr. Douglas's report was exaggerated. Mr. Schreiber then called in Mr. Douglas, and he then told Mr. Douglas that the accuracy of his report was questioned. Mr. Douglas gave his version again, and it ended in Mr. Schreiber coming to the conclusion that Mr. Parent's contradiction was incorrect, and that Mr. Douglas's report was correct. I call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Schreiber swore before the committee investigating this matter that when on the 12th of March he found a conflict of testimony between Mr. Douglas and Mr. Parent, he came to the conclusion that Mr. Parent was wrong and that Mr. Douglas was right. That was on the 12th March when this work had just begun.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman the reference to the proof of that statement: That Mr. Schreiber believed Mr. Douglas in contradiction of Mr. Parent.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, I can verify that. On page 135 of the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee—I will not take up the time of the House by quoting what went before—but here is the evidence bearing on the point:

By Mr. Davies :

Q. Were you satisfied that Douglas was telling you the truth or that Parent was telling you the truth ?—A. I was satisfied that Douglas was telling the truth. I was satisfied that Parent would remedy anything that was wrong.

He was satisfied that Douglas was telling the truth, and that he had not given an exaggerated description of the character of the operations that were then going on. Now, the Minister of Railways, it is fair to assume, knew of Parent's statement, and he knew that Mr. Schreiber had, as it were, adjudicated on the matter in the way mentioned, because it was by order of the Minister of Railways that this inquiry was made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Could I interrupt the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. MULOCK. Not at all, I invite questions.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman read five or six lines more of the examination of Mr. Schreiber by Mr. Davies, because I think the whole statement varies perhaps a little the line he dwelt on.

Mr MULOCK. I will read the whole cross-examination by Mr. Davies :

By Mr. Davies :

Q. On the same point, I would like to follow that question with this : You evidently sent Mr. Douglas there to make a special report, because in your letter of the 10th you write Mr. Parent : "In the meantime I anxiously await the report of Mr. Douglas, who has been down to Montreal and visited the works."

Q. Therefore, he had gone with your knowledge ?—A. He had not gone for that special purpose. He was down there in connection with the superstructure, and I gave him his instructions to see what was going on.

Q. You were aniously awaiting his report ?—A. Yes.

Q. And you got his report ?—A. Yes.

Q. You got his report confirming in a general way the statement made in the "Star" ?—A. In a general way, yes.

Q. You telegraphed for Parent. Parent came up and denied it. Did you see Douglas and ask him for evidence in confirmation of his reports ?—A. Yes, and I saw Douglas on his return, and he stated the same as that.

Q. Were you satisfied that Douglas was telling you the truth or Parent was telling you the truth?—A. I was satisfied that Douglas was telling the truth. I was satisfied that Parent would remedy anything that was wrong.

Q. Although he contradicted, in general terms, this statement of the number of men employed ?—A. He said it was very much exaggerated.

Q. You took no steps ?—A. He was the one in charge and the one I relied upon.

Is that all ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the point.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Schreiber was satisfied that Mr. Douglas had correctly reported to him, and had not exaggerated the state of affairs at the works. That was not the only notice the Minister had, for I was about to say that we must assume that all that transpired between Mr. Douglas and Mr. Schreiber was communicated to the Minister, because the Minister had directed this inquiry. But another officer at the works, Mr. Kennedy, the superintendent of canals, also becoming anxious, writes on the 12th March to the Solicitor General as follows :—

I beg leave to acquaint you of the scandalous manner how certain things are being conducted on the Lachine Canal, in reference to the construction of works in connection with the new Wellington and Grand Trunk Railway bridges, as well as the renewal of the masonry of old lock No. 1.

After referring to certain details he goes on to say :

Without consulting any one, and for what motive I consider a mystery, he (Mr. Parent) issues specifications, asking for rates for the supplying of foremen, derricks, stonecutters, stonemasons, double and single teams, and skilled labour ; Mr. E. St. Louis was announced the successful tenderer. Now, I can get all the above by the thousands, at an average day's pay, without any discontent ; we have also supplied ourselves with the necessary derricks capable of running the work of construction of Wellington bridge ; they now want to turn all those engaged on to their list, which would increase the cost of the work 75 per cent. Imagine their trying to place pick and shovel labourers, whom I employ for $1.25 per day, at $1.87½ on his (E. St. Louis') pay-list.

As you are no doubt aware, I am, and have been, working day and night to push the work forward, and it will be too bad, when completed, to have the press crying out against the department and the Government, the enormous amount of money this bridge has cost. If the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals is cognizant of these facts, and endorses them, why, I shall accept in humble silence, but I trust and hope that under the present successful appearance of the progress of the work, nothing nor any one shall be allowed to intercept me to the finish.

Trusting you will give this your immediate attention.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
E. KENNEDY,
Supt. Lachine Canal.

Here Mr. Kennedy, who had been for a lifetime the trusted officer of the Government in charge of this special kind of work, writes to the Solicitor General informing him of the scandalous manner in which certain things are being conducted. The Solicitor General very properly takes cognisance of that information at once, and brings it to the knowledge of the Government. He told us to-day from his seat in the House, and his letter in reply also told the tale. On the 14th March, 1893, he replied to Mr. Kennedy as follows :—

My dear Kennedy,—I have seen the Minister of Railways and Canals and found that all has been tendered for, including labour for the carrying out of the work of the bridge, &c.

Now, the Solicitor General did not put the case quite properly in that letter. He said that all had been tendered for. Even admitting that all had been tendered for, did that mean that the work was to be carried on in the reckless manner that Mr. Kennedy mentioned, that Mr. Douglas mentioned, that the "Star" newspaper hinted at? The fact that labour and material had been tendered for did not mean that labour or material should be extravagantly employed or wasted. Then, Mr. Kennedy, not being satisfied, and anxious no doubt for the public interest as well as for his own reputation, determines to come up personally to the fountain head and see the Minister, and on the 16th of March he telegraphs to the Solicitor General in these words:

Will arrive in Ottawa to-day per 3.30 p.m. Canadian Pacific Railway train. Want to see you at Russell House, 4 p.m., without fail; important business. E. Kennedy, Superintendent Lachine Canal.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that it was a most unfortunate thing for the Minister of Railways and the Government and the country that Mr. Kennedy was not allowed to continue his journey; but he gets an answer from the Solicitor General in the following language:—

Do not report at department until you see me.
J. J. CURRAN.

Now, why did the hon. Solicitor General send that telegram? He has told us to-night. He says that on receiving Mr. Kennedy's telegram to the effect that he was coming to Ottawa, he went to the department to see Mr. Schreiber, he reported Mr. Kennedy's intended arrival, and Mr. Schreiber ordered Mr. Kennedy to remain on the works or he would be dismissed. What does Mr. Kennedy say on that point? He was examined before the commission, and he swore as follows:—

Q. You would not like to admit that you have no political influence?—A. At the present time I have no political influence.

Q. But in the old days?—A. In the old days I think I had some. I was entitled to a little. But, in answer to your question as to Parent, I want to inform you that Mr. Curran, Solicitor General for Canada, the member for Montreal Centre, in whose district and constituency the work was being carried on, when I complained to him, he came up here to Ottawa and I telegraphed to him that I was coming. He went and interviewed Mr. Schreiber, and told him that Kennedy was coming here. He was told by Schreiber, that, if Kennedy came, he would discharge him.

Q. What were you coming for?—A. I was coming here to make certain explanations as to what was going on.

Q. And complaints?—A. Yes, and Mr. Curran, with all his influence, was told to go home and mind his own business, and so was I.

Q. Mr. Curran was told that?—A. Well, he was not told that exactly, but he was told that, if Kennedy left the work and came up to Ottawa, he would be discharged.

Q. Did he tell you that he told Mr. Schreiber what he wanted to come up for?—A. Yes; with regard to the labour contract.

There, Mr. Speaker, we have it in evidence, not only that men were anxious to furnish information to the Government, but that the Government were themselves standing in the way and refusing to allow a trusted servant to come here in the public interest and supply that information. So the expenditure goes on. Then, last session, the Minister of Railways, addressing the House on this question, said:

The chief engineer, about the 12th of April, sent Mr. Douglas down to Montreal to investigate, and on the 14th of April he reported so far as he was able to ascertain, the amount of the pay-rolls, &c., for March and the first week in April to be about $177,000, and that there would probably be a further expenditure of $100,000 by the 1st of May.

There we have it that on the 14th day of April the Minister of Railways had information from Mr. Douglas that the pay-roll for March and April would amount to no less than $277,000, leaving out the cost of material and the $60,000 which he knew the country would have to pay for the superstructure. What ought to have been the course of the Minister of Railways on receiving that information? Surely at that stage he ought to have visited the work himself to satisfy himself from actual observations what was going on. Did he do so? No. If the Minister were in the House, I would bring to his attention a manifest error which he made in his speech last night. On the 19th April the Minister of Railways did inspect the work. He saw what was going on. On the 25th April, Mr. Schreiber reported to the Minister. I will read his letter:

Dear Mr. Haggart,—As I mentioned to you, I was not a little startled upon receiving from Mr. Parent the pay-rolls and accounts for the month of March in connection with the Wellington Street bridges, which summed up to an enormous figure. I at once despatched Mr. R. C. Douglas off to Montreal to look into the matter and ferret out all the information he could, and report to me the position of matters; the information he gives me is as follows:—

December, January and February pay-rolls, &c., in round figures.....	$ 79,000
March	132,000
April	110,000
Contracts for superstructure.....	61,000
	$382,000
Less materials, &c., to be credited to this work, and to be debited to other appropriations, say.....	22,000
	$360,000

And this he considers is the minimum figure that the work is likely to cost. When the estimate made by Mr. Trudeau, the then chief engineer, and Mr. Parent, the superintending engineer, early in 1892, is considered, namely, $150,000 for 16 feet navigation, and $40,000 additional

if a depth of 20 feet of water was given, making in all $190,000, the excess of expenditure requires some explanation. Mr. Parent explains that the excess of expenditure is due to the large amount of ice which had to be be cut up and carted away; to the frozen condition of the excavation, to the breaking away of the coffer-dam on two occasions, to the solid frozen condition of the crib and other obstructions which had to be removed, and, as I understand him to say, to political interference. Superintendent Kennedy attributes it to all the causes named by Mr. Parent, excepting the latter, of which he makes no mention. I, however, am of the opinion that, whilst these latter causes may have contributed to an increased cost, that we must look for other reasons to account for the enormous expenditure over and above the estimate. Mr. Douglas is now in Montreal looking into the matter and endeavouring to keep expenses down to reasonable proportions. In the meantime, liabilities have been incurred for wages, materials, &c., to meet which a Governor General's warrant is required for $200,000.

I may state that this excess of expenditure over the estimate was not foreseen by me, and even now I am not in a position to explain it to my satisfaction, but I will have the matter carefully looked into and endeavour to get at the bottom of it. So far as I have had the opportunity of observing, everything done in connection with the Lachine Canal is on an extravagant basis, if nothing more.

That is the statement of the confidential deputy head. What should the Minister of Railways have done on the receipt of the letter? Should he not have stopped the payment of money? Surely that letter was a warning. Nothing was done, however, and on the 10th May, a commission was issued. Here I call the attention of the Minister of Justice to an extraordinary delay. The Deputy Minister, Mr. Schreiber, on 10th May advised the issuing of a commission. A week elapsed before it was issued, and it was not until the 29th May that that commission was put into the hands of the commissoners, and not until nearly $150,000 had been paid out to the contractor, who was afterwards said to have obtained the largest portion of it by fraud. The last claim made before the issue of the commisison was for $66,000, and that was paid on the 27th May. There had been a recommendation for the commission on the 10th May, there had been an order for it on the 17th May, and that commission was held in abeyance until after $66,000 had been paid on the 27th May. The Order in Council appointing the commission, was dated the 17th May, and after it was issued and before the commissioners met, this large sum of $66,000 was paid on account of the claim suspected at least of being fraudulent and the genuineness of which was to be the subject of inquiry. I find after the inquiry was began, namely, on the 6th June, $39,000 more was paid on account of these alleged fraudulent and overcharged accounts, making a total of $179,170.87 paid to Mr. St. Louis between the 24th April and the 6th June. From the 10th March, when the Minister of Railways had notice, at the very commencement of these frauds, until the completion of the works, no step whatever was taken to guard against loss or wrong-doing and a mere inquiry is directed to take place after the loss has been sustained. I think we are entitled to ask the Minister of Railways, with all these notices before him, why he did not personally examine the work. If every one of his officers had agreed to give him one particular version, if all the evidence was of one character, then we might be more likely to be lenient in our judgment. But in this particular case he had ample notice to put him on his guard. Mr. Schreiber knew there was conflict of testimony. The department knew well the extravagance that was going on, and there was every reason to suggest to the Minister the necessity for personally informing himself. What is his explanation for not having himself awakened to a sense of his responsibility and personally investigated these works long before he did? If he had gone to these works on the 1st April, when they had only been in full swing for about three weeks, he would have been able to a large extent to stop this mischief, but he only went on the 19th April and made an official visit. What is his explanation? Let me read from the speech which he delivered last night. He seems to have had an extraordinary idea as to his responsibility. If his deputy gives him certain advice, he is not to act upon it. Last night, speaking of the contract for labour, this improvident contract for labour, which is the cause of the greater portion of this loss, the hon. Minister said:

I may have been mistaken in regard to the contract, the engineer in charge of my department may have been mistaken in regard to the employment of labour, and that it should have been obtained by contract. Is that a serious charge to be made in this House and to be embodied in an amendment to go into Committee of Supply—an error of judgment, perhaps, committed by me because I accepted the recommendation of the engineer of my department and of the superintendent of the works. I am not supposed to possess sufficient technical knowledge to act on these matters. It would be sufficient justification for me at any time if, instead of exercising my judgment, I simply accepted the advice of my department.

Now, Sir, if that were to be sanctioned for a moment in this House, if it were admitted that it was a sufficient defence on the part of the Minister if he could show that he had acted on the advice of his deputy, then all ministerial responsibility would be at an end. In that case we should be extending to the Ministers of the Crown the doctrine that alone protects the sovereign, "the king can do no wrong." Then each member of the Government would be placed upon a pedestal beyond the reach of criticism; he would be enabled to take shelter behind subordinates who are not in any sense responsible to the people. I will quote further from the hon. Minister's de-

fence for not inspecting the work, which, I think, you will find is no defence :

The first time I knew that extravagant expenditure was being made, was in a report made by Mr. Schreiber, on 26th April.

I have given some evidence that is not quite consistent with that.

I never certified to payments, nor is a single payment certified to by myself.

As to the point of certifying, I say it was the hon. Minister's duty to actively interfere in order to prevent the money going out, instead of, after all this notice, merely acting, as his own statement shows, a negative part in not certifying to enable the money to go out. Then he says, speaking of the labour contracts :

The price was a fair one for the labour which those parties performed. At that time, as every one knows, the House was in session ; the House was in session from January to the last April, all this work was done between 8th March and about the 20th April, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite say that the Minister of Railways should have a supervision over the work.

Now, the Minister of Railways here suggests that because this House was in session he could not superintend this work, his time being occupied here from January until the last of April. That is his excuse for not giving his personal attention to this transaction. I want to acquit the hon. gentleman in advance of any intention of mis-stating the facts ; but I may tell the House that in the session of 1893, the session to which he alludes, the House prorogued on the 1st April. And yet from 1st April to 19th April, the day before the whole work was practically complete, according to his statement, he never visited the work. He offers, as an extenuation for not visiting the work and informing himself as to the facts that he was engaged attending to his parliamentary duties—that is the inference to be drawn from his statement—and yet the House had prorogued three weeks before. So, whatever may be argued as good ground for extenuation, he has struck the wrong explanation in the statement he has made. The fact seems to be to give it the mildest colour—and I desire to do that—the hon. Minister appears not to have appreciated his proper position in connection with the expenditure of public money. Now, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for having occupied so much of the time of the House at this late hour ; but I think I have made good the statement I made at the beginning that I would simply use evidence that could not be successfully contradicted. I have shown that, even taking the most favourable view of the case, $134,000 has been paid out without any possible justification. I have shown that that expenditure took place inside of two months ; that during the whole of that period the responsible Minister had constant, almost daily, information that there was extravagance if not worse in connection with the work, that most unbusiness-like methods were adopted, and these things themselves culminated in producing an impression on his mind and the minds of his colleagues, resulting in a demand for a public investigation. And yet, with all those warnings, it never seems to have occurred to the Minister to take the first step to prevent wrong-doing, and to protect the public treasury. This is an extraordinary state of affairs, particularly in view of the sums so paid for labour :

24th April	$ 74,777 45
29th April	9,000 00
8th May	8,393 42
27th May	66,000 00
6th June	39,000 00
Total	$197,170 87

being part of the expenditure of $394,000. And after abortive attempts to bring an outsider to justice, we are told when we come here, to the court of last resort, that we must not call the responsible Minister or the Government of the day to account. And I am reminded that these last two payments, amounting to $105,000, were made after the pay-sheets had been discredited by the chief engineer by his refusal to certify them. And one defence of the Minister is that he had nothing to do with signing the cheques or taking active steps to cause the payments to be made, but that the payments simply followed the presentation of vouchers. I think, Sir, that after a warning like that, a clear duty devolved upon the responsible head of the department to take active steps to prevent loss. Whatever may be the proper remedy, it is too late in the day of responsible government to tell us now that no Minister of the Crown can be held responsible under such circumstances for this loss to the country, for this loss to our public reputation, for the discrediting of our system of public works, for the general demoralization that appears to have existed in the Railway Department of this country.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, we have had what I will venture to call a rambling discussion upon one of the most extraordinary motions that has ever, under any similar circumstances, been proposed in this House, or any Parliament existing under the British constitution. It has been most difficult, as your experience, I am sure, will show, to confine the debate to any of the many serious questions that have been raised. Under the cover of this motion there has been an extraordinary, if not unprecedented, attempt to centre upon one man only all the responsibility for many matters and many incidents absolutely beyond his control, with many responsibilities that were never supposed to rest upon the shoulders of any one member of a Government. Hon. gentlemen have attempted to

bring before you considerations of facts that are not in any wise before this House. Hon. gentlemen have given their opinion upon the conduct, for instance, of the litigation, and I venture to say that not five gentlemen in this House, either to your right or to your left, have taken any pains to inform themselves upon the exact state of facts in regard to this question. Last session we debated many of the incidents that have been referred to in this blue-book. A large part of the evidence in that blue-book was before this House, and upon that evidence the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) considered that he was warranted in attacking the Department of Railways from head to foot, and incidentally the Government as a whole. And this Parliament, as has been well said, after hearing the Minister of Railways on this subject, were satisfied with his statement, that in regard to the acknowledged thefts, in regard to the acknowledged frauds, in regard to the evidence of negligence, here, there and in many particulars, which every member of this House regretted, which members of both sides of your Chair did their best to ferret out—the House, I say, was satisfied with his pledge that he would have all that information, and such information as could be acquired by him, sifted, dealt with, and the offenders brought to justice. Now, 60 days after the beginning of this session, a motion is sprung upon us to reconsider, to rediscuss and to debate again the facts as they are contained in that blue-book. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether from anything that has happened in this debate, there is a single hon. gentleman able to rise now—and I will cheerfully give way to him, the member, for instance, who has charge of the resolution, is welcome to interrupt, the leader of the Opposition is welcome to interrupt and to say that he knows now what has been done by the Minister of Railways and Canals in pursuance of the pledge which he gave to this House as to the course he would pursue in view of the evidence that had been taken by a committee of this Parliament. Is there a single hon. gentleman opposite who can now tell me that he has taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the facts and circumstances that have occurred since that statement was made in this Parliament? I pause for a reply; I would welcome an answer. I think the Minister of Railways is entitled to some answer at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. If there is one man there who can tell you what has happened, what steps have been taken, what men have been dismissed, what men have been prosecuted, what men have been punished in connection with the admitted steal, the admitted fraud, he certainly has not yet spoken in this debate. Silence now is significant, and it is to my mind of the greatest importance. Sir, I say here, speaking for myself, having closely followed this debate, having some regard for parliamentary procedure, having a little knowledge of the procedure of parliaments like ours, that if the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) believed he had a case, believed he had anything like a case, that warranted the strictures in the resolutions that are now in your hands, he was a good enough parliamentarian to appreciate that he could make his position doubly strong by laying grounds for this indictment, and by asking in a parliamentary manner for all this information—and there has been much since the discussion on this subject took place last session—to be put on the Table of this House, to be put in the hands of members to your right and to your left; and then I grant you the Government would be on its trial, on its trial anew if you like; and there would be some reason for this old subject being threshed out again, instead of taking up the time of the House uselessly to debate a question of this character twice over upon the same information. What do I mean by that? I mean that the gist of the case as put against us is that a fraud upon the Crown was perpetrated, that a crime was committed, that a loss of money occurred through the fraud and through the crime; and following hotly upon these facts, that are not in dispute, the hon. gentleman, forgetting all parliamentary procedure, all precedent in a case of this kind, all sense of fair-play and of dignity of debate, all the advantages of a free and full discussion, rush pell mell forward and say: We charge you with all that responsibility, and having proved a fraud and a theft, we asperse your motives, we impute to you a design that all this should take place, because one of the men charged with the crime and the misdemeanour, was a friend, was a member of your own ranks, was a man who made a very awkward statement in evidence, and we infer from all that that this was nothing less than a huge and abominable job between the members on the treasury benches and those who have been accused of crime. But there is a very important hiatus in that case, and I say it lies upon hon. gentlemen opposite to show, not in debate, not on the statement of this gentleman or that, no matter whether his position be important or unimportant in this House, but it lies upon any hon. gentleman attacking this Government, so far as their position has been affected since the debate on this subject occurred last session, to lay bare in a proper manner the facts that have occurred since then. I say that this House is not in a position at the present moment to sit in judgment on the conduct of the Government so far as they were bound, and undoubtedly they were bound by the pledge of the Minister of Railways, to deal with all and sundry persons who are in any respect guilty of abetting crime, or by whose conduct those persons who have robbed this country were enabled to carry out their designs and their pur-

poses. But instead of obtaining the information, how atrociously unfair, if I may use the expression, has been the position taken by the hon. gentleman who has moved the resolution and the leader of the House. Why, they have travelled not over this blue-book only, they have distorted the evidence in that book, if I might be permitted to say it, almost shamelessly. They have given part of a witness's statement and part of a sentence even which might convey a certain meaning, and they have hurried on over 30, 40 or even 100 pages to patch up and make a case. How desperate was their position when, after the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) had misrepresented, not wilfully, I believe, the evidence that was taken in the Public Accounts Committee, the leader of the Opposition rushed to his rescue, knowing but very little of that evidence, as is plain from the speech he delivered in this House, knowing very little of the facts within his command and with which he could have made himself familiar if he had tried, and began to asperse in the most unfair and unprecedented manner the character of a member of the bar of Quebec, of the bar of the city of Montreal. He charged, without having any information that was in the possession of this House, the gentlemen entrusted with the Crown case with negligence, with being a party to one of the greatest frauds that the Government could perpetuate, because by innuendo if not directly that charge is made against my department, if not against the Government, that we had played with the criminal prosecution, that we had got a junior counsel weakly to present the case to the court and the end of the whole thing was a failure, and further that that failure was anticipated if not sought and desired. What had that to do with the judgment of the House which this House is asked to pass against the Minister of Railways and Canals ? Suppose I or my predecessor had so far forgotten the traditions of the Department of Justice and the position which gentlemen filling that office had occupied, as to stoop to that nefarious and abominable conduct in carrying out the admitted instructions of the Department of Railways and Canals, what had that to do with the inquiry this House is asked to make into the character of a member of this Government who is particularly singled out in this debate and in this resolution ? How is it that these statements, made without a shadow of foundation, these statements that involve an unfair slander of a man occupying a dignified position in an honourable profession, are hurried into this debate, and quickly hurried into it ? How is it that the leader of the Opposition ventured to asperse either the character of the department I presided over or the character of the gentleman whom he called a junior counsel at the bar of Montreal, when he evidently did not take the trouble to acquaint himself with the fact that instead of a junior counsel being engaged in this matter there were three counsel, two of them senior counsel at all events and beyond dispute at the bar of Montreal, and a gentleman whose character and integrity has never been challenged, so far as I am aware, either in this House or out of it ? Does he pretend to tell me that Mr. Bisaillon is not a man fit to be trusted in a case of this character ? Does he pretend to tell me that Mr. Hall, of Montreal, is not fit to conduct a prosecution of this character before a magistrate ? Does he pretend to tell me that the junior counsel, Mr. Sharpe, for he is junior only of the three counsel, a man whom I would not call a junior counsel, and I do not think the members of the bar of Montreal would term a junior counsel in the sense the hon. gentleman meant to apply, is not himself and alone without assistance in every respect able to conduct a case of the character that was pressed against Mr. St. Louis ? The hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) sits in this House. He, as the hon. gentleman says, is an eminent member of the bar of Montreal, and he referred to the hon. gentleman's eminence. He also referred to Mr. Macmaster and his eminence at the bar, and I venture to say that neither of these gentlemen, nor any member occupying a position of respect at the bar, would sneer at Mr. Sharpe. I venture to tell the hon. gentleman, and to tell this House, that it is not fair to say that Mr. Sharpe is an ordinary member of the bar of Montreal.

Mr. LAURIER. I said nothing against Mr. Sharpe.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says that he said nothing against Mr. Sharpe. But I am in the judgment of this House whether he did not refer to the fact that against the able counsel on the other side we had placed the case of the Crown in the hands of a junior counsel at the bar of Montreal. This assertion is unfounded, it is contrary to the fact.

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That assertion is so contrary to the fact that it would raise the indignation of every fair-minded man in this House. I will not press the vindication of the character of Mr. Sharpe—I was prepared to do it. I understand the hon. gentleman withdraws any insinuation against the ability or standing of Mr. Sharpe at the bar in Montreal.

Mr. LAURIER. I am within the memory of the House : I did not say a word yesterday derogatory to Mr. Sharpe as a member of the bar, but I said the Department of Justice should have had a senior counsel associated with him. And so I say now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I fain believe that the statement of the hon. gentleman is in line with the statement he

made yesterday, and which gave rise to my own honest and fervid indignation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I care not for the jeers of hon. gentlemen opposite on this subject. I have forced the hon. gentleman to abandon one position he took in this debate, that we had played with the case against Mr. St. Louis.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman can read word for word what I said yesterday. I dare him to do it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's statement is there, and mine is there, and Mr. Sharpe's reputation is beyond any possible damage by the statement of the hon. gentleman. But let me pin the hon. gentleman down and follow him. The hon. gentleman now says his charge was that we should have had some other counsel associated with Mr. Sharpe. Why should we have done so? Was Mr. Sharpe not able to conduct that case properly and efficiently before the magistrate in Montreal? Does the hon. gentleman say no now, or does he remain silent?

Mr. LAURIER. I say certainly, that in a case of that nature it is unprecedented that a single counsel should have had charge of it. That is what I say now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And now the charge is not that he was a junior counsel, but that he was a single counsel. Sir, it was not a single counsel that was employed. The member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) who sits near the leader of the Opposition was in this case, and if he consults him he will find that Mr. Sharpe was assisted by two eminent counsel of the Bar of Montreal.

Mr. TARTE. Not before the magistrate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They argued the case before the magistrate, and I am surprised that the interruption should come from the hon. gentleman from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte). Was the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) following this case very closely in the court?

Mr. TARTE. Pretty closely.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, I have in my hand the report of the case, and the report of the argument of Mr. Bissaillon before Mr. Desnoyers, the magistrate. I say that if the hon. gentlemen opposite had exercised common decency either to the Government or to these gentlemen of the Bar before they criticised the conduct of that case, and before they dragged that case into this discussion to prejudice the position of the Minister of Railways, they would have obtained the notes of the evidence, and the notes of the argument of counsel which were taken. I do not hesitate to say that the evidence, and I have read it, reflects upon Mr. Sharpe the greatest possible credit. I do not believe that the case against Mr. St. Louis could possibly be put stronger than it was put by Mr. Sharpe, assisted by Mr. Bissaillon and Mr. Hall, two Queen's Counsels. I have the evidence, the House is welcome to it, and there is no attempt on that side of the House, nor on this, to show that these men bungled that case in one single particular. The hon. leader of the Opposition himself, not many days ago, agreed with me that the magistrate was the man who had blundered, not the counsel for the Crown. He will not defend the judgment, and no man in this House has yet ventured to defend, or to agree with the opinion of Mr. Desnoyers, even on the case presented in the decision of Mr. Desnoyers himself. The Bar has universally condemned that judgment as unsound. The facts which the magistrate recites as proved before him afforded no justification for the conclusion, and that being so, I think it would be better if the leader of the Opposition had remained in the blissful ignorance, or confessed that he was still in the blissful ignorance that he was, on June 6th last, when he said that he did not know who were the prosecuting counsel. Now, this is June 19th, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) spoke on June 18th. From whom did he obtain the information, I would like to know, that we had only one counsel, and that a junior member of the Bar. Did he obtain it from the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion)? I challenge him to obtain the slightest confirmation of the statement which in any way reproaches the Government for the manner in which this case was followed up. Let us be fair. We read the papers. We may not believe all of them, but what do they all say in the district in which the prosecution took place? Do they say that it was a namby-pamby prosecution, or that it was a fraud, or that it was not pushed or pressed? No: on the contrary, they state, and it is felt by many, and it has been stated even in this debate, that the Government prosecuted Mr. St. Louis. An attempt has been made to create sympthy for the accused, and the attempt has largely come from the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite, and yet, in this debate, and in the city of Ottawa, we are told now, that we were not in earnest, and that we did not press the prosecution. Sir, as I say, no man has given facts upon which that statement can be founded. No man who makes that statement can have followed the steps that were taken by the Crown, both before Mr. Desnoyers, and when Mr. Desnoyers failed to deliver the judgment which the Crown thought should have been delivered by them, under the laws of the country, and with the assent of this Parliament, and as promtly as it was permitted them to do so, bringing that case under the consideration of the Grand Jury at the then

next assizes in the city of Montreal. But all this has been brought into the debate. The conduct of the Department of Justice has been impeached. For what purpose, and how was it relevant? If there was a strong case against the Minister of Railways and Canals, why travel outside that amendment, which points with malignity—I might say if it were in order—which points at any rate in the most direct manner to the Minister of Railways and Canals. Members on the other side of the House seem impatient in this debate to get to that feature of the discussion. They pass in the most hurried manner over all questions of Government responsibility, all questions of crime of civil servants, and all questions as to how the Government has dealt with either negligent or criminal servants. They hurry over all that. Indeed, they hurry over the question or policy that is involved in the letting of the contract. They do not ask the decision of the House directly and squarely upon the policy of the Government, for it was the policy of the Government that that work should be let in the way it has been explained to have been let. That is not referred to in this resolution. It is drawn in like a hundred other things to bias and to prejudice the members of the House. Neither do the members of the Opposition refer in this case to whether the Government has done all that it should have done in regard to the parties directly concerned with this loss of public money. Let me give an illustration which will be a homely one to this House. We have discussed several times the question of the administration of the fishery bounties, which refers to a department I once presided over. Hon. gentlemen have said that by means of a bad system, and that means of lax administration, gross frauds were perpetrated upon the Government, and I have admitted, time and again, that bounty money has been stolen, that gross frauds were perpetrated, and that, in some particulars, the machinery for the administration of the bounties needed repairing and improving. Has the House, does it intend, has it yet impeached me? Does it intend to follow up that subject, for, if, on the statement of facts put forward in this debate by hon. gentlemen opposite, the Minister of Railways is to be impeached because money has been stolen in connection with his department, because the checks in connection with the administration were not perfect, and because of other incidents: then I certainly must go into the dock with him; and yet my crimes preceded his; my supposed defects and shortcomings were all before his. Why single him out? There has been no beating about the bush in regard to the case of either of us. The facts have been brought out, as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said, many of them by myself in the Committee of Public Accounts; and, forsooth, I was acting, as I thought at the time, and as I believe now, as I had a right to act, in probing these matters to the bottom, just as the various members of the British Parliament, whether Conservative or Liberal, probed the departmental scandals of 1883 and subsequent years in England. You will find volume after volume—I have three of them at my feet—containing evidence of gross fraud, evidence of departments overreached, evidence of officers negligent, and evidence of the absence of checks to protect the British treasury; and yet you will go through "Hansard" from 1883 down to this date in vain to find a resolution of this character, aimed at the political head of any of the departments concerned, or any speeches designed to fasten upon him responsibility for crime, outrageous crime, that is admitted by every member of Parliament. Our whole trouble to-day is that, rightly or wrongly, with all the case that could be made by the officers of the Crown, we have not been able to bring the guilty parties to justice—that, in the face of what we believed to be the clearest of evidence of crime, we have not been able to put the man against whom we believed the evidence was the strongest, even on his trial. And when I say that, some have suggested that I asperse the administration of the province or the district concerned. I do not necessarily do so. It is possible for us all to do so. It is possible that if we met with an experience of that kind once or twice or thrice, we might seriously consider whether there were any other steps that could or should be taken. But nevertheless, the fact of the whole matter is that, because we have no criminal in the dock, because we cannot go on further with all these details in a court of law, hon. gentlemen are driven back to attack the Government of the day and to ascribe to the Government and its members, particularly the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, a fell plot that this crime should be perpetrated so that contributions should come to the pockets of candidates of the Conservative party. And to exhibit the utter lack of candour and the utter absence of fair-play on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, I will allude to a statement made over and over again by hon. gentlemen who ought to have known better—and some I believe must have known better. They referred to the evidence that Mr. St. Louis gave in regard to his books and the reason they were destroyed—lest they should commit or implicate some members of the Conservative party; and much of the case against the Minister of Railways and Canals has been built up upon that foundation. If these hon. gentlemen had taken the course which should have been taken before this debate was sprung upon us, if they had asked for the evidence given before the Exchequer Court and before the magistrate, they would have found that Mr. St. Louis

gave three explanations why he destroyed his books, all of them inconsistent, all of them contradictory, and only one of them, that the one given before the Public Accounts Committee, of the nature they have referred to. One reason, for instance, that it was his invariable custom to destroy his books in connection with a particular transaction after that transaction was over, has not been referred to. Neither was the other reason which was given in the Exchequer Court. I mention that only to show, if it be proper to say so, the political venom that lurks beneath some of the suggestions that have been made in order to implicate the Government in what all admit to be crime. Take the criticism of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and the evidence given by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) in regard to these details. What do they relate to? They relate to fraud, to trickery, to deception, to stuffed pay-lists, to all kinds of false pretenses; and if the case stood there, that the Government, knowing of that, had done nothing, the case would be grave indeed against this Government or any Government. But what information, I ask again, has any hon. gentleman in this House on which to base a case against the Government? Do they pretend that they can make one solitary elector in any part of Canada believe that under a Liberal Government or under a Conservative Government, under the present Government of thirteen or fifteen men, you could guarantee the people of this country against fraud and iniquity on the part of men employed by the Government? Such a proposition has not been made, and I submit that such a proposition must be made and must be sustained before the House can support the resolution now in your hands. This attempt to fasten upon the Government with a jump the responsibility for admitted fraud, cannot succeed under these circumstances. You must lay your ground better. Any hon. gentleman who wishes to follow this matter up must put in the hands of this House further evidence than lies on this Table in order to convict the Government or any member of the Government of wrong-doing. Follow up that trial; follow up the evidence; give it a fair discussion; and if you find that the Government, after it has had the opportunity to inform Parliament of what it has done and the reasons for its conduct, has not gone far enough, has not punished severely enough or prosecuted vigorously enough, frame your resolution on these lines, and then this or any other Government under similar circumstances will have a fair consideration, a fair trial, and must stand or fall according to the merits. But I press again that there has not been fair-play adopted in this case—that prejudice has been imported from every quarter in order to make the case, which was discussed admittedly lamely by hon. gentlemen opposite last session, a little stronger this session.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Now, I have referred to the manner in which the hon. gentleman who has charge of this resolution undertook to present it to the House. Nothing in my judgment could have been more unfair than for him to have put such a resolution before the House after the line of examination adopted by him in the committee. He has stated that we are responsible. He is charging us with the responsibility of men whose responsibility we may either adopt under the constitution under which we live or whom we may punish and for whom we may no longer stand responsible. In the committee, in 1894, this was his idea of the case: he is examining one of the witnesses, I think, Mr. Parent, and he asks:

Q. You had a large number of men under your control; in a certain sense you were responsible.—A. Yes.

Q. Owing to indifference or negligence of some of those men the country was robbed of $200,000?—A. The work cost more than it should have.

I put it to any hon. gentleman, lawyer or layman, as to the idea that induced the hon. gentleman to put that question. The responsibility, and I think correctly then, was put upon certain specified men. There is a certain staff with certain duties, and you may look in Todd and Bourinot or any authors on this subject, and you will search in vain to find that any government, under the British constitution, has ever been held responsible upon evidence of that kind. Mr. Desnoyers, the magistrate who, forsooth, was referred to in this case, though his judgment has not been approved of by hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken, was referred to as a prop for their case, and may therefore be quoted by me with regard to the result of the evidence. When the case was argued before him, this conversation occurred. Judge Desnoyers said:

There is no doubt in the record that there has been a big steal committed somewhere in the name of Mr. St. Louis, and I would like to see where I am to find conclusive evidence. It was to his benefit and particularly to his knowledge that such was done.

By Mr. Sharpe, of Counsel for the Crown—

I understand from Your Honour's opening remarks on the question of there having been a robbery against the Government, the record has satisfied you that such is the case.

Mark, if you please, the result of this evidence put in proper form, not the higgledy piggledy collection of testimony contained in that book, one half of which, I venture to say, would never be received in any court of law in Christendom, but evidence sifted and put in proper form before the magistrate on whom the hon. member for Queen's leaned when he comes to prefer his indictment against the Minister of Railways. Mr. Sharpe said he understood then that he considered that a fraud had been committed upon the Government, and the court replied:

"Yes. I think there can be no doubt about that, that there has been stealing going on." Now, then we start with a statement of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) who has this resolution in charge, made in 1894, and the statement of the magistrate with regard to the evidence subsequently presented. I think every fair minded man who examines the evidence will come to the conclusion that there was a steal. Where was there theft committed? Under the eyes of the department? In the department? By the connivance of the Minister? Or by the connivance of any member of the Government or the Government as a whole? No matter what exaggerated statements have been made in this debate, still no one has ventured to give a line of testimony or information which would suggest such a conclusion. The whole thing occurred on the work under men whose character had never been impeached in this Parliament or anywhere else, who had served the Government, most of them, almost for a lifetime, who were in every respect to be relied upon by the Minister as they were by his predecessors. And now because this has occurred we have a number of very wise men—there are always such to be found—who have very little experience, judging by their own statements, in managing men saying that there were not proper checks. What checks have been suggested? Was it suggested by any one that the Deputy Minister, the chief engineer of railways and canals, whose character cannot be attacked under a motion of this kind, framed as it is, should have taken up his abode at Montreal, or that the Minister of Railways should have left this Parliament and given personal supervision to the work. No, and what I complain of is that not a member opposite has been fair enough to say that, under ordinary circumstances, he would not himself have done differently. The hon. member for York states it is a very simple job, a very ordinary $176,000 transaction. Well, the Minister did what every Minister since 1887 has done. He relied on his officers whom he thought competent in connection with these works. The leader of the Opposition, for a moment, thought this was a very simple thing too—so simple that he began to give a construction to a statute which had never before been given to it. He said it was so simple a job that there was no reason for it to come within the exception of the statute which prescribes the powers of the Minister of Railways in the construction of public works. The leader of the Opposition referred to section 11 of the Act relating to railways and canals, which provides:

That the Minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works, except in cases of emergency, in which an appeal would be injurious to the public interest, or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the Minister.

Where was the hon. gentleman when the works on this canal were carried on previous to the construction of the Wellington bridge under the same system as testified to by Mr. Schreiber. The Auditor General put the facts in his report. They were before Parliament. Where was the leader of the Opposition and all the other gentlemen who will now instruct us on the wisdom of that kind of a contract. They say not a word against Mr. Trudeau, whose standing and integrity and ability have not been attacked, or to Mr. Schreiber whose standing integrity and purity have not been attacked at any time in this House since I have been in Parliament. Both of them joined in recommending this system. And I would appeal to members, who may know something of the conduct of work of labour magnitude in Montreal, whether that system has not obtained in the construction of private works or works of corporations. I am told that it was; but without searching for evidence of any kind from these scientific men, these experts, men of every other profession than engineering, hasten to give their opinion now that that was not one of the works in relation to which the opinion of the officers and advisers of the Crown should have been followed. And, if the Government were to fall on that ground, if the Minister were to lose his standing on that ground, what would be the position of Minister after Minister in the Imperial Government? How about the Ministers who are responsible for the construction of ships that, after having been built, are almost as speedily condemned? How about Ministers responsible for supplying the army with bayonets that will not stand the slightest use? How about Ministers whose departments have been investigated time and time again in reference to other matters, and who have sheltered themselves, and sheltered themselves properly, behind the advice of experts. I have heard one of the late leaders of this Government state without quarrel in this House and without any difference of opinion being expressed—I refer to the late Sir John Macdonald—that in reference to matters pertaining to engineering, he went by the advice of the engineer. The hon. leader of the Opposition blows hot and cold in this matter. He wants to indict the Minister of Railways one year for departing from the advice of his engineer: he wants to indict him the next year for following that advice. That is another evidence of the desire, the intemperate desire, of these hon. gentlemen to snap a verdict from the country on this matter while not putting the whole case before them. If there was a member of this House—I was not here in his time, but I have read something of the discussions during the time he was a member—who stood by his engineer and was not ashamed to shelter himself behind his engineer's opinion, it was the late Prime Minister of the Reform Government. If Mr. Page, the engineer in that department,

was ever held up to this House as an authority, whose word should not be questioned, he was so held up by the late Mr. Mackenzie.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And he was attacked for it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman agree that he should have been attacked? The hon. gentleman knows that he resisted that, and now he would like to take a different position.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But your argument——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is only one part of my argument—to show how inconsistent these gentlemen are. But God forbid that it should be my only argument in a case of this kind. Now, to show, again, how this case was pressed and unfairly pressed by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies), I would remind the House that that hon. gentleman referred to the date of 14th March as the time when the extension of the contract took place in favour of Mr. St. Louis, and he said that the fictitious pay-sheets were known about that time. That was a slip of the tongue, but what an important slip of the tongue. I could not believe that the hon. member for Queen's would intentionally make that statement. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) who is in his seat, and who followed this evidence closely, knows that that statement is not correct. March 14th is the beginning of the critical period. And we have Mr. Schreiber's evidence that the first time that he smelt fraud was on 10th May——

Mr. McCARTHY. 10th May?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, I gave the page last night. Mr. Schreiber suspected extravagance. He called an officer in whose integrity he had confidence, in whose integrity he had no reason to doubt, to investigate the matter, and, after that, visited the work. I do not propose in this debate to deal with any question not before us. I hold myself free to come to any conclusion as to the chief engineer, or any man under him. I hope I made clear to the House when I began to criticise this resolution. I am dealing with this attack upon the Minister of Railways, pure and simple. I want to show how unfairly the hon. member for Queen's pressed the case against the Government—or against the Minister of Railways, it is the same thing—when he referred to these fictitious pay-sheets, and indicated that they were known at so early a period. The hon. member for North York went through the report of the commission to-night paragraph by paragraph and he knows that there was no evidence on which even a commission could come to a conclusion that these fictitious pay-sheets existed; and in the prosecution of Mr. St. Louis it has been one of the most difficult things to establish to the satisfaction of the court. Indeed, from the result in the court we can infer that it was not satisfactorily established. Now, Mr. Speaker, the statement was dwelt upon by the hon. member for Queen's that no one was left to keep check upon these men. No reliable man, if you like; no man who proved worthy of his trust, if you like, but there is not a tittle of evidence that a single man was put there because there was a suspicion that he would connive at wrong-doing or irregularity—not a single one. Up to the moment when these men were left in charge of the works on the canal, there was not a single particle of evidence to show that the Minister should have been on his guard lest these men should prove dishonest. There was a staff, an ample staff. Why, if there had been more there would have been a howl on the Opposition benches at the gross extravagance of this Government in putting so many men on this work. There was Mr. Parent, a man of twenty years' experience as an engineer; there was Mr. Papineau, a man of high class, and other officers of the department. They were all certified to by the chief engineer as fit for the work. And are you going to drag Ministers down to this, that we are to try every statement that an engineer makes; are you going to hold us responsible for every officer you place at our command? Or, on the other hand, shall we not be given the privilege of believing these men when we have no reason to distrust them, of believing these heads of departments who are put there to assist and advise us in regard to these works? A more monstrous proposition could not be imagined than that we are to doubt the representations of, say a man like Mr. Schreiber, as to whether there were enough and proper men in charge of a work of this kind.

Mr. MULOCK. What is a Minister for?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A Minister is for other purposes than that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen opposite are hilarious at times. They have extraordinary opinions of their own, and when they ask a question, they seem prepared, in a most extraordinary manner, to express derision before an answer is given. I say that a Minister of the Crown is warranted in believing every officer in responsible position in his department, in acting upon his advice if the subject be a technical one, in accepting his statements if they be made officially; and where the Minister's responsibility comes in is whether on that advice, and on those statements he exercises a wise discretion, and where he finds that advice false or the statements untrue, whether he still retains

that officer, whether he again seeks that officer's advice and continues him in his place. This is not the point that has been alleged.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister allow me to put a question to him? On the 12th March, 1893, Mr. Schreiber interviewed Mr. Parent, and he reported the interview to Mr. Douglas. There was a conflict of testimony between Mr. Douglas and Mr. Parent as to the alleged extravagance. Mr. Douglas had reported to the Minister and to the deputy the fact of the extravagance. Mr. Schreiber knew this conflict, and deemed it his duty to consult Mr. Douglas again, and he came to the conclusion that Mr. Douglas's report as to the wild character of the work, was not exaggerated. He discredited Mr. Parent and he credited Mr. Douglas. Now, does the Minister say that in view of the Deputy Minister having come to the conclusion that Mr. Douglas's report was correct, the Minister was not obliged to act upon it?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman hardly does himself justice. I recollect he made that point in his speech, and he repeated the same argument that the hon. member for Queen's has mentioned. But the hon. gentleman has paid me a poor compliment if he did not listen to me when I went into that inquiry to-night, and when, in opening my argument, I approached this question entirely apart from the question of whether the conduct of the chief engineer was reproachable or irreproachable. I did say that his integrity of character and his ability as an engineer, had not been impeached in the debate. That was creditable to him. I believe I am warranted in saying that he is a gentleman for whom the Auditor General has a high regard, and many hon. gentlemen in this House will agree with me that there is no more painstaking officer in the service of the Government. Now on these grounds that officer's character has not been put in issue in this debate. I have approached this question perfectly free to have one opinion or another about the different officers; but I say that before this House can sit in judgment upon us as to how we have dealt with A, B, C, D, and others, they must in fairness ask us to give them information in due form, instead of in this irregular manner across the floor of the House. But in regard to the department to which the hon. gentleman refers, this is Mr. Schreiber's explanation, which has not been given to the House. The hon. member for Queen's referred to the "Star" article. It was shown later on in the debate that he had not fairly represented the "Star." There had not been this charge of gross extravagance, but a reference had been made to the extraordinary number of men on the works. Now, this is all the Minister of Railways knows about it, this is all he was bound to know about it. His chief engineer calls upon him and tells him of these rumours, and tells him that, having called up Mr. Parent, he has dismissed some 500 of the men—at least that is my recollection of the evidence; and sitting at his desk at that time, clothed with all the responsibility you can fairly put upon him, is there any hon. gentleman who thinks he should have done differently? Is there any hon. gentleman who thinks he should have said to his chief engineer: I do not think you are capable of looking into this matter, I do not think you or Mr. Parent are capable of informing me on this subject, and I must go down to Montreal myself? As we know the facts, and as they have come out in committee, and as it has suggested itself to a great many of its members, it would have been a grand thing if we could have all gone down to Montreal and taken the pay-lists and compared them, and have checked the whole thing over. But I say there is no company, there is no corporation in Canada, there is no Government on the face of the earth, that pursues such a system, and they never will, otherwise they would not be able to carry on their business. It is absolutely and physically impossible. And how about the staff? Would the member for North York be surprised if I told him where the misplaced confidence was put? That staff at Montreal, I am told, consisted of these old officials and others, every man Jack of them a Liberal to his backbone. Only one solitary Tory was found amongst these men, and I am told that man was removed.

Mr. MULOCK. Who was the Tory you removed?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, you have told us that Mr. Desbarats was removed from the works.

Mr. MULOCK. You say you removed Mr. Desbarats?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You said "dismissed," and again you press the case unfairly against the Government. It has been alleged that we took Mr. Desbarats, and because he was an honest and intelligent man, we dismissed him from the works in order that fraud could run riot. Why was the hon. gentleman not candid enough to give us Mr. Schreiber's explanations on oath, that Mr. Desbarats was removed because he was not required on these works? Why were hon. gentlemen not candid enough to tell us that if he had remained he could not have helped us in the least? Why did they not give his evidence from his own mouth where he tells us that as regards the stuffing of the pay-lists, they did not come in his line at all? But that is where the great fraud occurred, as hon. gentlemen all know. The hon. member for Queen's says that the question now is: How far are the Ministry responsible? I have already said that so far as this House is aware, so far as the information goes, every

pledge made by the Minister of Railways last session has been fulfilled. Not a statement has been challenged. No one has asked who had been dismissed, who the men were who have been punished for the undoubted frauds and wrongs committed. Now, the leader of the Opposition contended that it was the business of the Ministry to know all that was going on at the works. Well, Sir, I contradict that statement as a matter of principle. I do not propose to let the House believe that I am cognizant, or ever will be cognizant, of every thing that is going on in my department. I am at the mercy to-day of probably hundreds of men in reference to the expenditure of every dollar that has been voted to my department. I do not propose to admit that it is my duty to go and inspect everything that is done. If I had opportunity, it would be a pleasure to be in a position to say that I had gone, and seen, and I know. But that is not a duty that I have to discharge, or that the country expects me to discharge. They put at my disposition, as they put at the disposition of the Minister of Railways, able, and expert, and technical officials. Those officials are charged with certain duties, the Minister directs the policy, and if misconduct occurs he is bound to take the responsibility of either approving or reproving the conduct of that official. An official's conduct should not come before the House directly, but it comes through the channel of the Minister. Now, I was surprised at the leader of the Opposition, who has achieved a reputation in this country not altogether discreditable to a public man, having gone out of his way to utter what I do not hesitate to term a most unfair slander against the reputation of the late leader of this Government, Sir John Thompson. I propose to give Sir John Thompson's words as an answer to the calumny. I suppose the best period of the hon. gentleman's speech on the Wellington bridge was with reference to the case of the release of the prisoners from custody, and as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is in his seat he will appreciate the reference I will make to "Hansard" of last year. The leader of the Opposition was sufficiently unfair to insinuate that Mr. St. Louis, if convicted, would have to be released, so it was easier to release him before his conviction; and he referred to a case which not only particularly affects the late Prime Minister, but which, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) knows, particularly affects the Governor General in the most direct manner possible, for if there is any way in which His Excellency has power of an absolute character in this country that subject relates to the prerogative of mercy. There are two gentlemen in this city Dr. Church and Dr. Wright—no member on the Opposition side of the House has ever ventured to asperse their character—and if their statements be true, because on those statements Sir John Thompson acted, his action was the only action that could be taken on the line of the precedents in this country since we had responsible Government and on the line of precedents that obtain in England. I well remember how the hon. member for York was sat upon by the late leader of the Government. I remember that not only such was the case, but on this subject his lips have been sealed ever since.

Mr. MULOCK. You do not know anything of the kind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman forgets it.

Mr. MULOCK. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman the words of the well deserved rebuke and snubbing he received from the late leader of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen may jeer as much as they like, but another subject, just as irrelevant as this is to the subject under discussion, after Sir John Thompson had sat down, the hon. member for York used bold words, so bold and so absolutely without warrant that I am not surprised to find that to-night he is oblivious of the fact he ever uttered them. He stated in regard to the First Minister:

> He chose to go outside of this motion, for what reason I do not know, to say he was not ashamed of anything connected with the criminal prosecution or anything that followed it. Well, I am ashamed of what followed, and I think the time has come when the hon. Minister should explain what followed and why he gave the advice to His Excellency which led to the prostitution of the administration of justice in this country. I may say with regard to his action in that matter, that his predecessor, the late Sir John Macdonald, whose political actions did not always commend themselves to my judgment, during his long career in public life, never once was known to have disregarded the purity of the bench or to have done anything to interfere with the administration of justice.

and later on—this is the promise which he has never fulfilled:

> I will continue to bring it up until he justifies his action or stands convicted before the country of having prostituted justice.

The hon. member praises Sir John Macdonald in the lifetime of Sir John Thompson. He would now praise Sir John Thompson, who is dead and gone, in the life time of the leader of the present Government. But Sir John Thompson was alive and he made a statement which sealed that hon. gentleman's lips from that time to this.

Mr. MULOCK. It did nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then it ought to have sealed them. It ought also to have sealed the lips of the leader of the

Opposition, because a more unfair and unwarranted statement was never made, in my opinion, than that made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. That is your opinion, it is not the country's opinion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Sir John Thompson said :

> Let me make a very short statement in answer to the irrelevant and abusive attack of the hon. gentleman. I have only to state, without going into details, that he has made this attack by insinuations time and time again, and has not been man enough to challenge my conduct in that matter on any occasion when I had an opportunity of answering him in this House. But he is that description of man who can make these dirty insinuations at the close of a long debate on an entirely different question. I have only to say to him——

I call the attention of the House to these words, for every hon. member is aware that on the subject to which I refer the late leader of the Government was an authority accepted the country over :

> —that he can search the records of my department, whether under Sir John Macdonald or his predecessors or successors, and he will find in no case has an application for clemency been refused, under the representations that were made and put on the Table of this House in the case of Messrs. Connolly and McGreevy.

That was his statement, and it is one of great importance and significance. It was a challenge to a debate, but the session was allowed to pass.

Mr. MULOCK. It was at the close of the session.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Sir John Thompson died, and sixty days of this session have elapsed before any one has had the audacity to arise and by implication besmirch the character of that statesman in the most atrocious manner it could possibly be done, because if there is a word of truth in the statement that came from the lips of the leader of the Opposition, nothing worse can be said of a public man than that he made political abuse of the prerogative of mercy. And that distinguished statesman in his lifetime made this challenge to a fair, open and manly discussion, with the papers on the Table, and no hon. member rose to enter the lists with him and engage in a discussion.

Mr. MULOCK. On the last day of the session.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, on the last day of the session ; but after his last words had been spoken and his lips were closed then an hon. gentleman manages to obtain sufficient courage to rise and make a charge which if true, reflects upon Sir John Thompson's character in the most serious manner possible. Then the hon. member for Winnipeg, and I only refer to this in passing, said that Mr. St. Louis escaped justice because others had assisted him to steal. That is his construction of Judge Desnoyers's decision and the finding of the grand jury ; and I leave him to settle that question with the tribunal over which in that particular, we have at present no control. Then the hon. member for L'Islet, and I think he is the only hon. member in this House who would make the suggestion and insinuation, asked why Mr. St. Louis was prosecuted in Quebec ; while we brought other offenders to the province of Ontario. I never heard that this question was ever asked by any one else, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will be able to quote any leading member of the House as favouring that suggestion. In the case to which he referred there was a prosecution ordered by this Parliament. In the other case there was a departmental prosecution pure and simple. That is one distinction, and I leave it to the judgment of the House whether the hon. member for L'Islet would not have been one of the first to harangue the electors if we had dared to bring a member of his race to the province of Ontario to try him on that charge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen should give vent to derisive cheers. The thing is almost too ridiculous to criticise, and I would not have made the remarks if the hon. member for L'Islet had not made the suggestion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I see the hour is advancing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The debate has been long, and from the remarks that greeted that observation the debate has been too long, and too unprofitable, I believe, to many of the men who started it. I fancy that no man insinuates that I have been too long.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the taunt was made from the other side that we would not speak from the treasury benches. I have avoided as much as I possibly could—to the great detriment of the case of the Minister of Railways—reference to the evidence. But I do say, that this amendment, as it stands, cannot, in my opinion, be supported by any fair-minded man. I say that it is unfair to challenge the conduct of a Minister of the Crown in the absence of any evidence as to the steps that he has taken since he made his last important utterance in the Parliament of this country, which utterance was that he would deal with each and all of the individuals that were concerned in these serious crimes. Nothing but my desire to avoid wearying the House prevents me—it is not necessary that I should do so—going

into the steps that have been taken. When hon. gentlemen are seized of that information, which can be obtained in the usual way, then the questions that have been debated under this motion will be germane to the resolution, but at this stage of the debate I do not consider they relate to it in any way whatever.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I trust, Sir, that I should pay sufficient regard to the feelings of my fellow-members, and certainly I shall consult my own feelings better, if I fulfil the promise which I now make, that my observations shall be very brief, as brief as they possibly can be on so important a question as the one which is now under consideration. I do not like, on this occasion, to give a silent vote. The charge is not one impugning the honour or integrity of a member of this House, although there has been an attempt on the part of the Minister himself whose conduct has been impugned, as well as on the part of the Minister of Justice to divert, as it were, the attention of members from the matter which we are now considering, and to make it rather appear as if the attack were of a personal character. If the charges were of a personal nature against the Minister of Railways and Canals he would not be sitting here now. After he made his explanation, according to our rules, he would have been compelled to withdraw from the House. The charge against him is with reference to the manner in which, according to the responsibility which is due to this House, he has fulfilled the duties pertaining to his important office. Upon the main features of the history of this most unfortunate transaction, there is now practically no dispute, and if I summarize them briefly, it will be merely for the purpose of making plain to the House the argument I shall attempt to adduce based upon these facts. It will be remembered, Sir—perhaps we shall never forget it after this discussion, and after the different circumstances attending it—it will be remembered that it was in the first place proposed and suggested that the works in connection with these bridges should be done for a total sum of $170,000. From that amount we may at once eliminate the cost of the superstructure as to which no difficulty has ever occurred, and as to which no complaint has ever been made. We have not merely to deduct that $73,000, but we have also to deduct a further sum of $15,000, which was rendered unnecessary because of the arrangement subsequently made that the canal was to be unwatered. We therefore get a sum of $82,000 as the estimated cost of these works, to which I am called further to add—although, perhaps, the amount is liberal—the $40,000 for deepening the works, and enlarging them, which was estimated by the department, and by the different engineers who were examined before the two inquiries into this matter.

We have the estimated sum, therefore, of the cost of the operations of these works, about which the difficulty has been caused. To that—because I desire in this to be perfectly fair—to that, the commission added a further amount, owing to difficulties that occurred during the progress of the work. I have read the evidence, and I have endeavoured to understand it so far as one can without hearing it, and I am not quite satisfied that the commissioners arrived at the proper conclusion in this addition which they made, but I am not going to occupy the time of this House at this period of the discussion with any criticism on that. The conclusion I have arrived at is not determined by questions of that kind, and I will assume that the commissioners were right, and that this work might possibly have cost in the neighbourhood of $200,000. I will pass by all these questions which have been debated on both sides, and to which the speech of the Minister of Justice has been mainly directed, and acquitting, so far as I am personally concerned and so far as it is necessary to consider here, the Minister or his department of any preconceived scheme to allow this robbery to take place, and treating the matter on the most favourable possible basis that it can be treated for the Minister, I will see to what conclusion any man, having regard to his responsibilities, must reach. Let me give the dates. In the first place, all these circumstances of suspicion were certainly not unreasonably urged in this House, because from the extraordinary incidents that occurred, no doubt, this steal from the public treasury was rendered possible. Take the matter to which the Minister tells us he demurred, that is, the hiring of skilled labour in the first place. We know perfectly well that if it had stopped there, Mr. St. Louis' ultimate transactions could not have obtained the magnitude which unfortunately for the country they did. But the Minister was weak enough afterwards, without any apparent reason, and against his better judgment, as he now tells us, to apply the contract for the hiring of skilled labour to labour of all classes and kinds, including ordinary days' labour. Undoubtedly this led very largely to the unfortunate transactions which has caused so much discussion in the country, and which is no doubt destined yet to attain considerable proportions before the people of this Dominion. Then, we pass from that, because after all it may be said, as I think I hear the Minister of Justice say, that that is but a small question or a nice question. It may or may not be so. Whenever the Ministers are pressed, I notice that they have a habit of falling back on their engineers; and whenever the Ministers do anything right, as, for instance, in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, we hear nothing at all of Mr. Pottinger or Mr. Schreiber or the officers of the department, but the credit goes to the Minister of Rail-

ways. So that it is always heads I win, tails you lose.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman is referring to a conversation which I had with the Secretary of State, and which I intended to be private, I said that this question of what was skilled labour was considered a very nice one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would tell the hon. member for North Simcoe that each time the Minister of Railways has spoken of the Intercolonial Railway, he has given great credit to his engineers.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not going to be diverted at this hour of the night to any further statement in regard to that. We probably all know what has occurred. While the Secretary of State may say that the Minister of Railways has given credit to his engineers, I do not think the Secretary of State will say that that has been his own practice, because he has blown the trumpet for the Minister of Railways on that account on every platform throughout the Dominion, without reference to any officers of the department. Now, Sir, at this hour of the morning, and after all the discussion that has taken place, I am going to deliberately avoid every criticism with reference to the conduct of the work. I can appreciate, and I hope I am fair enough to give sufficient weight to, the argument which has been urged that it is not perhaps possible or reasonable for a Minister to have minute charge of all the works of his department, and that it would be unfair and improper to hold the Minister of Railways responsible for what occurred on the works at Lachine, providing, of course, that upon the facts coming to his knowledge he took the course which as a Minister of the Crown he ought to have taken to relieve the country, as far as it was possible to relieve it, from the loss which had occurred. But, Sir, we arrive at the date when it seems to me it is impossible for the Minister to shield himself any longer or any further behind his engineers or the officers of his department; and, in order that that may be made clear to the House, let me give the accounts as they were presented at the time when the Minister himself admits that he became aware that great extravagance had been committed, namely, on the 24th or the 25th of April. Now, the Minister of Justice to my surprise stated that the Minister of Railways had no knowledge of any fraud until the 10th of May. When I heard that statement, I thought I must have misread the evidence very much indeed, as well as the argument put forward by the Minister of Railways himself when he practically conceded that on the 24th or 25th of April he had ample and complete knowledge of the fraud that was committed at Lachine by this man St. Louis. Upon that point there ought to be no dispute; and, as conclusive evidence, I give a letter written by the chief engineer of the department—though it is not by any means the first notice of what was going on at Montreal that had been brought to the Minister's attention; and let me ask if after that it can be pretended that the Minister of Railways had not adequate knowledge. I am not speaking merely of implied or imputed knowledge, but I am speaking of positive knowledge which the Minister had as to the cost of this work above the estimate, which was first $122,000, and which was afterwards swelled to $200,000, when this letter of the 25th of April was received by him:

Dear Mr. Haggart,—As I mentioned to you, I was not a little startled upon receiving from Mr. Parent the pay-rolls and accounts for the month of March in connection with the Wellington Street bridges, which summed up an enormous sum.

So that before the 25th of April the matter had been mentioned by the chief engineer, and mentioned to the Minister:

I at once despatched Mr. R. C. Douglas off to Montreal to look into the matter and ferret out all the information he could, and report to me the position of matters, the information he gives me is as follows:—

December, January and February pay-rolls, &c., in round figures	$ 79,000
March	132,000
April	110,000
Contracts for superstructure	61,000
	$382,000
Less materials to be credited to this work, and to be debited to other appropriations, say	22,000
	$360,000

And this he considers the minimum figure that the work is likely to cost.

Against an estimated expenditure of $170,000 and the $40,000, making altogether $210,000, because in this sum the contract for superstructure was also included. He goes on:

Superintendent Kennedy attributed all to the causes mentioned by Parent, except the latter, of which he makes no mention. When the estimate made by Mr. Trudeau, the then chief engineer, and Mr. Parent, the superintending engineer, early in 1892, is considered, namely, $150,000 for 16 feet navigation, and $40,000 additional if a depth of 20 feet of water was given, making in all $190,000, the excess of expenditure requires some explanation. Mr. Parent explains that the excess of expenditure is due to the large amount of ice which had to be cut up and carted away; to the frozen condition of the excavation, to the breaking away of the cofferdam on two occasions, to the solid frozen condition of the crib and other obstructions which had to be removed, and, as I understand him to say, to political interference. Superintendent Kennedy attributes it to all the causes named by Mr. Parent, excepting the latter, of which he makes no mention. I, however, am of the opinion that, whilst these causes may have contributed to an increased cost, that we must look for other reasons to account for the enormous expenditure over and above the estimate. Mr. Douglas is

now down in Montreal looking into the matter and endeavouring to keep the expenses down to reasonable proportions. In the meantime, a Governor General's warrant is required for $200,000.

Now, I start with that point. I deliberately pass by all the other inquiries. I am not concluding, I do not desire to conclude myself as accepting the argument put forward by the Minister of Justice. But I think it is well to leave these matters which are in controversy to one side and to come exactly to the question about which there can be no dispute. At that date, all that has been paid to the contractor was $14,717.45. That was the payment of the January and February pay-rolls, and it had been made in March. So that at the date we have now come to, the 24th or 25th April, there had been of this sum which the Government seem to boast has been stolen—and because stolen they think they are free from all responsibility—only the amount of $14,000 paid out, which, there is but little doubt, Mr. St. Louis was honestly entitled to receive. But in the face of this document, in the face of this notice, coupled with the other matters to which reference has been so repeatedly made, the Minister of Railways, on the 24th March ordered the payment—I do not say he signed the cheques, because he says he did not—but he permitted his chief engineer and deputy head to give to this contractor a sum, which was not paid until the 28th, of no less than $74,777.43. On the 29th April, another cheque was signed but not actually handed over until 5th May for another sum of $9,000, making an amount of $83,777, a large portion of which was evidently obtained by false pretenses, deliberately and designedly paid over in the face of the statement made by Mr. Douglas that these works would cost nearly double the sum estimated by the engineers of the department. Referring to page 451, according to the exhibit which the Minister filed, and as to which there can be no dispute, the accounts for labour in March were as follows:—$73,013.13; $10,129.78; $7,263.64. These accounts had been received by the department on the 18th and 24th April, and had been examined on the 24th and 28th April, and certified to by the chief engineer on the 24th and 28th April. I may be told that the chief engineer, the head of the department, certified to the correctness of these accounts on the 24th and 28th, and you will observe that some of the accounts which were paid by cheque dated the 24th do not appear to have been certified to until the 29th. But is that an excuse which we have any right to accept? I shall not, at the moment, do more than just make that observation, because what I say I can say in one sentence when I make the whole statement which I propose to lay before the House, and which has been so ably laid before it by my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). We know now that after the 24th April, after this letter was written on the 25th April, whatever doubt there might have been at that time ripened rapidly into conviction; and before the early days of May had gone by, the chief engineer and deputy of the department had become abundantly satisfied, from what he had heard from Mr. Douglas and what he had seen and known, that gross frauds had been perpetrated. There is no question as to that. I will not do more than refer here to the interviews between Mr. Schrieber and Mr. Douglas, which took place on the 24th April and the 10th May. Upon the 10th May Mr. Schrieber reported to the Minister that frauds had been committed, and that by reason of these frauds it was necessary there should be an investigation, and he recommended the appointment of a commission. In the face of these conclusive facts, as to which there is no dispute, passing by all the doubtful matters: admitting that the Minister was not wrong in letting the contract out by day work, admitting that he did not violate the act of Parliament, giving him the benefit of all that doubt—let us say it was not wrong to hire skilled labour, let us say it was equally justifiable to engage ordinary labour, let us say that those notices which were brought to him from time to time were not of any moment and not calculated to put him upon his guard—what are we to say when, after the 10th of May, the department of which the Minister of Railways is at the head paid out public money to a man, respecting whose conduct they had issued a committee of inquiry to assertain whether he had stolen money or not. Let me give the dates. On the 8th May, by cheques on the 11th, $8,393.13 was paid; on the 27th May $66,000 was paid; on the 27th May by a letter—I do not see a cheque signed, put among the exhibits but the letter is here at p. 175—another $1,000 was paid; on the 6th June, $39,000 was paid to this contractor, at the very time the Governor in Council had issued a commission of inquiry on the ground that frauds had been committed. I confess I cannot imagine a case stronger than that. I fully admit that a departmental head cannot be held responsible for all the details of the working out of a department. I am willing to admit that if the Minister of Railways and Canals puts in charge of these works competent and proper men to see to the performance of contracts he does all that in him lies so far as that goes. But, Sir, where it has been ascertained by his own departmental deputy that frauds have been committed, he takes again responsibility when he authorizes the payment of the money. Because the only fraud up to that time was in the demand that was being made. Why, Sir, I do not wonder at the police magistrate of Montreal after all this prosecution, after listening to the evidence coming to the conclusion that it was

impossible to hold this man guilty of having obtained money under false pretenses. What is the money he was alleged to have obtained under false pretenses? The $8,000, the $66,000, the $7,000, the $39,000 paid by the Minister of Railways, paid certainly before he had the report from his commission, but after he knew of such irregularities that he actually caused a commission to be issued to prove and establish the facts. If I understood the Minister of Justice, and if I took down his language correctly, he says that the important point upon which hangs the responsibility of the Government, is what has been their conduct after the facts had been brought to their knowledge; I agree with the hon. Minister: I think that is a fair statement of the responsibility, and I am quite willing, for my part, to deal with them on that ground. Sir, can there be any question about it? I believe the fact is—and I want to state it though it makes no difference, as I think I shall be able to show from a constitutional point of view—that some of these payments, I do not know how many, were made upon the authority of the acting Minister, the present Prime Minister. But I do not suppose the Minister of Railways wants to shirk his responsibility by saying that the misconduct was that of his present chief. Certainly, according to every rule and principle governing the relation of Ministers to their parliamentary head, he was bound, on resuming the duties of his office to accept responsibility for all that had been done in the interim by the acting Minister. But, Sir, I have not stated the whole gravamen yet. Why, Sir, these accounts when they were paid actually had not been authorized by the Deputy Minister or even checked over. So we have the fact that the Minister of Railways as to part, and the Prime Minister as to the balance were paying out the moneys of the country for accounts that were not checked by the proper officers, and in the face of the information we have all heard about and because of which they thought it necessary to ask for an inquiry. Sir, I am not going to occupy time with a further statement of the argument. If upon this simple statement of undoubted and undisputed facts I am doing wrong in voting for the motion in amendment now in your hands, I must accept the responsibility. To my mind it would be impossible for any man who understands the facts and who understands the responsibilities which the Minister bears to the representatives of the people, whose money has been stolen, to do otherwise than record condemnation of the Minister's action in this matter. I impute nothing to him personally, but I ask him what steps did he take, when he handed over his department to the charge of the Prime Minister, warning him not to make these payments. What did he do when he knew that this man was demanding and clamouring for his money and the Minister himself was going on a summer jaunt? Did he take the slightest means to protect the treasury by leaving instructions that no money was to be paid out until this matter had been investigated? There is no evidence that he did anything, that he took the slightest precaution. The hon. Minister followed this case through the Public Accounts Committee at every step, urging everything that could be urged in defence of himself and his department; but, from first to last, he has not pretended that in any sense he sought to protect the public treasury in respect of the payments made during his absence, for which he is responsible on every ground. For my part, I put the question upon these grounds, and I draw attention now to the responsibility which, as I understand, rests upon Ministers of the Crown, and upon them alone. Sir, according to the constitution we have nothing to do with the officers of the departments; we have no right to censure them. The gentleman responsible to us is the political head, and he is bound to keep his department in order. I do not mean to say that if he shows that he has been circumvented, and that he has done all that a reasonable man could do, upon the knowledge being brought to him in order to save the public treasury from spoliation, I do mean to say that under these circumstances he should be held responsible. But what I do mean to say is that we are bound to call him to account, and upon him rests the responsibility of establishing to the satisfaction of this House and of Parliament that he has taken proper means to prevent such robbery as took place in this instance. Why, it seems almost too ridiculous, after this man has been used for false pretenses and the law has been appealed to to recover the money paid over, that it should be clear that the money was paid with a knowledge of the facts. It may be that the Crown cannot be bound in such matters by the action of its officers, but if this were the case of a private party, it would be a hopeless thing to attempt to recover money paid out under such circumstances as in the case of this money paid to the contractor, much less would the party receiving it be held guilty as a criminal in the courts of the country. Now, there seems to be some doubt as to this question of responsibility. Let me give the House a recognized authority as to the responsibility of Ministers to Parliament for the conduct of the officials of their department. In the work of the late Mr. Todd, vol. 1, page 628, he says:

> As a necessary consequence of the division of the Civil Service into political and non-political officers, and of the acknowledged supremacy of the members of the Administration over all the subordinate officers, it is required by your parliamentary system, that every branch of the public service should be represented, either directly or indirectly, in the Houses of Parliament. This duty is performed by the political heads, who are themselves solely responsible for every act of administration, down to the minutest details of official routine. Having entire control over the

public departments, they are bound to assume responsibility for every official act, and not to permit blame to be imputed to any subordinate for the manner in which the business of the country is transacted, except only in cases of personal misconduct, for which the political chiefs have the remedy in their own hands.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to find that that meets with the approval of the Minister of Justice. Nobody can deny that that is the proper constitutional rule. Now, Sir, I am not holding the Minister of Railways responsible for the wrongful acts of Mr. Kennedy, or Mr. Parent, but I am holding him responsible for the acts of Mr. Schreiber, done upon these different dates, when this money was paid out; because there is no pretense that these payments were not made under and by authority of the Minister directly, and with his knowledge, and there is no pretense that Mr. Schreiber has been repudiated. The Minister of Justice argued that the department could either adopt or repudiate the acts of its subordinates, and until the department took that course, the Minister could not be held responsible. But there is no pretense here that Mr. Schreiber, in making these payments, was not acting in accordance with the authority and instructions of his departmental head. Now, I refer again, upon the same point, to this work of Mr. Todd, at page 215 of the second volume, and I will draw attention to a discussion which took place in the House of Commons in England as to the impropriety of Parliament in any way interfering with departmental officers:

Recent administrative reforms, however, have all tended to reduce the proportion of the political element, by recognizing the supreme authority and responsibility of the parliamentary chief of each department; he must be held accountable for all the weakness or inefficiency of all his subordinates, and every member of the Ministry must share with him in their responsibility.

Having thus secured an adequate responsibility for the efficient administration of the whole public service, by means of the control which is exercised by Parliament over Cabinet Ministers, Parliament should carefully abstain from any direct interference with the subordinate officers of Government.

Then I read again from page 217:

But, under any circumstances, responsibility for the actions of subordinates should always be fixed upon their political heads. If Ministers find the (permanent) officers of the departments do not work well under them, then it is their duty to devise some remedy for this inconvenience; but the responsibility should not be divided; it should be imposed only on those that are able to respond for themselves in the House.

And then an instance is given:

Thus in 1873 the Committee of Public Accounts reported unfavourably of the financial administration of the Post Office, and expressly disapproved of the proceedings of Mr. Scudamore, the second secretary of the department, in appropriating enormous cash balances on hand to a particular service, without the knowledge of the treasury, or the authority of Parliament. But in a debate in the House of Commons upon these transactions Mr. Gladstone observed that Mr. Scudamore's conduct might be very properly animadverted upon in a report of a committee, but that he was not a fit subject for the censure of the House.

These last words being Mr. Gladstone's:

It is the political officers of this House who stand between the permanent officers and its censure, and if the House is bound to take the utmost care to avoid the cardinal error of treating the permanent servants of the Post Office as proper objects of parliamentary censure.

Then we deal only with the head of the department, and we deal, so far as I am concerned, simply with the matter as to which, as I have said repeatedly, there is no controversy and no dispute. But, says the Minister of Justice, this matter was brought up last session and underwent a discussion; and he pleads now, though the plea is a novel one to me, that the promise of the Minister of Railways that he would prosecute all these offenders, was accepted by this House in satisfaction of the delinquency of the Minister himself. Well, it is an ingenious defence, but it is wanting in any authority; it stands alone upon the argument of the Minister himself. But I deny, that because, during the closing hours of last session when only 110 members were present, before the papers were fully printed, before it was possible to digest these accounts, this question was brought before the House, that the House is not now as free as it ever was to consider, and more deliberately, as we are doing now, and to determine, what we should do, and what we should say with regard to the political officer who is charged here with the offence. But, Sir, if I were to venture upon any criticism with regard to any subsequent conduct, which I do not think at all either adds to or takes from the offence which, in my judgment has been committed by the Minister, I should ask how it is that the party who stole in the early part of 1893, that was reported upon by this commission some time in the month of January, 1894, was never prosecuted until the month of October, 1894. Now, Sir, has there any excuse been given for that? All the facts had been collected by the commission. They needed no collecting, they needed no grouping, they were all in the department, and from the early part of 1893, in the month of May or June, when the money was paid, not a step is taken until the month of October in the following year, when, hounded on by public opinion, hounded on by the comments that were made, by myself among others, upon the extraordinary fact that no attempt had been made to prosecute this criminal, as I think we may call him, the department commenced a prosecution in the month of October, which terminates seven months afterwards in the month of May.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would mention this fact, that the commission did not suggest any evidence of crime.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then where did the evidence of crime come from ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Later on.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, all I can say is that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice takes a very charitable view of the case. If that commission did not show that there had been crime, then I do not know where or how you are going to find it.

Mr. MULOCK. Did not that commission suggest fictitious pay-lists ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Frigon, who was the first witness of crime, was not heard before the commission, but before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. It was the first direct evidence, if you like, but surely you do not wait to prosecute criminals until you get direct evidence, and if this man Frigon had never turned up and made a clean breast of it, surely it would not be pretended that no prosecution would have been commenced.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think we ought to wait until we get evidence before we prosecute.

Mr. McCARTHY. All I can say is that I do not think that any subsequent conduct in the slightest degree removes the censure or makes in favour of the Minister himself. Now, Sir, I dislike very much to comment upon the conduct of the police magistrate of Montreal. I observe by the public press that the outspoken terms in which the police magistrate of Montreal was referred to here by a much more important member of this House than I am, the Minister of Justice himself, have met with severe condemnation at the hands of the press and also the Bar of the city of Montreal. Now, I cannot pretend to say what the practice is in Montreal, but I think you will search all through the criminal practice in England, as well as in any other English-speaking community, to find a case which, on a preliminary inquiry, was dragged out to the length to which this inquiry was extended in Montreal. Why, I should have thought with proper management—and I am not desiring at all to reflect upon my fellow-members of the profession who were engaged in the case, because, as I say, I do not know what their instructions were—but I do think with proper management that case could have been presented to the police magistrate in one or two sittings, and that in one or two sittings he ought to have been able to say whether a prima facie case was made out for trial.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I beg to say that you know very little about the case.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman seems to know more about it than I do.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. I never heard in all my experience, and it is a good deal longer and wider than that of the hon. gentleman, of such a case, and I challenge the hon. Minister to show when an investigation before a magistrate of a charge of obtaining money on false pretenses, was ever permitted to drag along such a length of time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman never conducted a case in Montreal before Judge Desnoyers. And I say this, that while my experience is not as great as that of the hon. gentleman, it does not enable me to furbish up a case where a magistrate ever allowed so many continuances and adjournments, against the wish of the Crown, as Judge Desnoyers allowed. The hon. gentleman will not charge the Crown with not pushing the case. We pushed the case, but the magistrate had control.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not charge the Crown or the Minister or those in charge of the prosecution with not pushing the case ; I merely comment on the fact with which we must all be astonished. But this I say, that the case against the Minister has been enormously strengthened by the double fact, that the magistrate having heard the case argued at length, and not only listened to arguments but read factums, deliberately came to this conclusion that there was not even a prima facie case, although he was satisfied that the department and the country had been defrauded by this man St. Louis. And why ? I suppose because the money was paid to him, as I have pointed out, with knowledge on the part of the officers of the department of the suspicious circumstances ; because the money was paid to him deliberately. And not only did the magistrate stand justified in his own estimation and by his own reasoning, but the grand jury—and I suppose they were not affected with the same mania for listening to cases—were able to dispose of it in two days.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The witnesses would take two hours.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Minister probably thought that the grand jury would take six or seven months. The grand jury also decided that there was no ground for sending the man for trial. If the grand jury did not see a case made out for sending the man for trial if this money is gone, as it is, unless perchance it can be recovered by a civil suit now being brought—and certainly I should think that very doubtful if the Crown is not in a better position than a private individual would be when the money was duly paid with all knowledge of all the circum-

stances—if these be the facts, what are we to do, what are we to say? Are we to say that there is no man responsible?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Allow me to say that the partner of the hon. gentleman speaking believes we will obtain the money in the civil suit. He is engaged by the Crown in obtaining it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no desire to differ from my partner as to whether the money can be obtained or not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He knows the facts better than you do.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope he will be a little more successful than the hon. gentleman's representatives have been in Montreal. I only say this, and I do not hesitate to say it, that if it was not the Crown that was a party to the suit, for there are technical rules to the effect that the Crown shall not be prescribed by the dishonesty and negligence of its own servants in seeking to recover money, I venture to state, on the little reputation I have, that the money could not be recovered. If the Minister of Railways paid this money to St. Louis with knowledge and notice of the facts, if I know anything about the rules of law which govern the recovery of money paid under such circumstances, I say the action would not be successful. But the money being paid out by the Crown in this case, the Crown can set up the negligence of the Minister of Railways.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You are differing from the opinion of your partner.

Mr. McCARTHY. This plea may be urged by Her Majesty in the case against this man, and I do not know whether judgment would lie for the recovery of money under these circumstances or not, and whether it may be recovered and not retained by the person who obtained it illegally and improperly in that respect. For my part I have no hesitation in voting for every line of the resolution which my hon. friend has moved. I have passed by, because it was unnecessary at this hour to go into them, various questions which have been so fully and ably discussed in the course of this debate. I agree that there was no ground whatever for letting this work by days' labour. But the department and the Government are above all law. They pay no attention to the statutes. I was astonished only last year to find with respect to the Sheik's dam that, without a shadow of pretense, and the Minister of Railways admitted in his speech that there was no ground for his action, a contract was let to William Davis & Bro. without tender and in violation of the clause in the Act of Parliament. If I read the Act aright, there is no ground whatever here, and when the Minister of Justice pleads the advice of engineers on the construction of an act of Parliament, then I think he is asking a little too much at our hands. I quite agree that in all matters of a technical nature the Minister has a right to rely on the officers of his department. But this is not a matter of engineering; it is the matter of the construction of a statute. Surely the hon. gentleman can read the language of the statute and decide whether there is any ground under either of the clauses to do what he did in this case, and whether this was a work that could be done more expeditiously by days' labour than by contract.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The engineers thought so.

Mr. McCARTHY. They did not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They advised so.

Mr. McCARTHY. You will not find it in the record, or I stand corrected. The work could have been done just as expeditiously by contract. Moreover, the statute says that only when the work can be done more expeditiously and economically is permission granted to do work by days' labour. We have the fruits of economy in this case. So I wholly agree with that clause in the resolution. One word and I have done. Not only was the money paid in the manner mentioned, but the Minister went to the Governor General and asked to have a warrant to pay it, and he deliberately did so. Here was the money expended that Parliament had voted, which, according to the estimate of the department, was all sufficient for its purpose, two votes, one of which has not been referred to, namely, an amount of $50,000 or $51,000 in the supplementary estimates, making altogether $226,000 in connection with the Lachine Canal; but on the 4th of May we know that the Minister went to the Governor and represented that there were debts due by the Crown so pressing in character and urgent as to entitle him to issue a warrant. That was a deliberate act on the part of the officer, and if the Government could by any means have enabled this man St. Louis to keep the money, they did it then, for they took every step which, according to my light, it was possible to do in order to make that money and payment safe in the hands of St. Louis.

Mr. FOSTER. Late or early as it is, late in the debate and early in the day, it is not my intention to make any lengthy remarks with regard to the question soon to be voted upon by the House. It is a question with which technically I am not well acquainted, a question which I have not followed in its details with any very great degree of closeness, and the remarks which I may make will spring from the general knowledge I have of the question, and the conclusion which I have arrived at by my own examination of the evidence, and by what I have

heard in the House. In the first place, by way of bringing the contrast before the House, I want to note the difference in the grounds upon which this question was approached by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McCarthy). My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition started out with the presumption, that the whole of this unfortunate business had been preconceived, and designed of corrupt motive and for corrupt purposes to put money into the hands of political favourites, which money should come back in the way of contributions to election funds. It did not seem to trouble my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) whether or not the evidence was on hand to justify that assertion, and so he started out with it as being a necessary declaration, whether evidence could be brought to establish it or not. My hon. friend who has taken his seat (Mr. McCarthy) disclaims the imputation of any motive of corruption with reagrd to the Minister, or to the Government. In that respect the contrast is a very marked one, and it is not at all to the credit of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. It plainly indicates what was the motive for revamping the old charge which was thrashed out during a former session, and with reference to which I wish to emphasize again the very strong point made by my colleague (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) an old charge threshed out a year ago and with reference to which no new information has been asked for, and no new information is available before this House. It is a charge upon which the Government and the Department of the Minister of Railways were put upon their defence last year, and after all the information and the arguments that could be based upon it were brought before the House,—than which we have to-day no further information—the House by a majority of more than two to one, exonerated the Government and repudiated the charge which was made against them. Now, Sir, the charge is brought up again, as I said, without additional evidence and without additional information having been asked for. I can quite well see how members of the Opposition would have a case to come before the House again in reference to this question, if they had enlarged it in the line of the statement made last year by the Minister of Railways; that as far as he and the Government were concerned, any officials of the Government, any officials in connection with this transaction who have been proved guilty of collusion, of fraud, or of conspiracy in order to have the money of the Government taken away from it wrongfully; that they should be punished, and that he would see that they were punished. If the Opposition had asked to know how far that pledge had been carried out, and had called for evidence with reference to it, and upon that evidence had based, and well based, a charge that nothing had been done by the Government or the Minister, then they would have had a perfect right to pursue the charge, under the new light, without leaving themselves open to the insinuation that failing to get anything new to urge against the Government they were forced to bring up charges which had been thoroughly investigated, which had been thoroughly discussed, and which had been rejected by a large majority, and by the good sense of the House, on a previous occasion. Now, I want just for a moment to call the attention of the House and the country to that fact a little more in detail. What is the teaching of this, the principle motion which my hon. friends opposite have brought against the Government this year, taken in connection with a little previous history, previous hopes, and previous vauntings, if you please. They came up to this session of Parliament heralded by their newspapers, and heralded by their own statements upon the public platforms of the country where they addressed the electorate, that they were coming charged full of new matter, of terrific scandals, and in cases of mal-administration, which the country had not heard of previously, but which when they once got into Parliament and faced these men, they would hurl against them, and by the force of these charges drive them from power. And sixty days have passed, and all the machinery of their press, and all the machinery of their investigations, and all the combined energy and vigour of their intellects put together, have been exerted in finding these new charges, in bringing to light these new scandals, and in bringing before the House these new charges which should prove the death knell of the Government. But after sixty days have passed, and the session is in its dying hours, they are forced to go back to an exploded charge of years ago. Now, Sir, that is well worth taking into account, and I mention it for what it is worth, and it will be found to be worth something before this House and the country as well. There is something more. Let us take a reasonable view of the matter even on their own lines. Can you not distinguish, and ought you not distinguish between extravagance, and fraud and corruption? Ought you not, and must you not distinguish between negligence, and conspiracy in these matters? Take the charges as they have preferred them, and as they have pursued them, and up until this 27th day of May, that has been spoken of by my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy); although in this after light which investigations have thrown upon the whole matter it is easy to see that frauds have been committed and that mal-practice has taken place: yet, Sir, up to that 27th day of May, when these last large payments were made, I say that from the records of the officers of the department and from the knowledge of the Minister himself, and from all the

sources of information that he had, there was nothing to justify the Minister or the Government in supposing that frauds were added to extravagance in the conduct of that work in the city of Montreal. It was well known at that period that extravagance had marked the work; but it was not well known, and there was no information upon which either the department or the Minister or the Government could go which would justify the charge which is brought to-day, that in the face of acknowledged and well-known frauds and corruption, we yet made these payments. It is easy to see it a year after the time, when these frauds have been exposed, and when this whole matter has been set before the country in the full light of day, and by whom, by what agency, Sir? Did the Minister wait until a charge was preferred in Parliament and a committee was asked for? Did he wait until he was forced to investigate the matter? Granted that the premise of their whole attack was right, and that this was a preconceived machinery for giving public money into the hands of political favourites, to come back again for purposes of election, would the Minister have prosecuted the very favourite he is charged with paying the money to, and prosecuted him before he was forced to do so by a strong public opinion making itself known in this House? Is there any more conclusive argument to brand their whole assumption as false than that,—that there was no such delay or procrastination, and that the Minister himself and the Government were the parties who put into operation the machinery which exposed the frauds, and that they went as far as they had power to go through the machinery of the courts towards the punishment of the main individuals who are acknowledged to have taken the money. I hold that to be an argument which sensible men will take cognisance of and have some regard to throughout the country; and they will contrast that course of action with the charge, which is hurled without a shadow of proof, that a corrupt motive existed from the very first. Sir, it is really wonderful to watch the processes of this wonderful Opposition, who spend a large portion of their time in taunting this side of the House with a lack of ability and capacity, and spend the rest of their time in trying to hatch scandals, when both portions of their time—if they would take a little bit of advice from myself—would be put to much better use, and would bring them a much richer political harvest, if they would give a little attention to the state of the country, and put themselves into a position of accord with the spirit and needs and wants of the country, and evolve something that could be dignified by the name of a policy, which, when it was given to the country, would carry the electorate by the force of a positive advantage. Then these gentlemen would not have, as they do now, to put their hands continually behind them for the old, wornout armaments of scandals upon which they seem to rely for coercing the electorate. It is one thing to draw the electorate by the power of your policy; it is another thing to try to coerce them by this line of canvass: "Oh, you ought to turn out these men whose policy you believe in, because of the scandals, and perforce, of necessity, put us in office." Let hon. gentlemen get something that will draw; let them get a positive policy that will appeal to the electorate of Canada, and let them leave this policy of simply trying to frighten and scare and drive the electors by imaginative scandals, and scandals once, twice, three times evolved—vamped up and put forward as new; warmed-up cabbage to feed the intelligent electorate of the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, for anything but extravagance, there was nothing but the symptoms and the gradually evolved information patent to the department, up to the 27th of May; and I come now to speak for a moment as to the only point of strength, whatever strength there may be in it, which was placed before the House by my hon friend, which has not been dealt with by those who have preceded me in this discussion. On the 25th of April, he says, leaving all previous circumstances out, the responsibility of the Minister began without doubt, because at that time he certainly had a knowledge of the frauds that existed. He bases that statement upon a letter written on that date by Mr. Schreiber to the Minister and upon the statement made in the letter that Mr. Schreiber had spoken of the matter to the Minister before the day on which he wrote the letter. The hon. gentleman read the letter, but it hints at nothing more than extravagance. Mr. Schreiber does not say, neither does he detail in the least possible degree, any signs or anything at all to reveal corruption or fraud. Later on, on the 10th of May, the evidences of extravagance and of bad management had reached that point when it was thought advisable to appoint a commission, and a commission was appointed. But, Sir, I speak I think within the knowledge of the Minister of Railways and of those who followed the matter, when I say that even at the time of the appointment of the commission the last thought that came into the head of the Minister was that that commission was for the purpose of unearthing frauds that existed in the development or the conduct of these works. It was supposed that the commission would show extravagance and mismanagement on the part of the officials, and may be something worse than mismanagement; but, Sir, that it was to unearth the frauds which were afterwards and by a different process found to exist, was not within the knowledge or the mind of the Minister then, however patent it may be now, a year or more after the frauds have been unearthed. That com-

mission went to Montreal, performed its labours and made its report ; and you will find, on reading its report that the commissioners themselves, after all methods and means had been employed in their investigation, were yet but slightly advanced on the path of fraud or corruption, though they did find indubitable evidences of extravagance in connection with the whole management, and lack of capacity, if we go no further, on the part of officials who had been long in the service and who were trusted by the Minister to oversee and carry on this work. When did the evidences of fraud come out ? When, Sir, at the Minister's own initiative and by the result of his own action, evidence was brought before the Public Accounts Committee which showed that frauds did exist, to whom was due the fact that this was brought out ? Hon. gentlemen opposite occupy a different position with reference to this than they have occupied in some other charges that they have made previously against this Government, where they themselves unearthed the wrong, and where they could see that unless they had unearthed that wrong, it would never have been unearthed or would have been allowed to sleep. But in this case the merit attaches to the Government, in the very line of policy that the late Sir John Thompson laid down and the pledge he gave that wrong-doing would be ferretted out wherever it existed, if it could be brought to the light of day. It was the Minister and the Government itself who set the machinery at work, who unearthed the frauds and collusions that existed, and who brought to the knowledge the state of things that existed in the conduct of that work. Now, my hon. friend says that on the 27th May these frauds existed and we had knowledge of them. There, I think he is wrong. He might say that the Minister had knowledge that extravagance had existed. On that date, $66,000 was paid. Let us take a reasonable view of the payment under the circumstances, at the time, with the knowledge that existed on the 27th May, and, mind you, without the knowledge that we to-day possess of fraud and wrong-doing. Under the circumstances as existed then, it is difficult for us to disassociate ourselves from the knowledge that we have at present ; it is difficult to put ourselves back to the quantum of knowledge and the exact circumstances as they existed then. But let us reasonably and fairly do that, and on the 26th May, when the payment was made, what were the circumstances ? Extravagance was known to have characterized the work. How great the extravagance was not known, and only a shadow of the truth, as it existed, had begun to make itself felt in the department. All that was known was that extravagance existed, but to the existence of fraud at all, there was not the fringe of suspicion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Not a fringe of suspicion of fraud that could be based upon anything to justify action existed, under the circumstances as they were known at that time. What did exist ? Pay-rolls, certified to by whom ? By the men who had to certify to them in the first instance. By the resident engineer and superintendent in Montreal, where the works were carried on. Pay-rolls, signed in due order, aggregated at that date about $174,000. What was done ? Under the representations that labour remained unpaid and that certain bills to the amount of $170,000 were lying in the department, the payment of $66,000 was made. When that payment was made, with the information then existing, what more reasonable than to say : If labouring men have done their work and are asking for their pay, and are suffering for the want of it, is there anything unreasonable, when there is $174,000 of certified bills unpaid, which surely will keep the department safe, in making an advancement payment of $66,000, leaving $111,000 unpaid.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him ? I am sure he does not wish to mislead the House, but he is quite wrong in his figures. The amount then certified by the engineer of the department was $137,000 and the payments were $111,000 unpaid.

Mr. FOSTER. On the 27th May, 1893, there were unpaid pay-rolls returned from Montreal and at the department aggregating $174,855.49.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not so.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, pay-rolls, duly certified to and regularly returned by superintending engineer Parent, and also superintendent Kennedy and chief time-keeper Cloughmin. My hon. friend must not ask to correct me in a statement I did not make. The statement I have made was that $174,000 of pay-rolls was certified to by the men who must certify to them in the first instance, and were lying in the department at Ottawa when the $66,000 payment was made.

Mr. McCARTHY. That $174,000 includes all the pay-rolls which came in during the whole summer. It is the aggregate sums which Mr. Schreiber says he did certify to. If the hon. gentleman will look at the table, he will find that the three pay-rolls in at the time amounted to $137,000, and upon this $66,000 was paid and $7,000 and $39,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not talking of any certificates which were or were not given at the department at Ottawa, but simply of the pay-rolls sent up from the city of Montreal and certified to by the resident engineer and superintendent. I am bound to take the information I have at hand. I now come to the 6th June when my hon. friend says an additional $39,000 was paid.

Mr. McCARTHY. You pass by the 27th May, when $7,000 more was paid.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a small amount compared with the total, and I am simply dealing with the two large amounts. On the 6th June, $39,000 more were paid. The payment made at that time, according to the information which I have, was made for the sole purpose of going into the hands of poor labouring men who had earned their money and were without their pay. That consideration was brought before the department, and upon that consideration $39,000 more were advanced.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The evidence was to the effect that the money paid to the poor labouring men was paid by Mr. St. Louis out of the money he borrowed from the bank, and this money you were paying was only to recoup Mr. St. Louis.

Mr. FOSTER. That may have been the statement, but the statement I have made is that which was made to the Minister at the time.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not in evidence.

Mr. FOSTER. I want again to impress upon the House——

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). I have personal knowledge upon this matter from electors of my own, who came and represented that they had been working on the Wellington Street bridge not on the Lachine as the hon. member for Simcoe, (Mr. McCarthy) stated. A great many of my electors in Lachine and in the county, represented that they had been working and they had not been paid, that they had been waiting some months without being paid. And I went to the members of the Government and represented that these poor men should get their pay.

Mr. FOSTER. My information is that this money was paid to the men themselves, that the representation was so made to the department. And again I ask gentlemen on both sides of the House to put themselves back to that date and in a condition to say how the action struck them at the time, without the subsequent knowledge that they gained. I think that is an important thing. If the authority which gave the order for the payment of $66,000 and of $39,000 had had at that moment before him, the information which the House and the country has to-day neither of those sums would be paid. But we must take the circumstances into account. Now, Sir, the $39,000 was paid out under circumstances that always appeal to a department or a government. When labouring men who have done their work, done it in good faith, earned their pay and are suffering for the want of it, ask that they shall get that which they have earned—that always appeals strongly. Now, Sir, that was the appeal that was made, and the $39,000 was paid out. But it was paid out with the idea that there still remained $60,000 or $70,000 certified to by the engineer in Montreal, and, without a knowledge that frauds were practised, the conclusion of a man would be that if we still keep a balance of this amount it surely would be enough to cover extravagance which we know to have existed, and may be frauds which might be found to exist. That is the way it would strike me, and I think that is the way it would strike the House and the country. Now, Sir, I do not wish to prolong this debate, and I am not going to prolong it much further. What I say is simply this: Taking the common sense view of the matter, this is one of the things which occur in every country in the world and under every government of the world. That Government has never yet been modelled, and I doubt that the Government ever will be modelled which will be safe from malpractice in the administration of its appropriations spread over a large extent of country, under the supervision of multitudes of men between whom and the primal authority there must be a bond of faith and of confidence, but between whom and the primal authority there cannot be the bond of that personal knowledge which will make confidence absolute and secure. These things take place in every country. But, when such a thing takes place in our own country, unhappily we have an opposition which leaps over every circumstance that intervenes, to the conclusion that the Government knew of it, and abetted it, and that it is another instance of corruption for which the Government must be condemned. Sir, the Minister last year made a pledge to this House that the matter would be ferretted out and that punishment would be meted out to the officials who were guilty of wrong-doing. That pledge is now being carried out by the Minister. Not one single scrap of information has been asked for by this House with reference to that subject. That, however, does not affect the truth of what I say that the Minister's pledge in that respect is being carried out and will be carried out, and that in this whole matter, so far as any official connected with the department or the management of these moneys is guilty of collusion of fraud, of malpractice, he will be dealt with by the Minister and by the Government. That includes not only officers in Montreal but officers in the department here in Ottawa. The Government has been pledged by Sir John Thompson: the Government has been pledged by the statement of the Minister of Railways last year, and the Government stands further pledged, if further pledge is necessary, by myself speaking for the Government here to-night, that in this department and in every department no stoppage of justice will be allowed and that no case of negligence, corruption, collusion or fraud, which upon the face of it deserves to be punished, will

be allowed to go without its proper meed of punishment. Every government will be sensible and reasonable; every Minister will be sensible and reasonable. There are degrees of wrong-doing. There may be gross negligence, there may be simple negligence; there may be pronounced fraud. Due consideration must be given to every case. Allusion has been made here to-night by my hon. friend to the permanent head of the department, the engineer. Sir, I have known the engineer of that department personally for many years. I have every confidence in his good faith; I have every confidence in his honesty of purpose. He is fallible as every man is. Allusion has been made here to-night, and a charge has been, to a certain extent, made by my hon. friend who spoke last that a part of this difficulty has come to pass on account of the man at the head of the department. That remains for the Minister himself and for the department itself to investigate: and that investigation is pledged by the word of the Minister last year, and, if any thing further is necessary, by my own statement here to-night. Mr. Speaker, I hope we have heard the last of this matter put in the light in which hon. gentlemen have put it. I hope we have heard the last of this to-night. Why must it be always taken as a cardinal principle whenever the least wrong is found out whenever the least extravagance or the least fraud is found out in the carrying out of the work of the Government, that a charge must be hurled against the Government that it is because of collusion on the part of the Government and because of corrupt motives on the part of the Government? Cannot we discuss these things upon their merits, upon the evidence that is given, and come to the conclusion that that evidence warrants, and if there is laxity or negligence, say so? But is it necessary as a first point that everything that comes up must be branded as another scandal, as another act of corruption? The genesis of a scandal, as it develops on the other side of the House, is an interesting thing for hon. gentlemen on this side to follow. I have had some little experience in that myself, and after this session, in Reform newspapers and on Reform platforms, there will be another scandal added to the list, that is the Foster bridge scandal, because in the county of York a certain transaction took place——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You had better wait, and you will hear more about it.

Mr. FOSTER. I know I shall, and I mention it to-night to show the almost insane monomania that possesses hon. gentlemen opposite, in taking up every transaction, no matter what it may be, and if, in a business point of view, they do not approve of it, if some point of management does not commend itself to them, they immediately elevate or degrade it into a scandal, and attach to it the name of some person more or less prominent, and thereafter, in the head lines of all their newspapers, put it amongst the list of scandals. My hon. friend says I will hear more of it. I shall be ready to hear it, and ready to answer it when it comes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think if the hon. gentleman deserves credit for nothing else, certainly, in the light of the facts which have been recorded, not only in respect to this comparatively trifling matter but with respect to all the acts and conduct of the present Government and their predecessors for the last sixteen years, and notably since the commencement of this Parliament, the hon. gentleman deserves credit for being the man in all Canada who possesses the most unlimited fund of assurance when he wonders that my hon. friend, with the facts before him, with the knowledge of the characters of the men with who he is dealing, proved in every possible shape and shown upon our records, and where gross frauds are proved to have occurred, where large sums of public money are admitted to have been stolen, when the chief thief concerned is a near relative of one of his colleagues, and a prominent contributor to the funds of the Conservative party—when he wonders, I say, that my hon. friend, under these circumstances, thinks it not unlikely that there was some collusion and corruption. Now, I am not on the present occasion going over all the surrounding circumstances which amply justify any deduction my hon. friend might be pleased to make. I propose to deal very briefly indeed with what I cannot call the arguments, but what I may call the evasions, which have been presented to the House by the hon. gentleman in dealing with the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). And first of all, the hon. gentleman alleges that this thing was tried before. Sir, this thing was not tried before, because we had not anything like the evidence that is now in our possession. Last year it was our duty to show to the country and to Parliament that gross frauds had been committed in connection with this same Curran bridge. We proved that up to the handle, and we compelled the Government to admit all the facts which were stated by me. We compelled the Government to get down on their knees and plead that they were not responsible, and to make a promise, which they have utterly failed to redeem, that they would have justice and judgment done on the offenders. Now, this session, with fresh evidence, my hon. friend comes forward and proves conclusively that there was such gross misconduct on the part of the head of the department, as rendered it all but impossible that fraud should not have been committed. That is the charge which is made to-day; that is the charge to which neither the hon. gentleman nor his colleague the Minister of Justice, have up to this

moment interposed the slightest effective defence. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman alleges that it was an absurdity to suppose that there was any ground for suspicion of fraud as late as May, 1893. Well, if there was no ground for suspicion of fraud, why did the hon. gentleman resort to the extraordinary expedient of issuing a royal commission? Is a royal commission, one of the most extraordinary and exceptional instruments at the disposal of the Government, involving always a large expenditure from the public chest—is that issued on vague suspicion, or no suspicion at all? Is that issued simply because he thinks a little more money than was necessary may have been expended in carrying on a public work? Sir, it was a grave step, it was a step which the Government were not justified in taking at all. I admit that they were justified in this case—but they would not have been justified had there not been a strong suspicion of serious irregularities, amounting to crime almost, occurring in connection with this same bridge. Sir, he told us that the thought of fraud was the last thing that entered into the innocent mind of the Minister of Railways, that it was the last thing that he could think of as likely to occur under the circumstances which have been narrated to us several times this evening. Well, Sir, knowing something of the Minister of Railways, when he heard there was $132,000 spent in labour bills in one month, on a work the total estimate for which ought to have been less than $40,000 for labour, I should say it was not the last but the very first thought that would have entered into his mind, or at least, into the mind of any reasonable and intelligent man. The hon. gentleman tells us that the whole merit of the discovery of these frauds belongs to the Government. Why, Sir, the Government are there for the purpose of preventing fraud, for the purpose of preventing extravagance, for the purpose of seeing that the money with which the country entrusts them, is properly expended. The Government knew at the time of issuing that commission, that three times the money that had been voted by Parliament, had been expended, and they tell us that under such circumstances there is great merit if they discovered that this money was improperly expended. The hon. gentleman shelters himself under the plea that it was the kindly consideration of the Government for the poor labouring man that induced them to pay all this money out in direct defiance of every rule and every regulation that ever was framed in any department, governing the expenditure of public money. Sir, they knew that they were not paying that money into the hands of labouring men; they knew they were paying it into the hands of a political friend who, as I have said before, was in old times an exceeding liberal contributor to their corruption fund, and that was the reason, and not any regard to the public interest, that such a pressure was brought to bear upon them to induce them to pay these sums. They were not protecting the workingmen, they were using the workingmen, or their pretended regard for the workingmen, as an excuse for these abuses. Now, I do not wish to go over the ground that has been so well traversed by my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) and the hon. member for North Simcoe. But I call attention to this fact, that the hon. gentleman has not refuted one single argument brought forward by either of these two hon. gentlemen, and more particularly by the hon. member for North Simcoe. He has not disputed the fact that so far back as the 14th April, facts were brought to the knowledge of the Minister which showed conclusively that there had been scandalous wrong doing in connection with this expenditure, which showed most distinctly—and mind you that was a fortnight after Parliament had risen—that all the money that Parliament had put at their disposal had been spent twice over, and that there were huge claims coming forward which ought to have been investigated at once. Sir, he has not pretended to offer any excuse, either, for the payment of $74,000 on the 24th April, for the payment of $9,000 on the 29th April, or for the payment of $8,300 on the 8th May. Nor has he pretended to account for this; how after allowing a royal commission to issue, he then proceeded to pay a further sum of $112,000. Nor did he offer one scintilla of explanation of the fact that the great majority of those latter payments, all of those latter payments, I believe, were not certified to by the departmental deputy. I turn to the list furinshed by the Government itself, and that list shows clearly and distinctly that all those latter payments were made in utter defiance of the fact that they had not been certified by the chief engineer. What excuse have the Government for that action? What pretense have they for dispensing with the ordinary precautions, as we know they did, putting it on the lowest ground, they being aware that the most extreme extravagance marked the carrying out of this contract, for deliberately departing from the rules of the department, for deliberately overriding the chief engineer, who was too honest a man to certify to these accounts. It was their bounden duty under those circumstances to have declined to pay any further sum, at all events until this commission had reported. If this commission had found that there were considerable sums of money fairly and honestly due to innocent parties, then perhaps the House might have taken a more lenient view than it at present takes of this transaction. But the Government did nothing of the kind. It disregarded all the usual precautions, and it took advantage, improperly took advantage, of the power to obtain a Governor General's warrant. That

warrant was issued within a very few days or weeks after Parliament had risen. Parliament did not rise till the 1st of April, and there must have been in the department at the time ample evidence that considerable further sums would be required. Had the Government attended, as they should have done, to their business, had the Minister attended to his work, as he should have done, he would have known before Parliament rose that he would require large sums of money in order to complete the work, and he had no business and the Government had no business whatever to abuse that provision for the purpose of paying $220,000 which Parliament had never authorized. Sir, the hon. gentleman tells us he hopes that—and no doubt he is sincere in that—he will not hear anything more of this matter. I will disabuse his mind in that regard. There is not a hustings in Canada on which the conduct of the Government will not be exposed. He may take my word for it. There is not a constituency where it will not be known that $200,000 of the people's money have been stolen, acknowledged by the Government to have been stolen, acknowledged by the Minister of Justice to have been stolen, and stolen by reason of the gross negligence of the Minister of Railways and his colleagues, and that up to this time, two years after it was known that the grossest extravagance had been committed, and more than 18 months after it was known that fraud had entered very largely into the transactions, to give hon. gentlemen opposite the benefit of his argument, not one single offender has been put on trial for stealing nearly a quarter of a million of money. This matter has been discussed in the press and in Parliament. There is not the faintest doubt that Mr. St. Louis had a great many partners in this transaction. There is not the slightest doubt that had he not been a political favourite, had he not had friends in high places, had he been a poor ordinary offender who had stolen $5, Mr. Emmanuel St. Louis would be adorning the cell of a penitentiary in some part of Canada. I do not at all agree that the hon. the Minister of Justice would not be justified when he found the Government could not obtain justice for some reason in Montreal, in seeking a change of venue. It is hard to say which will strike the public mind worse on the present occasion, whether the evidence brought before us of the utter incapacity with which the Government has chosen to administer their affairs, or the miscarriage of justice which has taken place, or the huge theft of public money that occurred—I hardly know which of these will deserve the severest condemnation at the hands of the people of the country, unless perhaps it should be the defence which Ministers considered it was not beneath them to put forward in excuse of those frauds. The department pleads that it could not help itself, the department sitting at Ottawa with ample time to prepare itself and obtain all possible knowledge that could be obtained as to what was required for these public works, the department was so helpless and knew so little, and is so inefficiently administered, in this regard at all events, that they cannot prevent, under their very eyes, $200,000 of public money being stolen. There is no use in the hon. gentleman pretending that we exaggerated the amount, because the Government are now suing St. Louis for $175,000, alleged to have been obtained by false pretenses.

Mr. OUIMET. We are going to get back more than he ever got.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When we bear in mind the testimony given by St. Louis, that he was obliged to burn his books because there was danger if those books remained that many eminent persons, who had received contributions from him, might be injured. I fully and entirely believe the hon. gentleman that it is quite possible that out of $175,000, which the Government alleged to have been embezzled, a great deal of that was not embezzled for St. Louis' own personal benefit.

Mr. FOSTER. That is orbiter dictum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. Were I pleading before an impartial court I would find almost all the other members of the bench would agree with it. What are we asking? We are asking that after it has been proved, in the clearest manner possible, that the ends of justice have been frustrated by the deliberate misconduct of the Minister at the head of the department or the acting Minister, whoever he may have been, the present Premier, I believe, that those men have entirely misapplied this money from the purpose for which it was intended, and that they paid this money with full knowledge that the most gross extravagance had been committed, and with full ground of suspicion that gross fraud had been committed, censure shall be passed on the man who is constitutionally responsible to us for this loss of the public funds. Sir, if there ever was a case to which it was fully and clearly our duty to call the attention of the country, and to hold the Minister, with the new evidence we possess, responsible for the action taken, it is the present case as set forth in the motion of my hon. friend, and I venture to say, as I cannot, at this hour, go into further details, to the hon. Minister opposite, whether he knows it or not, even among hon. gentlemen behind he will hardly find a dozen, except of those who have some very strong personal reason for sustaining the Minister of Railways, who do not feel that his conduct on this occasion has been utterly and entirely at variance, I will not say with all constitutional principles, but with every single solitary precept of

common sense, every rule which any ordinary business man would lay down for his guidance in the daily transactions of life. Where could he find such facts brought out in the case of a great mercantile firm, let us say, where the firm, knowing the facts in the case and the parties who had defrauded them, then paid out a large sum, as was done in this case, under circumstances which as was well pointed out by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), make it a matter of exceeding doubt whether the country will recover one farthing, unless, peradventure, some ancient technical rule, which has subsisted for many years in a different state of society, can be twisted by legal ingenuity so as to baffle the effects of the folly and misconduct committed by the Government.

Mr. McNEILL. I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, to prolong this debate by attempting to discuss the question. But before I record my vote I should like to ask the members of the Government, whether or not it be the intention to bring to justice some of these people who have been concerned in this abominable fraud which has been discussed here to-night ? There has been an attempt, as we all know, to bring one of these men to justice, but that attempt has failed. I wish to know whether any further attempt will be made ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the House will permit me, I have no objection to stating very frankly to the hon. gentleman, that the Crown has met with a very extraordinary disaster in the prosecution of one against whom we had what we believed the most conclusive evidence, and it is a question as to how far we can proceed against the others implicated. One, for instance, Frigon (the hon. gentlemen of the Public Accounts Committee will remember him), we cannot very well perhaps proceed against. He acted as a witness for the Crown in the prosecution of St. Louis, and there are two others against whom the Crown has some evidence. However, the evidence against them is not so strong, by any means, as the evidence against St. Louis was. I have a report on all these question and there is not a paper that I have that the House is not welcome to. I stated frankly in the House the other night, that so far as I was individually concerned, I was prepared to advise the Government that with the experience we have had of the present prosecution it was idle to press the weaker cases.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, I say it seriously. It was idle to press in the same tribunal the weaker cases. If we cannot succeed in Montreal, either before the magistrate or the Grand Jury in a case where the evidence is, in the opinion of the advisers of the Crown, as strong as is thought necessary, I do not hesitate to say that it would simply be a waste of time and money, to proceed against those in reference to whom the evidence is not so strong. These are cases which will be considered on their merits, and I say unhesitatingly, that the instructions from my department and to the counsel who have assisted me in this matter, have been to proceed against every person who was guilty of crime and who could have been punished. So far as that can be done I have every desire to do it ; but we have to be reasonable, and where we find difficulties in the way we have to consider what these difficulties are. The instructions, and the intentions of the Government, are as I have stated.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago (the Minister of Finance stated it several times also), that we do not know the steps which have been taken by the Government for the prosecution of the criminals. We infer therefore that something has been done. The only thing we know of is the civil suit against Mr. St. Louis, and the Minister of Justice tells us that Mr. St. Louis is sued for much more than he owes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am delighted that the hon. gentleman has asked me that question. All he knows is that a civil suit is taken against Mr. St. Louis, and with the statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals last session that certain steps would be taken against all implicated in this wrong doing ; at the end of this protracted debate the hon. the leader of the Opposition says : He only knew that criminal proceedings have been taken and this civil suit. That is just my case. There have been, I suppose, eight or nine men who have been dismissed from the service. The hon. gentleman did not know that.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that a prosecution ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a very serious punishment to some people, and I think it would be very serious as the hon. gentleman would understand to a man who had been in the service for twenty years. That is what I had reference to when I said that no member had taken the trouble to inquire as to what had been done with the responsible parties.

Mr. LAURIER. The prosecution is dismissal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Surely the leader of the Opposition understands the statements I have made : that it is idle, in my opinion,—I frankly said that—to proceed against the minor criminals, when we cannot secure a conviction against the man towards whom the strongest evidence pointed.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask, in order that I may vote intelligently, if the

Government intend to proceed against the Premier who was acting in place of the Minister of Railways, and also, if they intend to take action of dismissal or otherwise against Mr. Schreiber? That would clear the way for me to vote intelligently.

House divided on amendment of (Mr. Davies) p. 2834:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Bain (Wentworth),
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Borden,
Boston,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Christie,
Colter,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Dawson,
Devlin,
Edgar,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Flint,
Fraser,
Frémont,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Harwood,
Innes,
Landerkin,
Laurier,
Leduc,
Legris,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
McCarthy,
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Martin,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mulock,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Vaillancourt, and
Yeo.—65.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Belley,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Bryson,
Burnham,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chesley,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis (Alberta),
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),
Grandbois,
Grant (Sir James),
Guillet,
Haggart,
Haslam,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hutchins,
Jeannotte,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Patterson (Colchester),
Kenny,
Lachapelle,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonnell (Algoma),
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreevy,
McKay,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Montague,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Pridham,
Prior,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Simard,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Turcotte,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westm'd).—102.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Moncrieff,	Lister,
Bergin,	Geoffrion,
Sproule,	Campbell,
Leclair,	Langelier,
Hughes,	Forbes,
Baker,	Choquette,
Smith (Sir Donald),	Charlton,
Smith (Ontario),	Lowell,
Tyrwhitt,	Edwards,
Patterson (Huron),	Préfontaine,
Pope,	Bourassa,
McLean (P.E.I.),	Welsh,
Corby,	Delisle,
Cleveland,	Lavergne.

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to: and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Resolution reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Main motion agreed to; and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 20th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Shore Line Railway Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Gillmor.)

IRRIGATION IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DALY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 120) respecting the utilization of the waters of the North-west Territories for irrigation and other purposes.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the nature of the amendments proposed ?

Mr. DALY. The first amendment relates to section 1. As it stands the word "agent" means the registrar of land titles. It is proposed to amend the section so that people will be able to go to a Dominion lands agent, instead of having to go to the registration office, which, for instance, in the territory affected is in Calgary. There is a Dominion lands office at Lethbridge, which will be nearer at hand for some people. The next amendment is in regard to section 4. Under that section in the original Act the use of water, except where the contrary is specified, is vested in the Crown. It is contended that this might interfere with navigable and floatable rights on any of the rivers, and the amendment proposed is to remove that doubt. The next amendment is to subsection 1 of section 7. It is provided at present that any person who desires to use water-rights subsequent to the passage of the Act shall obtain a license, and that such license shall be obtained on or before 1st July, 1895. The provision as it stands is compulsory, and refers even to people requiring water for domestic purposes. The amendment is to make the Act not to apply to water for domestic purposes, and also to extend the time for obtaining licenses, by people authorized to use the water, for another year. The next clause is in reference to the application for license. Under the present section men living on their own farms are put to great expense, because the Act provides that they shall file certain plans and give certain notices, and the experience of one year has shown that this entails on property-holders too much expense and trouble. The amendment will simplify that matter, especially as regards filing plans. The next subsection refers to the same matter. Under the present Act the maps, plans and book of reference must be signed and certified to by a duly qualified Dominion lands surveyor. It is thought in connection with the small ditches on individual farms to be unnecessary that the plans should be signed by a surveyor, but these may be submitted to an officer of the department, and if certified as correct, that will be sufficient. This amendment will relieve farmers or individuals from the expense of obtaining the services of a Dominion land surveyor.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. FOSTER.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES REPRESENTATION ACT.

Mr. DALY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 121) to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chap. 7, respecting North-west Territories representation.

Mr. LAURIER. In what particulars will the Act be changed ?

Mr. DALY. The effect of the amendment is this : Under the present law the qualification of a voter at Dominion elections in the North-west Territories is that he shall be a British subject, 21 years of age, a resident of the Territories for 12 months prior to the issue of the writ, and a resident of the electoral district for 12 months prior to the issue of the writ. This Bill seeks to amend that law by providing that the qualifications should be identical with the qualifications of a voter for the local assembly, namely, that he should be a British subject, 21 years of age, and that he should have resided for twelve months in the Territories and three months in the electoral district. There is a further provision altering the oath to meet that.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot help congratulating my hon. friend that he is coming to sound principles gradually.

Mr. DALY. It is the franchise that was laid down by this House some years ago.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved for leave o introduce Bill (No. 122) to amend the General Inspection Act. He said : The object of this Bill is to amend section 19 of the General Inspection Act by substituting the section that I have framed for subsection 2 of the Act, and also by adding an additional subsection as subsection 4. The purpose of the Act is to more completely regulate the inspection fees charged by the grain inspectors throughout the country. This subject was brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) some weeks ago. I then stated that the whole question had been engaging the attention of the Government, and that it was the intention to introduce legislation upon the subject during the present session. Owing to the rapid development of the export trade in grain, the fees collected at certain terminal points have been rather in excess of what would meet the requirements of the service. This is so only in two places, Port Arthur and Montreal. In what may be considered as normal years, and under normal conditions, the fees which were payable as salaries to the inspectors were not more than should be payable, having regard to the im-

portant and responsible duties devolving upon these inspectors. The Bill provides that the Governor in Council may make such disposition of the fees, at any of the places where inspectors are appointed, as may to them seem right and proper. The amendment proposes to provide greater facilities for entering the elevators and examining the books kept there for the purpose of showing the quantities of grain exported, and all other particulars that may be necessary. I may say that the elevators are owned by private persons and not, as is supposed by some, by the Government. This amendment is to render clear any doubt that might exist as to whether the Government had a right to examine the books belonging to the elevators. We have had no difficulty in doing that heretofore. I may add that the fees collected in all other places outside of the two points I have mentioned, are not excessive, and I doubt whether the service could be performed for anything less than the amounts that have been so received as remuneration. It must not be forgotten that in all matters of inspection, the policy of the Government has been for many years not to appoint salaried officers, the reason being obvious, that in years when the export of grain amounts to little, then the salaries to officers might form a tax upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The fixed policy has been to pay by these fees, and it is not intended to depart from it. But it is intended to so regulate the fees that when they reach a sum beyond what is considered right and proper for the officer to receive, then the surplus may be disposed of in such a way as the Governor in Council may think proper.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish I had drawn the attention of the hon. the Controller to an apparent discrepancy between the returns from Fort William and the amount of wheat which, according to reports, ought to pass through the elevators there. I understand that the gross receipts of that office are somewhat less than $10,000 a year. The fees amount to about $1 on a car of grain, and according to that there could not have been more than six millions bushels of wheat passed through the elevator and inspected at Fort William. The report in the newspapers, given to grain merchants, presumably by the Canadian Pacific Railway, shows that we exported something like twelve or fourteen million bushels from Manitoba. I would suggest that it would be well for the Government to get reports from the Canadian Pacific Railway as to the number of bushels they haul, and check the returns from the inspectors in that way.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) has suggested just what I have stated. The elevators belong to private parties. The hon. gentleman evidently makes a mistake in supposing that all the wheat that goes into the elevator is inspected. It is not. All the wheat that is inspected is checked and carefully looked into, and I am bound to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway has afforded our officer every facility for verifying the report of the inspectors. In fact, since the hon. gentleman referred to it, I have taken the pains to send Inspector Morrow, of Toronto, to verify the report. The salary of the officer in question is far less than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) supposed when he was addressing the House before.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUBLIC WORKS ACT.

Mr. OUIMET moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 123) to amend the Public Works Act. He said: This Bill is to provide for the sale by public tender or public auction, of public works or property that are no more required for public purposes.

Mr. LAURIER. Can the hon. gentleman at this moment inform the House what kind of property he intends to cover by that; whether it is plant or machinery or real estate?

Mr. OUIMET. Old plant, machinery, furniture, and property that is no more used as public property for the public service. At the present moment we have in Hamilton, for instance, an old building which used to be a custom-house, which we advertised for sale; and the question has been raised whether the Public Works Act authorizes us to sell it. Of late, authority has always been obtained by Order in Council. In order to get rid of the doubt which has arisen, I introduce the present Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPRESENTATION ACT.

Mr. OUIMET moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 124) further to amend the Act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons. He said: When the Act to readjust the representation in this House was passed two years ago, a mistake was made in the description of the newly constituted county of Berthier, and by that mistake the north-east half of the township of Joliette which used to belong to the county of Joliette was merged into the new county of Berthier; and, as the description of the old county of Joliette was not amended, this half township now belongs both to Joliette and Berthier. That part of the township of Joliette together with the other part and the township of Courcelles now form the parish of Ste. Emilie de l'Energie. This Bill is introduced to declare that the whole parish of Ste. Emilie de l'Energie shall belong to the county of

Joliette. When the electoral lists for the counties of Joliette and Berthier were revised last year, the revising officer in the county of Joliette did not make the electoral list of that part of the township of Joliette, but left it to the revising officer of Berthier. My first intention was just to place things in the same state that they were before, but it became very difficult to do that, on account of one single list having been made for the whole. Having consulted the parties interested in the matter, and especially the hon. member for Berthier, it was thought that the best way to get out of the difficulty would be to return to the county of Joliette all that part of the township of Joliette which was taken away, and also the township of Courcelles, that is, the whole of the parish of Ste. Emilie de l'Energie. It is further provided in the Bill that the list which has been prepared by the revising officer of Bertheir shall serve for the county of Berthier until a new list is made.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. GILLIES asked, Have the commissioners of the joint convention of the Governments of Canada and the United States completed their investigation into the subjects submitted to them to report upon? If so, does their report suggest that an arrangement be entered into between both governments preventing purse-seining, seining and trawling beyond the three-mile limit upon the Atlantic coast? If the work of the commission is not yet concluded, when is their report expected by the Government?

Mr. COSTIGAN. 1. The joint commissioners have not yet completed their investigations of the subjects submitted to them for report. 2. The points of inquiry are covered by the convention, but, as the investigations are not yet completed, no reports on these subjects have been anticipated. 3. Nor could the department at present intimate any probable date for the receipt of the report by the Canadian Government, which must in the first instance, either jointly or severally, be submitted to Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States.

POST OFFICE OF LAURENTIDES, P.Q.

Mr. CARROLL asked, 1. Has the Government purchased or bought from Ovide Brien or any other parties a building for the purpose of placing therein the post office of Laurentides, county of L'Assomption? If so, when, and on what terms and conditions? 2. Has the Government taken any steps, and if so, what steps to have the said building repaired and fitted to serve as a post office?

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Brien's building has not been purchased, but an expenditure of $350 has been made to fit it as a post office, so as to secure adequate postal accommodation for the people of that important town.

PROHIBITION COMMISSION.

Mr. BORDEN asked, What was the total number of meetings held by the prohibition commission? How many of said meetings were attended by each commissioner? Have all the commissioners received pay for the meetings attended by them?

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend to put that in the form of a motion for a return. The information is not in the office, but we have written for it, and will receive it by the time this motion is through.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. PERRY asked, Who has the contract for supplying cedar sleepers for the Prince Edward Island Railroad? Was the contract let by tender? How many tenders were received, and from whom? What was the amount of each tender? What is the quantity contracted for? Was the lowest tender accepted, and how much do the sleepers cost per thousand, delivered at Summerside, P.E.I.?

Mr. HAGGART. J. D. Windsor, New Mills, N.B., has the contract. Yes, the contract was let by tender. Five tenders were received, as follows, for cedar ties: —

J. D. Windsor, New Mills, N.B., 30,000 at..	$0.21½
Warren Taylor, Salisbury, N.B., 6,000 at..	0.22¼
Sumner & Co., Moncton, N.B., 15,000 at..	0.23¼
Sumner & Co., Moncton, N.B., 15,000 at...	0.23¾
I. & R. Young, Tracadie, 3,000 at.....	0.30

Thirty thousand were contracted for. The lowest tender was accepted, and the sleepers cost $215 per thousand, delivered at Summerside.

MR. GEORGE WALLACE.

Mr. FRASER asked, Is George Wallace, of Woodbridge, Ont., now, or has he at any time been in the employ of the Government? If so, (a) when was he employed? (b) For what length of time? (c) What remuneration did he receive, and (d) what was the character of his employment?

Mr. WALLACE. He was, but is not now, in the employ of the Government. He was employed from 9th April to 16th June, 1893, at Brockville and Quebec, in rearrangement of a vessel, at $3.50 per day; from the 1st to 31st of October, 1894, as an acting special preventive officer of customs, assisting special officer Belton, at $2 per day; from the 1st April to latter part of May, 1895, as an acting special preventive officer of customs, assisting special officer Belton, at $2 per day.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolution (p. 2815) reported from Committee of Ways and Means, was read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 125) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required to defray certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1895, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the order for second reading of Bill (No. 44) respecting commercial treaties affecting Canada be discharged. He said: After the discharge, I want to move for leave to introduce a Bill as a substitute. The Bill which is on the paper is general in its provision, the idea having been to make it applicable to all treaties that may take place hereafter. But, after thinking the matter over, we have concluded that it is better to pass a Bill relating to this particular treaty alone—that is, the French treaty.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know that the change the hon. gentleman contemplates is altogether an improvement. As I understand it, the Bill which the hon. gentleman is going to introduce is to be limited to the French treaty. As a consequence, in any future treaty we may have to negotiate, the same difficulties may arise as arose with regard to the French treaty. Unless the hon. gentleman has strong reasons for going back on what should belong to Canada at present, I cannot conceive that the measure he is going to introduce will give the same satisfaction.

Bill withdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it will give most perfect satisfaction. What we are really dealing with is a treaty which has been made and ratified by Parliament, and what we are going to ask the House to do is to pass the legislation which is necessary with respect to that particular treaty. I did not suppose I would meet any criticism from my hon. friend, when I was not asking powers for the Governor in Council, in the way of proclamation, as to treaties not yet made. Parliament is always here, and it is impossible for us to have a treaty without the sanction of Parliament; and when sanctioned, we can, in the same session, provide for what is necessary with regard to that treaty. It would be better to make each enactment refer to the particular treaty at that time in hand. I move for leave to introduce Bill (No. 126) respecting commercial treaties affecting Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SALARIES OF JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Resolution (p. 2180) reported from Committee, on a certain proposed resolution respecting the salaries of judges of the provincial courts, was read the second time and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) vincial courts, was read the second time and judges of provincial courts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEVELOPMENT OF SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 74) further to amend the Act to encourage the development of sea fisheries and the building of fishing vessels.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman please explain.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I gave an explanation when I introduced the Bill. I will read a memorandum which briefly sets forth the object of the measure:

> The object of this Bill is to give certain fishery officers standing power to take evidence under oath, when making inquiries into alleged fishing bounty frauds. At present, when a case of alleged fraud is reported and referred to the Inspector of Fisheries for inquiry, such officer is, in many cases, unable to get at the facts, because of the unwillingness of parties connected with the irregularities, or of those in possession of the facts, to tell the truth. It often happens too, when parties do give information with regard to alleged fraud, which, they say, they are prepared to prove if called upon so to do, that they refuse to substantiate their statements when called as witnesses. If the officers had the power to get evidence under oath, these difficulties would be removed, and better results would follow the prosecution of such cases. Chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, as amended by the Act of 1889, provides for the appointment of a commissioner to inquire into matters of this kind, but, as frequent complaints of fraud are made, it would be necessary, under this Act, to go to Council for a commission in each case, and considerable delay often follows; while the proposed amendment to the Bounty Act would enable the officer to proceed, once a complaint is made, to obtain the facts under oath without delay.

At present our fishery officers are given the power of justices of the peace for the investigation of cases of infraction of the fishery law. But now, when questions of fraud are to be inquired into, in order to take evidence we must go to the Governor in Council and ask for the issue of a commission. The House will easily understand the inconvenience of this course. This simply extends the power of the fishery officers so

as to authorize them to take evidence in cases of fishery bounty frauds.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, considered in committee and passed.

On motion for third reading.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the Bill is read the third time I would like to make an inquiry regarding a matter which I did not quite catch when we were in committee. This Bill confers these powers upon "any fishery officer." What class of officers is included in that term? Is there a definition in the statute which would show what class of officers is included under that term?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The inspector would naturally be selected wherever possible, but this is not always possible.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What other officers, what other persons than the inspector might be selected under this clause? I heard the hon. gentleman's explanation and I think the object he has in view is a good enough one; but I think such an inquiry ought to be entrusted to men of a certain intelligence. I think it likely that that class would be indicated by the expression "any fishery officer," but that term might also include men of a class not fitted to conduct such inquiries.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The only answer I can give to the hon. gentleman is that the department will select only permanent officers, the inspector by preference. But there may be cases where it would be inconvenient and unduly expensive to send the inspector. We must ask Parliament and trust the department to exercise a wise judgment in these matters.

Motion agreed to; read the third time and passed.

DOMINION NOTES ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 22) further to amend the Dominion Notes Act, was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any section of the Act requiring a return to be made to Parliament showing the extent to which the power conferred by this clause is exercised?

Mr. FOSTER. The returns are published every month in the "Gazette." This Bill is simply to remedy a defect in last year's legislation.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Incidentally, you might tell us how the defect occurred.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not been able to find that out myself.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

House resolved itself into committee on resolution (p. 2165) respecting judges of provincial courts.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is practically no change. This is really to remove a doubt and settle a question which occurred to the mind of the judge who is affected, that is the judge of the maritime court, and to put him in the position which he desires to be in. He himself has suggested doubts, as a local judge in admiralty—and the same with all the other judges in admiralty—one being that there was no mention of the maritime court of Ontario. He was left as judge of the maritime court, that position was not affected, but when we constituted the admiralty jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court, and provided that the local judges be judges in admiralty, we simply provided that the judge of the maritime court should be the judge in admiralty. In all the other provinces the judges in admiralty courts come within the terms of the Superannuation Act, and this is to bring in the maritime court.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not see how any one Parliament came to put the local judges in vice-admiralty on superannuation. How did they get an ordinary local judge in admiralty on superannuation?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Section 14 provides for that.

Mr. McCARTHY. How does that apply to judges of maritime courts in Ontario?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The doubt that arose was whether the judge of the maritime court, who is the local judge in admiralty in Ontario, was on the same footing as all the other local judges in admiralty, and as the maritime courts had not been specially mentioned, the object of this is to remove that doubt by putting after the words "vice-admiralty" in the present Act, the words "the maritime court of Ontario," because he discharges the same duties.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What statute contains that subsection 2 that you are amending by adding the words "maritime court of Ontario"?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Section 14 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was not that passed before we established vice-admiralty courts at all?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When those courts were established, and the local judges in vice-admiralty courts were appointed, was any provision made to bring them under the Superannuation Act, this new class of judges?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Under the provisions of that Act they remained entitled as judges in vice-admiralty. Then the Act constituting our admiralty court, threw upon those courts these duties, and so the judges in admiralty in other provinces were mentioned as such, and the judge of the maritime court in Ontario was empowered to do the work of the local judge in admiralty in Ontario. So it stands in this position, that we have assumed all along that they were on an equal footing as to the superannuation, but the judge of the maritime court in Ontario expressed his fear that there was a doubt through his not being considered as coming within the meaning of the Act as a local judge in admiralty, but merely as judge of the maritime court authorized to do the work of a local judge in admiralty. There is no reason, as it seems to me, for distinguishing his case from that of the other judges who do the same work.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that there would be no reason for distinguishing a judge of the maritime court of Ontario from the local judges of the vice-admiralty courts in other parts of the Dominion. But the assumption he draws is directly at variance with that which I drew. I understood from our Revised Statutes that the judges of the old vice-admiralty court came within the Superannuation Act, but when the new Admiralty Act was passed in 1890, I think, and the Exchequer Court was made an admiralty court with local jurisdiction and local judges, the salaries of those men were entirely altered and largely increased, but no provision, that I recollect, was made bringing this new class of judges, with their increased salaries, under the Superannuation Act. My impression was, and remains so up to this time, unless the hon. gentleman can show something to remove it, that it was not the intention of Parliament that these local judges should be brought within the superannuation clauses of that Act at all. If that impression is correct, I certainly see no reason why we should put them on now. On what ground? They do not do a large amount of business, they receive salaries which, in my humble judgment, are a very good compensation for the work they do, but I am not going to quarrel with their salaries. But that they should get an additional compensation, which I never understood up to this moment they had got, is something that I cannot agree to at present. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that there is no reason why the maritime court judge should be accepted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We can take a discussion on that general question, which, of course, was one I did not intend to deal with, on another stage of the Bill. But I may point out to the hon. gentleman that it seems to me at the moment there was a good reason for this legislation, because otherwise we would have affected the positions of those judges unfairly. They were judges in vice-admiralty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was our Exchequer Court in admiralty established in 1890?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In 1891. They were judges in the vice-admiralty court, and by law they had a right to superannuation quo ad their salaries as judges in vice-admiralty; and I take it that the British Parliament, in transferring the jurisdiction of their courts within the purview of the Canadian Parliament, would not seek to alter their standing and say to them: Under the Imperial system you were regarded as entitled to superannuation, but now that we are going to deal with you, we shall cut off that right. I think that in that particular they have vested interests.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh, no; and I tell the hon. gentleman why. The old vice-admiralty judges were Imperial officers, and held their position by Imperial patent. Now, when we introduced the new Exchequer Court Act, and appointed new judges of the new court, we also subdivided the districts, if I remember aright. For instance, in the old time there was one vice-admiralty court for the whole province of Nova Scotia. I think the late Sir Wm. B. Young was the vice-admiralty judge, and he discharged the duties for the whole of the province. His jurisdiction was large, his duties were onerous, and a great many cases came before him. His successor, now Chief Justice McDonald, also filled the same position, and my recollection of it is that when we established our new courts of admiralty in connection with the Exchequer Court, we subdivided this district and appointed a number of smaller judges.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We made these judges local judges under the Exchequer Court. There is an appeal to the Exchequer Court, and the judges who formerly exercised the jurisdiction of the court of vice-admiralty exercise the same jurisdiction as local judges in admiralty. Take the Quebec judge in admiralty, he has no other judicial function, and there would be this curious position if the law was not as it is, that a county court judge would be entitled to superannuation and a judge in

the vice admiralty court would be entitled to nothing. There was no reason for that distinction when both had served in their responsible positions for fifteen years.

Mr. McCARTHY. I had the impression that the judges of our maritime courts were not entitled to superannuation before the Act was passed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman is right; but the judges of the vice-admiralty court are. That is the point being made. When all these judges were made local judges in admiralty the construction was given that they would come within the general clause of the old Act, and as it seemed they were on the same footing, and there was no dispute that the other judges have a right of superannuation, it was proposed to make the whole matter clear by this Bill. This simply places the judges in the admiralty court in Ontario in the same position as other judges in that province.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will see I was right in my contention, as I find by the Act of 1891. There was introduced a Bill to confer upon the Exchequer Court admiralty jurisdiction within Canada. The jurisdiction of the old admiralty court was vested in the Exchequer Court, and it was declared to be the admiralty court for the Dominion of Canada. Then we vested the jurisdiction formerly resting in the vice-admiralty court in the court of Exchequer, and in the fifty-fifth section of the Act power was given to the Governor General in Council from time to time to constitute any part of Canada an admiralty district for the purposes of the Act and to provide for the establishment of a court therein. So these local judges in admiralty may be very petty judges, they may be appointed for a county. The Government for the time being may take the county of Cape Breton, Richmond or Inverness and establish a court in each county and appoint a local judge in admiralty. I do not think Parliament ever contemplated that petty judges of that kind should come within the provisions provided for superannuation of judges of the superior court. The old Act applied to judges of the vice-admiralty court, Why? Because the position of a judge was equal almost to the judge of the superior court, and the jurisdiction was co-extensive with the province. I ask the hon. gentleman, if he has not given consideration to this point, to think it over, for I doubt whether it ever was the intention of Parliament to extend the superannuation provision to judges whose jurisdiction may be coterminous with the county and who may not have a case before them for five or ten years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No doubt that is a matter of great importance, and I approached the question only from the point of view I have indicated. Before the second reading I will consider the points raised and if necessary have them discussed.

Mr. McCARTHY. What is the salary?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. $600 in Ontario.

Resolution concurred in.

THE LOBSTER FISHERY.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 91) to amend the law respecting the lobster fishery.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman state what he proposes to effect by this Bill?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not propose at the present time to discuss the merits of the Bill, and I may say that the principle is generally accepted by all the lobster canning establishments. Two principal changes are proposed. The first is with respect to the marking and stamping of packages. Great trouble and inconvenience have been complained of by the packers in regard to the system of marking as carried out, because it must be remembered that after all this is only an experiment. It is now proposed to adopt a more simple method, and one which appears to meet with the views of the trade. Instead of having a package labelled with the name of the manufacturer, the place where it is put up and the year, it is proposed to adopt a label to be attached to every package simply declaring that they are Canadian lobsters and that they have been packed in the proper season. It is provided in the Bill that every case shall contain such label before it is allowed to be shipped from the premises, and penalties are provided for the non-enforcement of the law.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the stamp to be put on the tin?

Mr. COSTIGAN. On the case containing the tins.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The present law requires, I believe, that the stamp shall be on the tins.

Mr. COSTIGAN. On the packages. The change proposed is in regard to the kind of label to be used, and it is now proposed to use a simple label declaring that the contents are Canadian lobsters packed in the proper season. The next change is with regard to the fees charged for these licenses. I might give extracts from reports I have received from leading factors, especially in the lower provinces, all agreeing to the principle of issuing a license, and, in some cases, suggesting that a very considerable fee should be charged. That was considered by my predecessor in dealing with the matter. It looked to be a generous offer on the part

of the large factories to say that high fees should be paid by them, but it might mean, also, that it would tend to close up the smaller factories which could not afford to pay that high price for the licenses. The receipts from these licenses may be estimated at about $6,000 a year as the Act is now. I do not propose to lose any revenue by the change suggested. There may be rather an increase, but I propose to redistribute that. The change I make is, that instead of fixing a fee of $10 for every license as is the rule to-day, I propose to put a license upon every hundred cases packed, so that the large packer will pay in proportion to the amount of business, and the smaller packer pay in proportion to the extent of his industry. The principle I take it is not disputed, and from the best advice I can get, I think the regulation will work fairly well in practice.

Mr. FORBES. It does not take effect this year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, because the fees are paid in this year, and we cannot make it retroactive. My officers have calculated that we are pretty certain to receive the same revenue, or perhaps a little more. The object of the Bill is to distribute the fees more equally on the persons who get the licenses.

Mr. YEO. It is very unfair to make the smaller factories pay as much as the larger ones, and in that respect the change is a proper one. Is the label to be put on at the stations where the lobsters are packed, or at the port of shipment?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The labels are to be affixed at the place of packing, and before removal. There is a clause which provides that where there are several packing establishments, that they may be removed from one branch of a packing establishment to another, which will be considered the shipping point. There will be no export without this label being attached.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FRASER. The schedule makes no reference to the number of cases, and how is the Minister going to arrange that? The Act does not provide for any maximum quantity as referred to in the schedule. Where is the schedule of cases that are to be used, and what is the fee? It may be 100 cases, or a thousand cases, but the fee is $10.

Mr. KENNY. I should think that would depend upon the application. A man would apply for a license to pack so many cases, and he would recite that in his application.

Mr. FRASER. It is $10 for any number of cases. One man would pay $10 for five hundred cases, and another for 20,000 cases. There is no scale.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). As I understand it, it covers any number of cases up to the year 1896. After 1896, then $10 will have to be paid and a sum additional for a certain number of cases?

Mr. FRASER. Even in that case there would have to be an alteration made in the Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Yes, I think so.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course, the Bill sets forth that the license fee is $10 for this year, but that after the 1st day of January next it shall be at the rate of $2 per 100 cases, so that the packer who packs ten hundred cases and the small packer shall pay just the same rate. The schedule is only used to continue the license for this year; but I will ask permission to change the Bill, so that it may be clearly understood that after the 1st of January next the fee shall be $2 for each hundred cases.

Mr. FLINT. Suppose a packer applies for a license to pack 1,000 cases, and after he has packed that number of cases, he wants to go on packing more. I see no provision here to enable him to get a new license or to have his license renewed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That has been considered. We fix a certain rate per hundred cases, so that the fee may accompany the application for the license. If the door is opened too wide, the result would be that with an application for a license to pack five hundred cases the fee would be sent for that number, and the packer would then consider that he had the right to go on and pack 5,000 cases, and the department would have to collect the balance of the fee. We do not want to do that. If the packer expects in good faith to pack 1,000 cases, his application should be forwarded for that number of cases; and then, if he finds that he is going to exceed that number, he has only to notify the department.

Mr. PERRY. I understand that on the 15th of July the close season will be in effect on the coasts of Prince Edward Island. Therefore I contend that the Bill will be useless this year, so far as the Island is concerned. But I protest against this license fee altogether; it is wrong to compel the packers to pay one cent. These people have hard times enough to carry on the industry of packing without being compelled to pay this tax. It is a direct imposition upon these poor people, meant to cripple the industry they are trying to carry on. I say there is no statesmanship in this kind of thing at all. If it is wrong to exact $10 for a license in 1896, it is equally wrong to exact it in 1895; I say it is wrong in either year. In the name of the fishermen and the packers

of the lower provinces. I protest against this injustice which is about to be perpetrated upon them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am very sorry that the hon. gentleman thinks that this Bill is all wrong—that $10 is too much, and that $2 is too much. I know the warm sympathy which the hon. gentleman has for the fishermen of his province; but he should remember that this Parliament has declared in favour of a license, and the Act is in operation to-day. The Act in force to-day requires the payment of $10 a year for a license, and the present Bill proposes that on and after the first day of January, 1896, the fee shall be at the rate of $2 per 100 cases, or fraction of 100 cases. As to the poor fishermen, while I cannot go the length the hon. gentleman wishes, instead of their having to pay $10, I ask that they may have to pay not more than $8, or $6, or $2, according to the privilege they enjoy. The hon. gentleman says this will only come into force next year. That is true, but if I do not ask Parliament to pass this Bill now, next year we will find that we are too late again. I propose that the Bill pass now, so that it may take effect as early as possible. You could not make it take effect at once, because you would have to return money to some people who have paid too much, and collect from those who have not paid enough, and I should not like to undertake that task.

Mr. FORBES. There are certain regulations as regards the marking of cans. Does that affect the law as it is to-day?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, that goes into effect the moment this Act passes. The portion that does not go into effect at once is that regarding the license fees.

Mr. FRASER. I think the Minister will find some difficulty in collecting the evidence required to fulfil the conditions of subsections 3 and 4—that is with regard to the return of the number of fishermen employed, the number of lobster traps used, the number of persons employed in each factory, distinguishing the sexes, and all that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They are bound to keep that record under the present law, and make those returns.

Mr. FRASER. How many cases of lobsters are packed in the lower provinces each year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There are over 680 canneries. I cannot give the number of cases.

Mr. FRASER. These new fees may be even more oppressive than the present fee. Two dollars for every hundred cases may be double and treble as much as is paid now under the $10 license.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We made the calculation, and I was careful to see that we should not lose any revenue by it.

Mr. FRASER. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman was careful about that. How much more revenue is the hon. gentleman going to get?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We do not contemplate any great increase.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman says he has calculated the number of cases put up last year, and this fee is graded on that number of cases. Assuming the same number would be put up this year, will the amount collected be about equal to what was collected under the $10 fee?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PERRY. I see a clause under which a man who only packs 100 cases may pay $10 as well as the man who packs 1,000 cases.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In order to give hon. gentlemen time to study the matter and become enlightened on its points, I would suggest that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want the hon. gentleman to consider, before we again meet in committee, whether it would not be well to introduce into the Bill that which was promised by his predecessor, and which, in my opinion, is a vital point of the lobster season—that is to have a close season arbitrarily fixed, and which cannot be extended by the Minister. As it is now, our lobster fisheries, in the opinion of those whose opinion I value very highly, are being absolutely destroyed by the extensions which are made of the time from twenty to thirty days beyond that prescribed by law, during which extension lobsters of a very bad quality are caught and thrown upon the market, and the whole catch of the season is deteriorated in the opinion of the purchasers and enormous losses accrue to those whose capital is invested in this business.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is a very important subject.

Mr. YEO. It is absolutely necessary in some parts of the island that an extension of the time should be given. For the first month very few lobsters are caught, and it would close the factories if the extensions were not given. I would like to call attention to the third clause, which provides that labels must be put on the packages before they are removed from the canning establishment where they have been packed. In Prince Edward Island, many of the small establishments, as soon as they get a few cases packed, send them to market, and the purchaser has to open the packages to see if the lobsters are

good. It would be impossible for these men to apply for a permit to remove the lobsters on every occasion, and it will be impossible to carry this regulation out.

Mr. FLINT. I wish to ask the hon. Minister one question. Is there any regulation or arrangement by which these licenses can be obtained from the fishery inspectors in the counties, or must the application be made direct to the department here?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Applications must be made to the department.

Mr. FLINT. It would be worthy the consideration of the Minister to see whether he could not supply the inspectors with these licenses, so that that delay could be avoided.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

The Office of the High Commissioner for Canada—	
Salaries..	$8,900 00
Contingencies, rent and insurance on office, income tax, fuel, light, stationery, &c., and the amount ($2,000) required towards the contingent expenses (water, light, fuel, carriage hire and railway fare) of the High Commissioner, and $1,200 for contingencies (rates, taxes, insurance, ground rent, &c.) of the official residence, including the income tax on the High Commissioner's salary.....	11,143 50

Mr. McMULLEN. We want to get some explanation with regard to the duties performed by the High Commissioner during the past year. I have not seen his report among the blue-books brought down. I would like to know also what the hon. Minister of Finance anticipates will be the results of the efforts of the High Commissioner in relation to immigration during the past year, and whether, from the experience thus far and considering the increased drain upon the resources of the people, it is considered wise to continue the office in the shape in which it now is. I think we should have some extended explanation with regard to the duties undertaken, the services rendered by the High Commissioner and the hopes of results from this office for the future, before we are asked to continue this expenditure for another year.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has had the fullest explanation of this item for a number of years past. It is the same item as for the last eight or ten years; and if my hon. friend will only do me the favour to look at the "Hansard" of three years ago, he will read there all that I could possibly tell him now, and this will have the effect of avoiding the loading of this year's "Hansard" with a similar explanation. At that time I went into an exhaustive statement of the duties performed by the High Commissioner and his staff, in every particular. It is a stated department and is being conducted exactly the same to-day as it was then. The work of that department, as my hon. friend knows, is the carrying out of the varied duties that fall upon the High Commissioner as the representative of Canada and of Canadian business in the city of London and at the seat of the British Government. The item is in every respect for the same services as have been estimated for as in years past. The principle of the establishment of a High Commissioner's office has been approved over and over again, and I do not imagine that my hon. friend wants to lead the House into a long discussion as to the principle underlying the appointment of a High Commissioner. That is interesting enough in its way, but after the exertions of a sitting lasting until four o'clock in the morning, possibly it is not such—I do not know exactly what term to use;—but, at any rate, it is not conducive, I think, to any great pleasure or any great flow of spirits. Another year we may get at this item in a fresher condition, when I shall be very glad to go at length into the matter and give my hon. friend all the information he demands. And, on the other hand, if his fond anticipations are realized, and he sits here clothed with ministerial responsibility, he will have the great pleasure, of continuing the same policy and of giving in the main, the very explanations I have given.

Mr. McMULLEN. No doubt the hon. Minister thinks it a very opportune moment, when we are all pretty well stupified with a sitting lasting a whole night and not disposed for any long discussion, to light upon this item. No doubt he hopes by that means to get it through without much criticism, though from past experience he has come to the conclusion that if we were in a fitter condition for debate, it would cost him six hours of discussion before he got it through. Notwithstanding the statement the hon. Minister has made, we know, with regard to this office of the High Commissioner, that we have been led from year to year to hope that additional duties would be performed so as to make the good results bear some proportion to the money that the department costs the country. We know that the establishment of the office was urged upon the House in the first place by Sir John Macdonald on the ground that he had not the slightest doubt that the High Commissioner would render services to Canada as financial agent that would repay the country more than double the amount of money it would cost. Under that very great inducement, it was that Parliament first assented to the establishment of the High Commissioner's

office. When the Finance Minister went last to London to make financial arrangements, he reported to this House on his return that he had not been able to utilize the High Commissioner as financial agent whatever; that he had to make his arrangements with the Bank of Montreal. I notice that the High Commissioner does render some service. When we send across lecturers for the purpose of addressing meetings of people in Great Britain on the subject of immigration to Canada, the High Commissioner is a handy man to secure a vote of thanks and to make a very glowing and flattering report of the eloquence of the lecturer and the able manner in which he presented the claims of Canada, just as he did in the case of the reverend gentleman of this town who went across last year. The High Commissioner took a very active part in moving a vote of thanks and in having that gentleman well noticed in the papers. He performs duties of that kind admirably, but I do not see anything else that he has done to warrant a country in the financial condition in which Canada is to-day continuing an office of this kind that costs $25,000 a year, when we consider everything connected with it. When we had this matter before the House last year we had a very extended discussion on the $2,000 additional for contingencies. I see that item is still included in the vote we are asked to pass. It was suggested last year that if it was really thought desirable that the High Commissioner should have his salary increased to $12,000 instead of $10,000 it ought to be put in the shape of an addition to the salary and not continued in this form. That point was pressed upon the Minister last year. I would like to know if he still continues to hold the opinion that the salary should be $10,000, and that this $2,000 should be continued to be voted as contingencies as before, and if he thinks that that course should be continued from year to year.

Mr. FOSTER. It is so put down in the Estimates this year, as my hon. friend will see, and we do not propose to make any change during the present year.

Post Office Department—
Amount required to pay those officers of the Savings Bank Branch engaged in the balancing of and computing interest on depositors' accounts, to June 30th, 1895..... $2,650

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Postmaster General is not here, but I will say to the Minister of Finance that I see no reason why these officials should not have the depositors divided into classes, as was done in the savings bank, so that that information could be readily available. They ought to have all these things duly classified. I do not ask for too many classes, but some such division as I suggested or was asked for the other day, would do, three classes.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. FOSTER. I will bring it to the attention of the Postmaster General.

Amount required for salaries of Board of Examiners and other expenses under the Civil Service Act..... $2,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the reason of the large decrease this year?

Mr. FOSTER. We dispensed with some of the expenses. The intention is to have two examiners instead of three, to dispense with the secretary, and to appoint one of the clerks who is at present in the Secretary of State's office to do that work, and to do it completely under the control of two commissioners. So that we will save the salary of the secretary and the salary of one of the commissioners. Reductions have taken place in the item of rents of rooms, and other outside expenses, which make the $2,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In all other respects is the examination to continue as at present?

Mr. FOSTER. No change.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand some of the examinations have been dispensed with. I understood there had been a promotion of quite a number of parties in the Civil Service, and that an opportunity for examination had taken place, but that in other cases, the parties have been refused promotion on the ground that they could not be examined.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course we have the regular promotion examinations, and if they have not passed them, they may not be able to be promoted until the regular promotion examination takes place. That is once a year. But no promotions have been made without promotion examinations.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand that a promotion examination ought to have taken place which has not taken place.

Mr. FOSTER. I think every regular examination has taken place. There may have been an application for a special promotion examination, which was not granted.

Contingencies—Department of Militia and Defence $7,100

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) $1,500 for clerical and other assistance, seems to me an enormous sum in a department like this.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is a decrease of $350.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I should imagine that in a department of that kind the regular officials would do all the work. I can understand that in some of the other departments extra clerical assistance would be required, but in a routine department such as the Militia Department, it would appear to an outsider as an unnecessarily high amount. I think it could be cut down to $1,200.

Contingencies—Department of Secretary of State..... $5,900

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is an item of $1,600 for clerical assistance. Now, in this department, of all others, where the work is absolutely routine, I do not see how so much clerical assistance is needed.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must take the estimates as a whole. He will find that when the Secretary of State comes with his main Estimates, there is a reduction of $8,000 or $10,000. I went over the matter with him, and we agreed that he should have this amount for temporary clerical assistance.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I notice there is an increase in the number of employees of from 19 to 40 since 1877.

Mr. FOSTER. Not in the temporaries.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The amount has increased from $35,000 to $53,000. But I am pointing out that there is an enormous increase in the permanent staff. I think that staff could be cut down two-thirds.

Mr. FOSTER. The staff is to be cut down.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That being so, there ought to be less necessity for voting this sum.

Mr. FOSTER. The Secretary of State will give good explanation from the main Estimates.

Contingencies—Department of Printing and Stationery..... $5,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What department is that?

Mr. FOSTER. That is under charge of Mr. Dawson.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That department used to be under the control of the Secretary of State.

Mr. FOSTER. It is now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In the figures I gave of 19 clerks instead of 40, those of that department were included.

Mr. FOSTER. We have a large printing bureau now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, but still the old duties are to be discharged, and the Minister will see that those duties represent a certain amount, so that leaving out the extra work arising from the Printing Bureau, the Secretary of State's Department has doubled in expense.

Contingencies—Department of Indian Affairs $7,350

Mr. McMULLEN. Why is such a large sum required for clerical assistance in connection with Indian Affairs?

Mr. DALY. It is partially owing to returns asked for by the hon. gentleman himself. In addition, the Auditor General has imposed extra duties on the department, which necessitates clerical assistance at different periods of the year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course it is possible to arrange the work in a department in such a way that it may be doubled or quadrupled. In 1878 there were eight clerks, besides two extra clerks employed, and the cost was less than $10,000 annually. Last year there were 52 clerks employed, at a cost of $54,880. There is no justification for that expenditure. I propose, however, to discuss the whole subject on a motion, of which I have given notice.

Contingencies — Department of Public Works $7,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the Minister received any report from the Department of Justice with respect to a matter in examination before the Public Accounts Committee, regarding an officer suspended for alleged misconduct?

Mr. OUIMET. I was informed by the Minister of Justice that the department yesterday sent their report to my department. It has not come before me yet, but will probably do so to-morrow or the next day, and I will let the hon. gentleman know the result.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the individual in question received any portion of his pay?

Mr. OUIMET. No; he is practically dismissed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The rumour has got abroad that he is receiving $2 per day.

Mr. OUIMET. In the case of employees not on the Civil Service list suspension means dismissal, because they are only paid by the day, and the moment their services are dispensed with their pay ceases.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this person has not received any pay.

Mr. OUIMET. Not to my knowledge. I am quite convinced he has not.

Contingencies—Department of Agriculture. $16,500

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there any real reason why the Archives Branch should be continued, and is it really necessary? Does the Minister propose to make any change in regard to it?

Mr. FOSTER. It is intended to continue the Archives Department. It is a department with which we cannot dispense. It is doing most excellent service in the matter of collecting and arranging old historical documents from the libraries of London, Eng., and Paris. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman is such an iconoclast that he

wishes to do away with the service altogether, although he may desire to criticise it. The Archives Branch has been for a long time under the Department of Agriculture, and there is no reason why it should not continue under that department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Objection has always been taken to the place where the branch was located as being very inaccessible. It should be in the vicinity of the library, and if the library were larger it should be there, but there is no room for it. At all events it should be in some position convenient to this building, so that it may be easy of access to members who desire to consult the documents. A few years ago it was in the basement of the western block, and a man visiting there might as well go into a prison.

Mr. FOSTER. It is evident the hon. gentleman has not visited the branch lately. It has been removed to the new building, and the quarters are fairly convenient, and indeed good. It is in the basement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it is a scandalous place in which to keep books.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think Mr. Brymner would allow anything of that kind to go on.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have allowed it to go on for some time. Books become mouldy and moth-eaten there, and covered with rust spots which will in a little while render them of no use. You spend thousands of dollars in making copies of documents that are inaccessible except in certain quarters in England, and after you have spent a large sum of money you put them where they soon become worthless. That is a very mistaken course to take, and it would be infinitely better they should be in a second or third story where there is air and light, than be put in a basement.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) is right, if that be the condition of things, although I think he has painted it a little darker than it is. The Government is now taking under consideration the whole matter of the archives of the country. Hitherto there have been three divisions of the archives and records. Some of them in the Privy Council Department, some of them in the Secretary of State's Department, and others in the Agriculture Department, and the Government is taking into consideration the amalgamation of those three, so as to avoid a duplication of work and separation of records. The whole matter will be considered and I hope we shall be able to put the archives in a better position than they are. It is quite true that such valuable works should be kept where they can be easily consulted by literary men, and the best possible quarters given them. It is the intention of the Government to take the whole matter up and to see if better conditions cannot be made in connection with the whole of the archives.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am very glad to hear what the hon. the leader of the House says in regard to the intentions of himself and his colleagues, but I know that the road to a certain place is paved with good intentions.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not going there.

Mr. SCRIVER. I hope not.

Mr. DAVIN. But you would like to send them there.

Mr. SCRIVER. No, I would not.

Mr. DAVIN. I mean metaphorically.

Mr. SCRIVER. No, not even metaphorically. I consider the language used by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) none too strong in regard to the manner in which these valuable books are now housed. Having visited that place as I have done several times, I confess I am surprised that such intelligent men as the members of the present Government, and men who I may say take a deep interest in matters of such great importance to this Dominion as the proper preservation of the archives, have not done something other than has been done to house these books in a proper way. I may say, if it would have any influence to encourage the Minister in the course he has promised to take, that some distinguished literary men who have come here from the States, and have asked almost in the first hours of their visit to see the place in which we keep what they admitted are documents of rare importance and value; I have heard them express wonder that we should keep these books in such an apartment. I learned to my surprise and my regret that it was seriously proposed to transfer the books from the cellar in which they are, to the basement of the Langevin block, and I am told on good authority that that would be anything rather than an improvement. I am glad to hear the Minister speak so encouragingly about the matter. I do hope that some arrangement will be made which will provide a creditable place for keeping these documents, and not only a creditable place, but a place in which a man like the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the members of the House generally can consult the volumes. Before taking my seat, I wish to say a word by way of bearing testimony to the admirable manner in which Mr. Brymner is discharging his duties. He is the right man in the right place.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCRIVER. Mr. Brymner ought to be sustained in every reasonable way in his efforts to take care of the books under his charge.

Mr. DAVIN. I echo the gratification with which my hon. friend (Mr. Scriver) has heard

the remarks of the Finance Minister, and I think that the Minister ought to contemplate a policy that would lay the foundation of a national museum where these valuable documents and archives would be properly kept.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I call the attention of the Minister to some remarks made by Dr. Marmette, in connection with the place where the archives are housed. In the book published of the Royal Society's transactions this year, he says :

It is much to be desired that the Government soon take measures to provide the department with accommodation more suitable for a library, already so important in the way of manuscripts and printed books. The three small rooms set apart for the archives are already so encumbered that we are at straits to place the new collections that we are constantly receiving. Indeed, the dampness of the quarters, which are situated in a basement, is injurious not only to the health of the staff, but also to the preservation of the valuable documents which are under its care.

The council adds this recommendation :

The council hope that the Government of the Dominion will soon find itself in a position to provide suitable accommodation for books and manuscripts collected at such large expense, and so invaluable to the country, and indeed to the world at large. If it were possible to build a national museum worthy of the Dominion, then a section of it could be properly devoted to this service. In the meantime, care should be taken to prevent any damage or deterioration to these valuable manuscripts, and to enable the staff to make the best possible arrangements for purposes of reference.

I do not propose to discuss the question of a national museum in the present state of the finances, but both these suggestions will, I am sure meet the approval of the Finance Minister, and ought to be adopted. The utmost care should be taken to prevent deterioration of the manuscripts, and in addition to that the best possible arrangement should be made to facilitate reference to them.

Contingencies—Department of Trade and Commerce $3,000

Mr. McMULLEN. This seems an exorbitant sum for clerical assistance in that department.

Mr. FOSTER. This department has a very small permanent staff, and there is a good deal of clerical work in preparing commercial returns of all kinds. That cannot be done without help. The permanent establishment of the department is kept very small, and it is intended to keep it small, so that it is necessary the work should be done by temporary clerks.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I should have thought that in the institution of a new department like this, a new departure would be made and economical principles begun at least.

Mr. McMULLEN. We vote $54,000 for clerical assistance in all these departments over and above the ordinary staff, and it appears to me that the Government could cut that down if they tried. I am sure that there is not a return prepared in the Department of Trade and Commerce, or at least I do not remember of any order for a return in that department this session.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is wrong. If he will look at that item, he will see that the $3,000 includes both sundries and clerical assistance, while in the case of the other departments these two items are separate. So that, taking that into account, this is a small sum compared with what many of the other departments get.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course, this is merely a branch of a department. The Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue are now under the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and you have $6,200 for clerical assistance in this department.

Mr. FOSTER. That is scarcely a fair way of putting it.

Charges of Management $164,150

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I asked for some information.

Mr. FOSTER. I have the information here. What we have done is to add $150 to Mr. Pope's salary, making it $1,950, $100 to Mr. Leitch's, and $100 to Mr. Loughran's.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think Mr. Leitch deserves better treatment than that. He has been for many years in that office.

Mr. FOSTER. I will look at that matter again.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice an increase of $2,500 in the item of commission for payment of interest on the public debt. I would like to know where the principal portion of this money goes ?

Mr. FOSTER. It goes to our agents in London under the terms of the contract entered into in 1892, by which terms my hon. friend will remember we saved a large amount as compared with the preceding arrangement with Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co. The increase arises from the increased amount of the transactions. Sinking funds increase every year, and consequently the brokerage increases.

Administration of Justice—To pay two Official Arbitrators $1,000 each..... $2,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought these official arbitrators were done away with ?

Mr. FOSTER. One was done away with. He died.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought the Exchequer Court judge did all the work now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. These are assistants whom he may call in. They are referees of the judge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They are not 'ad hoc' referees, but nominees from year to year?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I fancy they are about as much use to the Exchequer Court judge as the masters in chancery were to the Chancery Court judges. They took up a great deal more time to dispose of cases than the judges, and in fact, they were a capital scheme for putting fees into the lawyers' pockets.

Circuit allowances, British Columbia..... $7,500

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why is this sum so large, when Manitoba has only $2,500? That appropriation, it seems to me, arose from the condition of things that existed before there were any facilities for travel.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is owing to the very heavy expense of travelling over large portions of country, where travel is difficult, and the expenses are great.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the hon. gentleman any statement to show the distances they have to travel?

Mr. FOSTER. The Cariboo district is an immense district.

Mr. DALY. They have to travel 300 miles by stage.

Travelling expenses of judges, weekly sittings of High Court of Justice at London and Ottawa..... $1,500

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You have introduced a new item for the travelling expenses of the judges from Toronto to London and Ottawa for the purpose of holding weekly sittings. I have no opinion to offer as to the propriety of holding weekly sittings, but if we pay $1,500 a year for these two cities, that system may be extended to other cities in Ontario, and the question presents itself whether we will not require to have resident judges in these places. Otherwise, we may have to pay considerably more than $1,500 a year, as once you establish the principle, you may have to apply it to other important towns which will claim the same privilege.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I have already explained to the House, we agreed with the Ontario Government that in these particular cases we would ask a grant for this expenditure in order to facilitate the conduct of the work. The hon. gentleman fears that this may lead to an extension of the system, and heavy expenditure, but all these cases must depend upon local conditions. I do not think any other parts of the country could make the demand unless the circumstances were similar. I believe this system is giving great satisfaction to every one concerned in the conduct of business by the wiping out of dockets and preventing arrears of cases.

Supreme Court of Canada..... $21,050

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is one point I want to bring to the attention of the Minister of Justice with respect to the Supreme Court, and which we may as well have talked of first as last. The manner in which the reports are issued to the profession does not reflect any credit on some one—I cannot say where the fault lies. Those gentlemen who take the reports from England know that every month the English reports are published, and they have the reports of the Courts of Appeal almost up to date. In the case, however, of the Supreme Court of Canada, some of the judgments given two years ago are not reported at all. I am not going to charge the reporter or the assistant reporter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think it is the fault of the reporters.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I know the fact is discreditable to some one, and is giving intense dissatisfaction to the profession. It is most unjust to those who live a thousand miles away from Ottawa, and cannot come down here to learn what the judgments are. We cannot find out what the judgments of the Supreme Court are on points in cases pending in our local courts, and which must necessarily be governed by the decision of the higher court. The Minister of Justice should take measures to inform the reporters that the reports must be out almost simultaneously with the decisions. They are no good when they are published only two or three years later. In England these reports are published monthly; and with the exercise of a little vigilance I am sure that could be done here. If the fault, as it is hinted, lies with the judges, if they keep back their judgments, we ought to know it. We ought to know where the blame lies, and have it put on the proper shoulders. I hear the complaint generally expressed in the portion of the Dominion from which I come that the manner in which these reports are published is most unsatisfactory.

Mr. WELDON. I rise to endorse the complaint made by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). The view he expressed I have heard frequently expressed in similar terms. In the nature of things, there is no reason why the profession in our province should have to wait so long to get the Supreme Court reports. As the hon. member has said in the English reports you can find in the May publication cases reported which were decided February or March in the appellate courts, while here you have sometimes to wait a year and a half to know what is decided in the case. If the fault is with the judges, I hope that pressure may be

applied by the Minister of Justice to obtain greater speed in publishing the reports. The present practice is very unsatisfactory with the profession, very unfair, and not at all necessary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand the importance of the suggestion, and I know that the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken understand some of the difficulties that present themselves in dealing with a question of that kind. I have no doubt that this discussion will reach the proper quarter. We have control over the reporters, and it is only fair to them to say—for I have heard something of this before—that they do their work efficiently and quickly, and if all the judges were as prompt as the Bar desire, if the judgments were delivered and handed down at once to the reporters, I am sure there would be no complaint. But I have heard it stated that the judges consider it their privilege to hold over their notes, after giving judgment, before finally handing them to the reporters for publication. I shall, so far as I am able, endeavour to lay in the proper way the views of the House before the Supreme Court, and I hope that something different from the present practice may result.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there is a sum set down for travelling expenses for the judges of the Supreme Court. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. CURRAN. I understand this is for the judges ad hoc—for the judges of the Supreme Court when one of them takes a place in the Exchequer Court.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not see how that can be. Is there any provision in the statute allowing that? If the judges of the Supreme Court have jurisdiction to exercise Exchequer Court powers it must be by virtue of a statute.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This must be a mistake. I think this must be for the Supreme Court judges before the introduction of the Exchequer Court Act—there was an appeal from the sitting judge to the Supreme Court. This must be a continuance of an appropriation that was voted under different circumstances.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before we continue this vote the House ought to know what it is for.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I confess it. I will get the information before the item comes up on concurrence.

Mr. McMULLEN. My reason for asking the question is that there is an increase of $250 in the item this year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The object of that increase is this: Parliament has always provided for painting the portrait of the Chief Justice of Canada, just as in the case of the Speakers and other dignitaries. That rule, of course, applies to the present Chief Justice as to his predecessors, and the additional $250 is for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has anybody been appointed in Mr. Duval's place?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You intend to fill that place, of course?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes; that is necessary to the complete organization of the court.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As to the item for printing, binding and distributing the Supreme Court reports, I see you are asking for an increase of $1,750.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was found necessary on account of the cost of printing. This is wholly in connection with the publication of the Supreme Court reports.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope that as we are voting $1,750 extra we are going to get better service next year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A great deal of that comes back to us.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not much.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Some of it.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the House having sat to so early an hour this morning, I have no doubt all are very tired, and I think it would possibly meet the wish of the House if we were to adjourn and have a good night's sleep before to-morrow's work. I move, therefore, that the House adjourn.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 21st June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. LaRIVIERE presented third report of the select committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates, as follows:—

The Committee recommend that the services of Mr. A. N. Montpetit, a member of the staff of translators of the Debates, be dispensed with from this date.

SHORE LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. GILLMOR moved that Bill (No. 119) (from the Senate) respecting the Shore Line Railway Company be placed on the Order paper for second reading on Monday next.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that Wednesday's Order of proceedings, under Rule 19, be made the Order of proceeding for Monday next.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance when we may expect the return in regard to superannuation. The hon. gentleman has a motion on the paper on that subject, and I would like to know if we are to have the return before we are asked to take action on that motion.

Mr. FOSTER. It will not be ready for some days yet. They are working consecutively at it in the department, but it is a very large return.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to inquire when I may expect the return with regard to Hayter Reed.

Mr. DALY. I think I shall be able to let the hon. gentleman have it on Monday. It is all ready.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to call the Government's attention also to a return ordered on the 29th of April, showing the sums of money paid to members of Parliament outside of sessional indemnity, mileage, &c.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Finance again whether he can say anything with regard to the time when the returns I asked for on the 26th of April will be brought down. These returns are of great interest, not only to myself, but to all the British Columbia members. It is now two months since they were asked for, and I cannot see why they have not been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. I am informed by the officer of my department who has charge of that, that it will take about ten days yet.

SUPPLY BILL.

Bill (No. 125) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1895, and for other purposes relating to the public service (Mr. Foster) was read the second time.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 92) further to amend the Insurance Act (Mr. Foster), was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. EDGAR. These are comprehensive changes, and I think they should be explained.

Mr. FOSTER. I did explain them, but probably the committee does not remember the object of the Bill. A change was made in the Act last year, fixing a certain date at which the statements of the companies doing business in Canada, and the statements of those doing business outside of Canada, were to be in. When it came to be practically worked out, it was found that it was physically impossible for the British companies, whose business extends over the whole world, to get their statements in at the date fixed in the Act. In some cases the society or company did not hold its annual meeting until either later than the date or so late that it was impossible to get the statements in in time. So that we found ourselves face to face with this difficulty: on the one hand, the impossibility of these companies getting their statements in at the dates fixed, and, on the other hand, the imposition by the Act of penalties for any dereliction in that regard. The difficulty was one that could only be cured by legislation. The penalty was a money penalty, and also involved the withdrawal of the license or the cancellation of the license fee. The whole matter was brought to my attention and that of Council, by the superintendent, and referred to the Treasury Board, and the Government took the responsibility of waiving the penalty for the time being and not cancelling the licenses, and promised the companies interested to introduce legislation by which they could get their returns in at the times stated in the Act. The change made here does not interfere at all with the working of the Insurance Act and the obtaining of proper information for publication in the report which is laid before Parliament and the country. Practically, it does not make the report much, if any, later than it would otherwise be.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It does not interfere with provincial companies?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It does not require any license from them when they are doing business outside of their own province ?

Mr. FOSTER. These clauses do not affect the provincial companies at all.

On section 4,

Mr. FOSTER. This is a section for a different purpose. The effect of it, if it is passed, will be to make it necessary that insurance companies based upon the assessment plan shall conform to the Insurance Act in this respect as well as in other respects with regard to which they have already conformed to the Act. That will, in effect, render the deposit of the amount fixed by the Act necessary before they shall receive licenses to do business. It is a change the necessity for which has been making itself felt more and more. It is very strongly recommended by the insurance department ; and, considering the congested state of insurance on this plan, and, having due regard to the security of policy-holders and also to the fact that no very great hardship is imposed upon the companies, inasmuch as the deposit bears interest, and becomes a fair investment, it is considered highly necessary and advisable that this provision should be adopted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister will see that the expression used is geographical, and ought to be jurisdictional. It says : " Companies incorporated or legally formed in Canada." It ought to be " incorporated or formed under the authority of the Parliament of Canada." The hon. gentleman will see that the expression in the Bill is wide enough to include insurance companies in the provinces, with which we have nothing to do.

Mr. FOSTER. The clause sets forth just what is intended—that all assessment societies, whether incorporated by a province or under the authority of the Parliament of Canada, shall be included.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We cannot give ourselves jurisdiction ; we may simply invite a lawsuit.

Mr. EDGAR. The section in the Act relating to the assessment companies reads as follows :—

Any such corporation or association may be licensed by the Minister under the provisions of this Act, to transact business in Canada upon depositing with him fifty thousand dollars.

The first part of the section which explains what such corporation is, says :

The provisions of this section shall apply to corporations or associations incorporated or legally formed elsewhere than in Canada for the purpose of carrying on the business of life insurance upon the co-operative or assessment plan.

Subsection 2 makes the provisions of this section apply to outside companies.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This makes it apply to those as well as inside companies.

Mr. EDGAR. Inside companies, whether provincial or not ?

Mr. FOSTER. Outside companies have already to make a deposit. That is already provided by the law, and the intention is to make it apply to domestic companies incorporated under provincial charters, if they ask for a Dominion license. When they do, they come under the Dominion Act.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not dispute the correctness of this legislation unless that it is pretty sure to prevent any more assessment companies applying here for incorporation. There was a discussion in the Banking and Commerce Committee, at which the leader of the House was not present, in which this question was pretty well threshed out. I known that in one case in which application was made by an assessment company for incorporation, when told that this would be applicable, they withdrew their application. I rather think that will be the case altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. It will introduce caution, no doubt.

Mr. EDGAR. Whether desirable or not, that will be the effect. Assessment companies of course have not the same facility for raising $50,000 as stock companies have, and this will stop their applying in future, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be no scarcity, if it does stop new ones coming in, for there are a great many now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This will give the Government jurisdiction over companies incorporated in the province. I do not know exactly under what condition that would arise. In the next place, I do not see upon what grounds the Government can claim to exercise jurisdiction. In the Parsons case the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided that a local legislature might make regulations fixing the conditions upon which any company incorporated outside the province, shall undertake to transact business within the limits of the province ; but I do not know under what authority, or in what way, this Parliament should undertake to exercise that sort of jurisdiction over an insurance company of any province, unless in the Territories, because if a company incorporated by one province undertakes to exercise jurisdiction outside the province, but within the limits of Canada, it would be exercising jurisdiction within the local jurisdiction as well as the geographical area of some other province. I do not see where, except in the Territories, where they would come under the jurisdic-

tion of this Parliament at all ; and so I do not see how the hon. gentleman is going to make this portion of the Bill legally operative so far as local insurance companies are concerned. Indeed, I think it is extremely doubtful whether he could make it operative with regard to foreign companies ; for it seems to me that whenever a foreign company comes into Canada it undertakes to transact business, except in the case of the Territories, within the limits of some province, and then the rule laid down by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Parsons case would apply to such companies. I do not know, except the Territories, any area in Canada in which the provisions of this Act is to operate, with regard to foreign companies or even with regard to local companies ; and it seems to me that it would simply invite a contest in the court, whenever any company had any interest in calling in question the authority the Dominion is claiming to exercise.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend does not understand the measure but has taken the wrong view with reference to it. There is no interference with the jurisdiction of any other body. There is already an Insurance Act passed by the Parliament of Canada, and any company asking to come under the provisions of that Act and to exercise the right of insuring in our country under that Act must submit to its conditions. An insurance company can be incorporated in, say Ontario, and confine its business to that province without coming under these provisions of the Act in this regard ; but if it makes application to do business in the Dominion and wishes to come under this Act, it must comply with the conditions and make the deposit of $50,000. But no company need do this unless it likes. If it chooses to get the benefit—for it is a real benefit to a company to be able to say that it is operated under the Dominion Act and under the supervision of the Superintendent of Insurance—it must comply with the provisions of the law. But the whole matter is purely voluntary ; there is no force exercised, no compulsory jurisdiction. If they wish to do business under our law, we lay down a condition that they shall make a deposit which will be some fair guarantee of stability. With reference to what my hon. friend said as to the effect of the measure, there can be no doubt that unless there be a certain amount of strength to an assessment company, it will feel that it is not able to make the deposit ; but, on the other hand, probably it would be better if that element of caution were introduced and the policyholders given the added security that, at least, for every society that did business in that way, there was a certain amount deposited with the Government which could fairly be looked upon as security for his policy to the extent it went. It will probably have the effect of inducing some not to come into the field ; but it is no bar to a really well-founded and worthy assessment company which wants to do business for the benefit of the insurer rather than itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Heretofore our practice has always been, with respect to these Bills amending the Insurance Act to send them to our own Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think we did that last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I think we ought to have done so. The original Bill was discussed in that committee, and so were the subsequent amendments.

Mr. FOSTER. The original Bill was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the subsequent amendments were also referred to that committee. There are a number of gentlemen on that committee who are specially conversant with these subjects, and I think it would be a great pity, in the case of this Bill, to depart from the ordinary usage of referring it to that committee.

Mr. FOSTER. It is so simple a Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But practically very little discussion to any profit can take place here. A man cannot understand these things well without having the Act before him and going over these amendments with some care. If the hon. gentleman has any reasons for objecting to sending the Bill to the Banking and Commerce Committee, I would suggest that he allow it to stand over a short time, so that the various parties affected may be communicated with.

Mr. FOSTER. I find that last session the amendments were sent to the Banking and Commerce Committee, and I have no objection to following the same course in this case if the House thinks it advisable. As to the first part, it is simply a matter of detail and is not important at all. The second does involve less simple considerations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disputing the character of the Bill ; I am pointing out that it is practically impossible to consider such a measure unless one has the opportunity of doing it with the statute before him, and of hearing the opinions of the parties who are concerned ; and, for that reason, I suggest sending this to the Banking and Commerce Committee. There are quite a number of points that cannot be taken up here without very great waste of time of the House, which points are worth considering. I daresay that the Bill is a good one, but I think we had better adhere to our former practice.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I may say, Mr. Chairman—the hon. member for South

Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) not having been able to attend many of the meetings of the Banking and Commerce Committee may not be aware—that the principle involved in this section has been discussed in that committee on at least two, and perhaps three, Bills that have been before the committee; and in two of the Bills that are passed, this principle has been incorporated—that is, requiring the $50,000 deposit. So far as I can judge of the opinions of members by the discussions in that committee, they are fully in accord with this section.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not prepared to dispute that this is a very good Bill. I daresay it is. All I say is that I think, in view of our regular practice, this Bill had better go to the committee. The interests affected are very large, as the hon. gentleman knows. I forget how many hundreds of millions the Finance Minister stated as the amount of life insurance in Canada; and, while I am fully in favour of taking every possible precaution to secure the policy-holders, I would rather also have these matters carefully considered, which we certainly cannot do now to any purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Only that the principle is so simple a one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the application of the principle is not always so simple, as the hon. Minister knows. I should feel obliged if the Minister could see his way to sending this Bill to the committee. It is true, as stated by the chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland), that I have not attended the meetings. But that was because there was no such Bill as this before the committee. Had there been I should have attended.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As the chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee has stated, this principle has been discussed several times by the committee during the present session. It may be that the interests are of such vast importance that it would be desirable to solicit the opinions of others than those who have come before the Banking and Commerce Committee, but there can be no doubt that the committee have carefully considered the principle. The general consensus of opinion in the committee, I agree with the chairman in stating, is that this principle should be embodied in the general Act, and not left to be discussed upon the separate Bills respecting various societies as they come up from time to time. That was the conclusion reached by the Banking and Commerce Committee. But my hon. friend suggests there may be interests involved which have not been presented to that committee, and which may perhaps induce the Minister to refer this Bill back.

Mr. MULOCK. The matter of insurance legislation at the present time, I think, is in a somewhat unsatisfactory condition. We have a great many varieties of applications for corporate powers to enter on the insurance business, and there appears to be little or no uniformity of practice in regard to granting these powers. Now, some years ago the same element of uncertainty existed in regard to other important corporations. The time was when banks had separate charters with separate powers. The same remark applies to the loan companies. For many reasons it is inconvenient and undesirable that companies which are large enough to be grouped together and constitute a considerable class, should have different powers. It is embarrassing to the management, it is an embarrassment to the public, and it is embarrassing to the courts. If all companies of a certain kind, and engaged in a certain kind of business, say, banking and commerce, for example, have the like powers, a decision by the courts with respect to one applies to them all. In 1870, I think, a general Act was passed providing for uniformity in regard to the charters of banks, and so, later on, a general Act was passed under which loan companies could be incorporated and acquire corporate powers under the general Act, and thus uniformity was provided for in regard to the powers of loan companies. But no such legislation has taken place in regard to insurance companies, probably of all the companies the most entitled to careful consideration at the hands of the Government. There is no class of the public that has a better claim upon the consideration of the House and the country in respect to the powers, and the workings, and the strength of the company that they are dealing with, than the life insuring public, and yet there is probably no class of companies to-day engaged in business that in my opinion has received so little wise attention at the hands of the legislator as have insurance companies. To-day each company has its different powers. One company has power to invest its trust funds in securities that the court would not allow trust funds to be invested in, and others have more restricted powers in regard to investments, and there is no uniformity, in fact, in respect to their powers; so that the state of insurance companies is not, I think, wholly satisfactory. It is idle to put down insurance companies as trading companies, having similar business dealings with their customers. An insurance company is a trust company. The insured deposit money year after year, in the expectation that after the expiration of a certain number of years, or an uncertain number of years, that fund, or an equivalent to it, will be forthcoming for the benefit of the insured, or of the beneficiaries in the contract. So many years elapse between the contract being entered into and the benefit being claimed by the beneficiaries, that you cannot be too careful in surrounding the management of these companies with every possible safeguard. In the Banking and Commerce Committee

I have frequently called attention to this view, and I do so now believing that it is a question that is entitled to be dealt with by the Government, to be taken up as a Government question, and that the House ought to be advised by the Government in respect of a general scheme under which companies may be incorporated, if you like, as loan companies, by letters patent and their powers be made part of a general Act. At present everything is more or less haphazard. A short time ago the late Premier gave his attention to this matter, and he announced, if I remember rightly, that insurance companies were to be restricted hereafter in respect to the classes of investment. The matter came up in regard to the application of one important company for certain powers to invest funds. That attracted attention to the matter, and to some extent perhaps has attracted the attention of the committee; but as yet there has been no good come out of it, there has been nothing but agitation. So it looks to me now that whilst the drift of the committee is in the right direction, yet it has not assumed form and shape. I submit therefore that whilst this is a move in the right direction, strengthening the company, yet the matter is sufficiently important and sufficiently urgent to be dealt with, if you like, after a policy has been suggested by the Banking and Commerce Committee, or by the Committee of the whole House. At the earliest possible date, I think it is the duty of the Government to present a scheme dealing with this whole question.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to the matter going to the Committee on Banking and Commerce and coming from them in the usual way, as I find that has been the course adopted heretofore. But at this late period of the session, and there being practical unanimity of opinion with reference to what is being done, is it necessary for us to go through that form? Might it not be as well to let the Bill pass now?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We cannot get it before the committee unless we send it there.

Mr. FOSTER. We would have to report progress, and then send it to the Banking and Commerce Committee. I think it would be as well to let it go now, as long as there is no practical objection. I want to say to my hon. friend that no interests can be prejudicially affected. It does not have a retroactive effect. It is simply for those who apply hereafter.

Mr. BOYLE. It is altogether unnecessary to send this back to the committee, except as a mere compliance with a recognized practice. The opinion of the committee has been had on two previous Bills, and so strong is the sentiment with regard to this matter that even if there were no legislation of this character, the Banking and Commerce Committee, as at present constituted, would insist that such provision be incorporated in any Bill coming before them as would constitute the same protection to policy-holders as the Bill now before the House contemplates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disposed to raise objections to the Bill itself. I merely want to consider it. Do I understand that these clauses—I do not see any special provision to that effect—only refer to companies hereafter applying?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the last clause only refers to companies which come up hereafter. The other sections simply relate to the time of giving in the returns of the companies doing business outside of Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the hon. gentleman remembers that we had a good deal of discussion as to the way in which these various statements were made out.

Mr. FOSTER. That has not been altered in the least, except in the time when the statement shall be presented to the Insurance Department. No change at all has been made in the condition or character of the statements.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The rest of the clause is ipsissima verba as in the former statute?

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly the same.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What alterations have you made as to the dates?

Mr. FOSTER. The alteration in dates has this effect: What they call for is that these statements should be made 15 days after the general meeting of these societies in Great Britain. That will bring in the most of them about the 1st May, others it will bring in earlier than that. Of the companies interested, the names of which are set out, the great majority of them will, under this provision, make their returns in May, and only three or four will be later, they sending in their returns in June.

Mr. EDGAR. I think there is no doubt that the Banking and Commerce Committee have this session considered the matter pretty fully, and it seems they seem to have formed an opinion on section 4, which is the only material one in the Bill. In view of the work before the committee this session, which I hope is now very near its close, the Government are somewhat to be blamed because they did not bring down this legislation earlier, so that it might have been referred at an earlier date to the Banking and Commerce Committee and before private legislation occupied the whole time. I suggest that if further legislation on this subject is proposed it be brought down at an earlier date, because there are

interests, perhaps not private interests alone, which view the insurance law as very important, and they cannot be heard in the House except by button-holing members, whereas if legislation was brought down earlier in the session the Bill could be immediately referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee and its provisions argued out before the committee instead of through the ear of the Finance Minister or the Inspector of Insurance.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not object to that principle.

Mr. EDGAR. There is a provision, section 43, which provides that the Act shall not apply to benevolent societies although they do life insurance business. There are some societies doing an enormous life insurance business in this country which call themselves benevolent associations, and they are absolutely without inspection of any sort or kind by the Government. There is a difference of opinion as to the meaning of a benevolent association. An interpretation is given by the officers of the department, but some people think it does not comply with the terms of the Act. There should be some provision for Government inspection of benevolent societies which do life insurance business, and I hope the Government will consider this question, and if they submit another measure, will endeavour to deal with that aspect of the insurance question.

Mr. SPROULE. I fully agree with the statements made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). One of the greatest needs of the time is the enactment of some uniform law which would control insurance companies or organizations, whether regular companies, benevolent associations or assessment companies. At the present time there is a disposition all over the country to devise new societies; such societies are floated in large numbers every year. We have taken our cue from the United States. Many of these societies are short-lived and do injury to the persons joining them, because in many cases the people obtain no returns and are prevented from joining other and regular companies. This would be a good time, when the insurance law is being amended, to devise some uniform law that would control all these societies, and, in addition, would make all of them subject to inspection, and compel them to make annual returns to the Government, so that people may know on what principle they are being conducted. We should also take away from the societies the power they imagine they possess of making by-laws that invalidate contracts entered into by people insured in those organizations. Certain by-laws will control their operations this year, for example, and a number of people will be induced to enter the association. Next year the by-laws will be changed to the detriment of the interest of parties holding policies, and policyholders are compelled to submit to those changes, although they have not been a party to them, before the evil assumes too great proportions, and we are compelled to go through a similar experience to that which the United States has passed through. The law should be amended so as to control all these companies or organizations doing insurance business, no matter on what lines.

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

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Resolution (p. 3088) reported from Committee respecting judges of provincial courts, was read the second time and concurred in.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 129) to amend the Act respecting judges of provincial courts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GENERAL REVENUE FUND—NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

House resolved itself into committee to consider resolution (p. 2573) respecting the General Revenue Fund of the North-west Territories.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DALY. I may explain to the House that this Bill is required, from the fact that in 1887, at the request of the Legislative Assembly of the North-west Territories an Order in Council was passed providing that all the fines collected for infractions of the liquor law, amounting to about $5,000, should be paid to the Legislative Assembly for their use. The Order in Council provided simply that the fines for the infraction of the liquor law should be paid over. At that time, this sum was in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor, and it was ascertained subsequently that it included penalties under other Dominion statutes. The Auditor General raised two questions: First, that the sum mentioned included other moneys than those collected; and, second, that the Order in Council was not retroactive, and only referred to moneys subsequently collected. This Bill is necessary in order to legalize the handing over of these moneys to the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it referred to in the Report of the Auditor General this year?

Mr. DALY. No. It is a communication we had from the Auditor General, who requested this legislation.

Mr. DAVIN. There are no sums to be paid now.

Mr. DALY. No; the money has all been paid, and this Bill will be to confirm it.

Resolution reported.

SUPPLY—ATLANTIC AND SUPERIOR RAILWAY.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to have a little more explicit understanding, if possible, than is afforded by the answers which the Finance Minister gave to certain questions the other day about the Atlantic and Superior Railway Company. He stated, in reply to one of my hon. friends (Mr. Flint), that the Government had agreed to guarantee an issue of £500,000 sterling on their first mortgage bonds. As I understood him, the money had not been paid. Has it been paid ?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the general principle, I think the attention of the House might very properly be directed to it for some little time. This company, as I understand, proposes to issue £4,000,000 sterling first mortgage bonds. Now, according to the statement made here, it would appear that they propose to have recourse to the expedient of depositing £300,000 sterling in the hands of the Government at 3 per cent, for the purpose of inducing the Government to guarantee £500,000 of 4 per cent securities for a term of twenty years. In that case they will have to pay a very heavy sum, and get very little for it. Of the £500,000 issued, they will only get £200,000 available, and, as they lend at 3 per cent, and propose to borrow at 4 per cent, they will have practically to pay £11,000 a year for the privilege of getting hold of £200,000. Now, the point which I want more particularly to call the attention of the House and the Finance Minister to is this: The Minister declares expressly that the Government have not guaranteed, and do not propose to guarantee the interest on the bonds, but, at the same time it is perfectly certain that these people will endeavour to make the English investing public believe that the Government of Canada have examined this matter, and that they have on consideration guaranteed a certain part of it, they will endeavour to float. I make no doubt, the whole £4,000,000 if they can, on the strength of the guarantee of some £500,000. Now, unless this road has been constructed to a sufficient extent to warrant the issue of £500,000 first mortgage bonds upon it, it strikes me that the Government are in very great danger of being placed in a most invidious and awkward position in the eyes of the English investor should this loan, or a large part of it, be issued and placed on the English market, and should it afterwards fare as a good many other of our railways have fared and go into default. It cannot escape the attention of the Government, and particularly of the Minister of Finance, that a good many persons, in the English press, and in the English Financial Journal, have been commenting of late very severely upon Canadian railways, and in particular have been commenting a good deal upon the fact that the Government was mixed up with some of these—which I need not particularize, but some of which will, no doubt, occur to the memory of all parties—and have apparently endorsed the schemes, and that by reason of their endorsation a number of English investors have been induced to place their moneys in securities which have proved utterly and entirely worthless. It does appear to me that while the Government incur no financial risk, so far as this particular transaction is concerned, yet, that the Government are in considerable danger of injuring the credit of the country at large if this Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway should prove to be an improvident or ill-considered undertaking. I do not think, Sir, that the benefit we would receive from borrowing £300,000 sterling at 3 per cent, is at all, for one instant, to be weighed in the balance with the injury which would accrue to the credit of the country if a sum of three or four millions of pounds sterling is floated on the English market, under the supposition that the Government of Canada had looked into this matter, are satisfied with it, and have given their guarantee to it. No doubt that the statement made by the Finance Minister will be reported in the English journals of high class, and will attract some temporary attention. But, knowing something of the way in which these matters are floated in England, I can see very considerable danger of a great many persons being taken in, provided always that this company is not a company of first-class standing. I do not know myself sufficient of it to pronounce either pro or con, but the point which I understand and which, I think, the House should understand is this: That there is a very considerable danger, indeed, of our credit being compromised if we guarantee a small portion of this loan, and if that is made use of as a means of floating a much larger one. This is a thing on which I should be very glad to hear the policy of the Government. It does not appear to me that it would be at all desirable that we should go into the business of becoming a sort of trustee for railways which we may, or may not, approve of. Of course, in the case of such a guarantee as was granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that was a matter in which the Government of Canada had every opportunity to look into all the details, and were themselves, so to speak—I cannot say exactly large subscribers—at any rate, they were large donors to that road. But, apart from that—in a case where

the Government is merely doing this, apparently as a sort of financial speculation—I doubt exceedingly the desirability of allowing our name in any shape or way to be mixed up with a company which at this present moment I fancy is largely in the air. I should like to know if the Government have any information as to the extent of the road which has been constructed up to date; because if no sufficient portion of this road has been constructed and is in actual operation, it does appear to me that our connection with it may be placed in a very ugly light before the English investing public, and that we may have cause to regret, and very seriously regret, that we have allowed ourselves to appear in any sense or way as guaranteeing even the interest of a comparatively small portion of this four million pounds sterling. If the whole amount were guaranteed by us, I would see much less objection to it; but guaranteeing one-eighth, and one-eighth only, does appear to me to be a very hazardous proceeding—I will not say questionable proceeding, for I suppose the Government have some reasons for it which the hon. gentleman has not stated in his brief answer to the question of my hon. friend. I do not want to make a motion on this matter; but I do think that as a question of public policy the attention of the House and of the Government should be called to the use which may be made by unscrupulous promoters of just such a transaction as that which is detailed in the replies to these questions; and I think the Minister himself and his colleagues will see that they should give a great deal of consideration to it before undertaking to guarantee even a small fraction of a loan of this kind.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection at all to the matter being brought up in the way in which it has been by my hon. friend. The facts of the matter are really all contained in my answer to the question which was put by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) the other day. The Government does not guarantee this road or the scheme which is being promoted by the company, or by the gentlemen who are interested in the company, in any way. So far as my department was concerned, this was simply looked at from the financial side. The arrangement that I did ultimately make was that if these gentlemen would deposit a sum of £300,000 when we wanted the money and the necessity arose for making the loan, we would take that deposit, we would allow them 3 per cent interest upon it, and we would pay the principal and the accumulated interest, to themselves, or to the trustees, or in such manner as they wished. Their idea was to issue £500,000 bonds at 4 per cent, and their wish was that the interest and the principal should be paid out to the holders of the bonds, and that is the direction which the negotiation took. So that, in plain language, it is simply this: if they deposit with the Government £300,000 of bonds, the Government will allow them 3 per cent interest upon that amount, and will pay the accumulated interest and the principal to the holders of the bonds, the calculation being made, of course, as to the amount to be deposited, so that the principal deposited and the interest which accumulated would be sufficient to pay the interest on the bonds that were issued at 4 per cent, during the currency of the bonds. So far as Canada is concerned, I see nothing at all objectionable in that matter. It is simply some thing like the sale of an annuity or the taking of a loan upon advantageous terms; but when the company's bonds are sought to be issued in a market outside of Canada, where probably the same information does not exist that exists in Canada, I can quite see that it is open inferentially to the objection which my hon. friend states, and upon which he founds his criticisms. So far as I am concerned, I have taken every means of putting the exact state of the affair before the British public. And as my hon. friend says, it has been taken up and is now thoroughly well known on the market, and has been for some time. So that all those who look into the scheme must look into it on the simple point of view of the scheme itself, on its merits, without any idea at all that it is guaranteed, so far as the scheme is concerned or the road is concerned, by the Government, or that the Government has any interest in it whatsoever. They simply raise, by whatever means they can, this amount on deposit with the Government, which the Government accept as a loan, to be paid out to the bond-holders. My hon. friend wanted to know whether that was a policy which the Government would adopt. I can frankly say that it is not. It is a transaction which does not mark by any means a policy laid down by myself as Minister of Finance. This is a transaction standing solely by itself. I have no hesitation in saying further, if I agree to accept money on the same considerations in any other case, it will only be on the condition that the Government have sufficient interest in the project to thoroughly look into it and become sure of its bona fides, and accept a loan or deposit on equally favourable conditions. In the meantime, I think no harm whatever or danger, can result. I can quite see that investors who are not 'au courant' with the London market, and who invest through their solicitors or brokers and the like, and who have not the same facility for understanding all these things, might be led to a conclusion not exactly right, if the prospectus were in any way flavoured on account of the deposit made or interest paid in any way. To that extent, I have no hesitation at all in saying that this is open to criticism; and it is in relation to that I make the statement that it is not

a part of the Government policy, and, as far as I myself am concerned, I would not follow out a like transaction except upon the conditions I have named.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the money deposited yet?

Mr. FOSTER. My information is that it is not deposited.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has laid much stress on the statement that this transaction is not to be considered as part of a policy, but he has failed to give us any reason why it has been adopted by the Government. The fact that this transaction is not to be construed as a policy is conclusive that it is not of a character to meet with general favour. I quite understand that if the character of the road were such as to command general approval and confidence, if the line were built, or if there was capital visible at the back of the line, or other evidence of solvency, the Government might not have objection to introduce such a transaction. But nothing of the kind is known. I do not know that the company will have any money except what it can collect on its bonds. Under the circumstances, the only objection is that the investing public may be led into an error by the fact that the Government has entered into this agreement. There is the danger that the British public may be drawn, by this deposit, into another of those wild schemes which have made colonial securities time and again stink in the British market. The hon. gentleman has said that he has taken every precaution to have the investing public made aware of the conditions upon which the Government have accepted the deposit of that money. I am not aware that he has done anything of the kind, because, according to the statement in the press several weeks ago, all that was made known was that the Government had simply accepted the deposit. I am not aware that he has taken any measures to make the public aware of the character of this particular transaction. If he has taken any other steps, he should inform the House and the public what those steps were.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to enter into a discussion concerning the financial standing of the company itself. I know nothing against the standing of the company or its bona fides, or the project which they are carrying out, which involves the working of a large railway connection. I have nothing at all to conceal from the House and the public in this matter. It arose in a very simple way. The promise that I made to accept such deposit is now before the House. It was made some time ago, and I looked simply at this point, that we needed money and that the rate of interest on a temporary loan to the Government would be 4 per cent, and that, if this deposit were made, we would be getting the money at 3 per cent. I looked at it simply from the point of view of a transaction beneficial to Canada at that time. It was in that view that I agreed to it; and having agreed, I did not go back on my scheme, but stood ready to supplement it. So far as regards the means taken to make the exact facts of the case known, I have conducted no canvass against the company, and have taken side neither with the objectors nor the promoters of the scheme. That was not a part of my business, as I viewed the transaction; but I have been careful to have stated in the most influential quarters in London just exactly the position of the Government. All the leading financial papers in London have hat statement. It is current property among all the financial men in London. When my hon. friend says that harm might come through investment, he only referred to what we might call subsidiary investments. The promoters, the financial men on 'Change in London, who are the first in these matters to carry them through, know all the facts.

Mr. CASEY. I think the last remarks of the hon. gentleman are the most important he has made in connection with this matter. He tells us that he has himself made no investigation as to the standing of the company, that he is not concerned in discussing its standing with the House, that his promise was made in consequence of temporary scarcity of money, and that he accepted this proposal because he could obtain money thereby at 3 per cent, instead of going on the market and getting a temporary loan at 4 per cent. His statement is that for the sake of a difference of 1 per cent on £300,000, or $1,500,000, he has taken a step which, he admits himself, may have a very serious effect upon investors in a company of which he does not profess to know anything. I think that is a very serious statement to make. He tells us that he has had the whole matter explained in the leading financial journals of London, and that therefore the first takers of this stock, the floaters of loans of this kind, are in no danger of being misled. It may be true, as he stated, that the danger, if any can arise, will be to the secondary purchasers. But surely it is the secondary purchasers, of all others, whose interests we should have in view in an affair of this kind, so far as the interests of any purchasers are concerned. The large financial firms of London are generally able to protect themselves. They generally know enough of such schemes to invest carefully and wisely; but what is pointed out from this side of the House, and what the hon. gentleman himself admits, is that the transaction will enable the first takers of the stock, those who float the company in London, to pass it off upon individual investors, who will look upon it as stock issued with a Government guarantee.

It is not merely the interest of investors, however, which is concerned in this question, but the financial standing of the Canadian railways, and the honour of the Canadian Government. If it turns out that even to this extent the Government has been mixed with a road which may prove to be of the character of the Caraquet Railway, into the sad and disgraceful particulars of which I need not enter now, the honour and credit of Canada will suffer, and the reputation of Canadian railways as borrowers will suffer. It will begin to be believed that the Canadian Government guarantee is something that may be bought by railway promoters in the way suggested by the hon. Minister. Any railway may come to the Government, when the latter is hard up, and by making a deposit with it, obtain what such a recognition can give, and enable the stock to be passed off on unsuspecting investors as a stock with a guarantee from the Government not only of the bonds but of the soundness of the company.

There is, still further, a third danger just as great. The hon. Minister said that this is a good investment; that is in the nature of selling an annuity, or effecting a loan on favourable terms. It seems to me that it would be a very dangerous power to leave in the hands of the Government, to allow them to negotiate for the sale of annuities or for loans without the special authority of the House. What is the case? The hon. Minister has been able to borrow $1,500,000 without giving any notice to the House or any account of it to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend need not pursue that further. All the power was had in that respect and nothing not customary has been done.

Mr. CASEY. If this has been customary, I am sorry to hear it. I do not say that anything illegal was done; but I say there is a laxity in our control over the hon. Minister, if it be the fact that he is allowed to sell an annuity in this manner and make loans of this nature without making any statement to the House and without declaring his policy of making such loan or selling such annuity. It is usual, when the Government wishes to sell annuities to ask authority to do so, and I think that should have been done in this case.

Then, as to the nature of the transaction itself, a comparison of the amount deposited and the amount of bonds secured shows that the transaction is what is called in financial circles a very shady one. What is the company professing to borrow? £500,000! Of that amount they are going to deposit £300,000 with the Minister, out of the principal and interest of which he has guaranteed—what? Repayment of the bonds? No, Sir. Payment of the interest on those bonds. In other words, on the face of the transaction, three-fifths of the amount borrowed, even if this loan could be floated at par, is to be devoted to paying interest upon the whole of the principal. This, on the face of it, I think, is as shady a scheme as has ever been brought to the notice of the House. It is of so peculiar a character that I think the Minister was bound, as a matter of duty to look into the case to find out who the promoters were—which, no doubt, he knows—what their means of carrying on the railway are, where the railway is located, and other things which the Minister professes not to know. But he probably does know, and no doubt he will tell us, who the promoters of the road are, who the moneyed men in it are, and what are their prospects of raising this money otherwise than by floating these bonds. Nothing has been told the House of any means possessed by these parties of obtaining this money except by floating these bonds, three-fifths of the face value of which—which will be more than three-fifths of the proceeds—is devoted to the payment of interest. I think it is a sad thing for Canada that it should be known in England that this Government will mix itself up in any way with a company which proposes to pay interest on bonds out of the money received from the sale of those bonds. I think this feature is sufficient to condemn the whole transaction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. Minister of Finance has stated that he has taken care not to commit the Government in any way to recommending this company to the favourable consideration of English financiers;—that all the Government have done is to agree, in case loans are made to this railway company to the extent of £500,000, to take £300,000 of that money at 3 per cent interest and to pay it out to the bondholders according to the arrangement which the company may have made with the parties who succeed in raising the money, the Government is getting a loan of £300,000 at a very moderate rate pecuniarily, but it seems to me that after all the country would be paying very dear for money so obtained. I cannot conceive of the Government making such a promise without being morally held before the English people as approving of the enterprise itself. How is it possible for the hon. gentleman to promise to accept the deposit of £300,000 from that company without leading the parties in England who have this money to loan to the conclusion that it is a reputable company, one worthy of credit, and one to which the parties who are making the advances may safely lend their money? In my opinion the Government cannot escape a certain responsibility, and, that being so, I think it a most unfortunate thing; and it seems to me that it would be in the interest of the country that the hon. gentleman, even at this late day, should withdraw from the arrangement which he has made. No money has yet been received

by the company: no money has been advanced to the Government; and it is still open to the Government, it seems to me, in the interest of the country and for the sake of preserving the honour and credit of the country, to decide to have no connection with the company. I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, how the hon. Finance Minister can take the position he has done, how he can say to himself or to anybody that it does not matter to him what the character or standing of this company is. He says: The character of this company may be very good, or it may be very bad; I wash my hands of all responsibility for the company's acts. I say that the hon. gentleman cannot say that; the hon. gentleman cannot say that in the interest of Canada; because if the company becomes bankrupt, if the people who advance this money lose it they will hold the Government of this country responsible—they will say: The Finance Minister, by offering to accept this money from these people, led us to believe that it was a reputable company, a solvent institution, one engaged in a rational and proper enterprise, an enterprise that can and will pay the parties who advance the money for the purpose of carrying it on. That is the position the hon. Minister at this moment takes, and it is a position which ought not to be taken. It would be infinitely better to go upon the London money market to obtain such money as the hon. gentleman needs in the public interest and to pay more for it, if that is necessary, than thus to obtain this money upon the terms upon which the parties who are undertaking to promote this railway enterprise offer the money to the Government. I think that the hon. Minister has not given an explanation that will satisfy the House or the country with regard to the connection of the Government with this transaction. There is but one straightforward course for the Government at this moment, and that is to notify the parties that the Government will not receive the money, will have nothing to do with accepting of money on deposit or of payment for its use.

Mr. EDGAR. There is another feature of this case which I have no doubt the Minister of Justice has fully considered and which he will be able to explain to the House. While the Government has, of course, power to borrow this money as the Finance Minister has said, I would like to know whether the railway company has power to lend the money. Has the railway company charter powers to be a banking institution as well as to build railways? If it has not special provision in its charter authorizing it to collect money from shareholders or bondholders and to loan that to anybody, to invest them in this way and not for the purpose of constructing the road, then I say the loan is illegal. The company cannot make such a bargain; any bondholder or shareholder of the company could restrain them from making it. I assume that the Minister of Justice has carefully looked into this matter and can give us chapter and verse of the powers of the company which authorizes them to loan their capital in this way. I should think also that the Finance Minister—speaking from another point of view—would be able to tell us how the £500,000, the interest upon which the Government practically guarantees, is to be issued. Is it to be issued before the road is constructed, and how much per mile of constructed road is to be covered by it, or is the section usually inserted in railway charters to be acted upon, authorizing the railway company to issue bonds on the portion of the line constructed or under contract for construction? Surely the Minister of Finance has considered that point too. Then, looking at it in another way, the Minister of Finance says this is a transaction very much like the sale of an annuity. Well, what authority has this company to act as an agent of Canada for the sale of Canadian annuities? That is what it amounts to. The Government is constituting this company, in that point of view, its agent for the selling of this annuity. The company advances its money to the Government, and the Government says: We will create an annuity fund which you can use and sell for us. Then another thing occurs to me. The Minister of Finance says that the leading financial men in London will understand all about this business. Well, we all know that it is not the money of the leading financial men in London that buys bonds of this kind; we all know perfectly that a house there may take up a loan, but it issues circulars, and advertisements, to all its clientèle over the country, and invites little investors all through the country to subscribe for this loan; and what would these know about it? Will there be in the prospectus that will be issued there, a full statement that the Government does not know anything at all about the merits of this scheme, does not know where it begins, and where it ends, or whether it is productive or ever will be productive? That is what the Minister tells us to-day. He is very frank about that. But will the prospectus that is to be put out as a decoy, with the name of Canada on it, to get money from the investors all over England—will the prospectus say this? Now I think this is a very serious thing, indeed, and will be injurious to the credit of Canada unless it really turns out to be an exceptionally successful enterprise; and even if it does, the risk and danger that is being assumed by the Government, is, I think, entirely uncalled for in this case. Then I would like to know who the board are. Who are the great financial men? Who is the official with whom my hon. friend the leader of the House made the negotiations? To whom has he yielded this extraordinary concession? There must be an

individual in the case, there must be somebody controlling this projected scheme with whom the Minister has made the arrangement which he says he feels himself bound to carry out. I hope he will give us that information. It is very important for us to know that, and I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in hoping that it is not too late for the Government to withdraw altogether from what I think was a very improvident and rash undertaking.

Mr. KENNY. I do not know how regular this discussion may be, but both sides of the House must recognize its importance. As I understand the question, certain gentlemen who were promoting a railway, approached the Minister of Finance, and intimated to him that they desired to float, in England, bonds to the extent of £500,000, and that they wished to deposit in his hands £300,000 in money, on which they expected to receive 3 per cent interest, and asked the Government to be responsible to the bondholders of this company for the interest and the principal.

Mr. LAURIER. Not the principal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The interest for twenty years.

Mr. KENNY. Well, undoubtedly that is an arrangement which is liable to very great abuse, and I am quite sure that the Government would recognize that, and exercise the power with very great discretion. Nothing is more sensitive than credit, and to-day, happily, the credit of Canada stands very high in the English market. It is our interest, it is the interests of the Government, while sustaining its own credit, to help that of every commercial and financial association in the country, and I fear much that the power to issue bonds, with a Government guarantee for the interest in the hands of unscrupulous men, might be used in a manner which would result disadvantageously to Canada, by misleading the investing public in England. Now, as regards the brokers, and men who are interested in stocks, they can always protect themselves, they are always sufficiently well informed. But what we want, or any people want who are borrowing money on the English market, is to have a security, is to have a bond, which will be accepted confidentially by the general investing public. We do not desire to have our bonds only floating in the hands of brokers; it would endanger our chances of placing Canadian railway bonds succesfully hereafter, if such an arrangement as this with the Dominion Government fell into the hands of unscrupulous men. Therefore, I say that I regard this debate as a very important one, and in the exercise of the power conferred upon them by Parliament, this Government and every Government should exercise very great caution.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) whose financial standing is so high in the Dominion, and who stands at the head of one of our leading banks. I am glad he has seen fit to take part in this discussion, and to express himself in the manner in which he has done. I followed him closely in his remarks, and I think those remarks have received the closest attention of the House, and, I am sure, ought to have great weight with the Government. Now, we must remember that this country is a borrowing country, has been so in the past, and must be so for many years to come. It has large resources which have to be developed, and to develop these resources it will be necessary for us to resort to the money markets of London. Therefore, it is of the greatest national importance that so far as Canada is concerned, it should only lend its name, even if it lends it indirectly, to schemes which it can morally as well as legally endorse, schemes which we are prepared to encourage or to promote; and the utmost care should be taken that the name of Canada should not be associated even indirectly with those schemes which are known as wild-cat schemes. Now, what is the scheme we have before us now? I think the name of this railway is the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway. Practically, it is a scheme to construct a railway from Gaspé to Lake Superior, a railway which is going to parallel, partly the Intercolonial Railway, partly the Grand Trunk Railway, and partly the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, I do not want to make very strong assertions, but from what I know of the scheme I will venture to say that there is not a financial man in Canada who, unless he had ulterior objects in view, would invest one dollar in that scheme. It is what is popularly known, whether correctly or not, as a wild-cat scheme. I have talked with a great many men, some of them having knowledge of the subject, and I have never met one man yet who looked upon it as a feasible scheme, feasible in the sense that it will ever be a paying scheme, either directly or indirectly, directly to the shareholders, or indirectly to Canada. The promoter, I believe, Mr. Armstrong, a gentleman well known in this House—I do not know that I am doing wrong in mentioning his name—is a gentleman whose profession is that of a railway promoter. He is at the head of this scheme, and he goes home, associated with other gentlemen, some of them, I believe, whose financial standing is not bad, and hopes to be able to float this loan of £500,000 upon the London market. Now, it must be perfectly plain to everybody that as three-fifths of the loan borrowed is to be deposited in the hands of the Government, there will be but a small sum left, and he has no reasonable hope, with that small portion, of con-

structing that road; it cannot be done. I was pleased with one or two of the remarks of the Minister of Finance. He said that he was not in a hurry to repeat this financial operation again. I think he is aware by this time, to put it mildly, that he did not take sufficient precautions in the matter. Surely he did not take sufficient means to ascertain whether this scheme to which he was lending, in an indirect way, the name of Canada, was a bona fide scheme, or whether it was a bad scheme. Well, I respectfully submit to the hon. gentleman that that is what he should have done, and that, under no possible pressure, should he have been induced to lend the name of Canada to a scheme unless he was assured that it was a bona fide and respectable one. That seems to be a perfectly proper position. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he would not go into a similar scheme again. I am pleased to hear that, so far as it goes; but if there is any means by which he can withdraw from the position to which he has been committed, I think the general sense of the House would say that those means should be adopted. So far as the great financiers on 'Change are concerned, they are pretty well able to take care of themselves, they will inform themselves pretty well as to the exact position of the Government. But, as has been explained by my hon. friend behind me, they are not the class of people who really invest their money in these bonds. The loans are drawn from the widows and clergy and from people throughout England, who have small sums of money to invest, and to my mind it would be a deplorable national event if those people invested £300,000 or £400,000 in a scheme which Parliament will not venture to say is bona fide, which in all human probability will turn out a wild-cat scheme and fizzle, but to which we have, if not directly at all events indirectly, lent our support and countenance. The point taken by my hon. friend is one which the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Justice should answer. This company was incorporated with certain powers. All Acts of this class passed by Parliament contain provisions that the money borrowed shall be devoted to certain specific purposes, the specific purposes being in this case the building of the line; and the company are not allowed to be bankers and to lend three-fifths of the money proposed to be borrowed. If the company have not that power, it should be sufficient and ample reason for the Government withdrawing from the present position, which is a very invidious one and calculated to do financial damage to Canada in the future.

Mr. MULOCK. Although the Minister of Finance suggests that there is no risk run by the Government, yet I venture to say that this transaction may result in direct financial loss to the people of Canada. The Government lends itself to a scheme which may turn out a most unfortunate one, at least to the investors. The Investing public of England are asked to take up £500,000 of bonds to be issued by this company. I presume the deposit with the Government will be made up entirely out of the contributions to the loan. The company in the first instance will deposit nothing unless they float this loan, and £300,000 of the £500,000 is to be placed in custody of the Government, and on its receipt the Government are to endorse the coupons for 20 years. That is the bait with which to catch the unwary investing public in Great Britain, the capital is to be put in jeopardy, and at the expiration of 20 years, when the coupons have all been paid, what security is there for repayment of the principal? The Minister says, none. What does the company say, then? This amount of £500,000 is part of a total capital, according to the scheme, of £4,000,000. It may result in the ultimately unloading on the British public of a very large sum, and when the interest, which it is proposed the Government shall guarantee has been paid the English public, if the loan is successful, then when the principal is in danger, the scheme being without bottom to it, the investors will no doubt make an effort to hold this country liable. The Finance Minister says probably, in his mind, there is no legal liability. Right, there is no legal liability. But what do we know is going on now in regard to other transactions? The Government endorsed the Chignecto Railway scheme. Their endorsement was not to continue if the scheme was not carried into effect on or before a certain day. The English public invested a large sum on the faith of the endorsement of the Government. The time has run by, and the Government have escaped legal liability. But what do we see going on now? In England measures are being taken to induce the Canadian Government to extend the liability, and a portion of the Canadian press has stated that it would be most dishonourable for the Canadian Government not to renew the liability. What happened in regard to the Caraquet Railway, whose securities were endorsed by the Canadian Government. By the substantial aid given and the false credit given, the English people were induced to invest their money in these enterprises. In the case of the Caraquet Railway a meeting of bondholders was held in London, and a resolution passed that the action of the Dominion Government in endorsing this scheme had been the direct cause of inducing the English people to invest in those securities and put their money in the enterprise. They found themselves trapped into the scheme by the Government bait, and their money was lost unless the Government came to the rescue. If the Government does not come to the rescue, what is the effect on the English investing public? There is nothing, as the

hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) said, more sensitive than capital, and to impair our credit is to cause a direct loss to the Canadian people. We are borrowing in the English market constantly, we have two hundred millions of English money borrowed and the Canadian people are constantly obliged to renew the bonds, and if our credit becomes impaired and weakened, if an idea prevails that the finances of Canada are in weak hands and there is not the very best judgment exercised on our part in carrying out projects and in avoiding schemes not in themselves justifiable, we shall have to pay for it in the shape of increased interest. That is a direct result of loss of credit, and I trust the Finance Minister will at once withdraw the name of the Government from all connection with this road. Let me remind the Minister that already there is colour given by the press to his connection with the scheme. On 17th June the Montreal "Gazette" published a despatch from London, to this effect:

> It is stated that the Government of Canada has guaranteed the interest on the bonds for the period of their currency, and that the coupons will be so endorsed.

That is, however, only with respect to £500,000, while the prospectus published in the same paper speaks of a total loan of £4,000,000. The ordinary investor will certainly think that the Government of Canada, before endorsing those bonds, had investigated as to the sufficiency of the company and come to the conclusion that it was safe to endorse them. This does not say that the endorsement is procured, because of the cash to make good that endorsement having been deposited with the Government. The prospectus being silent as to the reasons for the endorsement, leaves it to the investing public to conjecture in many ways, why the Dominion Government chooses to guarantee the interest for twenty years. If it were possible to write upon every coupon, and in every newspaper, and to bring to the knowledge of every possible investor, the fact that this Government does not know whether the enterprise is an honest one or likely to be a profitable one or not, and that the endorsement was simply given because money to make good that endorsement was deposited with the Government, perhaps the Government would escape moral responsibility. But, here the Government is giving a fictitious credit to the scheme by endorsing the interest, and the fact that there has been deposited the money with which to endorse it, is being withheld from the public. The transaction is one of such importance that it is due to the House, and due to the credit of Canada, that the Minister should recede at once from the transaction and withdraw the pledge that has been given. It was an unwarrantable pledge and an unjustifiable pledge, and one that is sure, sooner or later, to lead to trouble. The sooner the matter is rectified by our withdrawing from all intermixing with the scheme, the better for the Minister and the better for the credit of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is unquestionably a very important matter and it is a good thing that it has been discussed in this House. If the entire sum intended to be placed upon the London market was £500,000 and that under their charter they could issue no further sum, I do not see that any very great evil could arise. But, from the fact that they have power to issue £4,000,000 it appears to me as if the Government were to a certain extent placing themselves in a position to be morally looked upon as bound for the interest on those bonds on account of which they have received no deposit. Every year schemes of this kind are placed on the market to get at the money of English investors. So far the credit of Canada has been fairly well maintained. However, the Finance Minister is aware that the "Investor's Review," published in London, has indulged in very severe criticisms within the last six months on certain investments in Canada. It behooves us to be very careful as to what the Government should lend the credit of the country to. If Canada wants money it would, in my humble opinion, be far better to borrow in the ordinary way at the ordinary rate, than to secure a small sum in this way at a low rate by lending countenance to a company that is yet in a very questionable position. By doing so, it may possibly enable that company to impose upon the English investors to such an extent as to cause another unpleasant reflection upon Canada as a borrowing country. It is very fortunate that this matter has been brought up by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and if it has not yet gone too far for the Minister of Finance to retrace his steps and allow those who are trying to promote that scheme to adopt some other means for floating their bonds, I think it would be very much better that the Minister should withdraw from the guarantee, so that we may be saved from the disaster that possibly might occur in the course of a few years, of this developing into a huge swindle on the English investors. We should guard against repeating our experience in the case of the Caraquet Railway and Chignecto Ship Railway. These things are undoubtedly an injury to Canada. Although the country is not bound to pay these investments, after all, everything of that kind causes a certain amount of suspicion and creates a feeling of distrust with regard to the country's credit. We cannot afford at this moment to further intensify the feeling of distrust which does exist on account of worthless bonds that have been placed on the London market and sold with some show of being good investments owing to the fact of Government aid being granted to the

schemes by the Dominion and the provinces. I hope the Finance Minister will be able to reconsider this whole question and to withdraw, if possible, from the position he has taken.

Mr. McALISTER. Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen opposite who criticise this road so severely and call it a wild-cat scheme, were aware of the facts connected with it, and knew the country through which the road passes, they would not speak as they have done. True, it is an opposition line; at least it will be run largely in opposition to some of the existing lines, but at the same time that is no reason why the road should be denounced. We know that the terminus of this road, formerly called the Baie de Chaleur, is in one of the finest outlets to the Atlantic, and therefore is certainly deserving of some favourable consideration. The part of the road already built has been operated last year and it more than pays expenses, without having any connection with the other roads at all. I do not think that the road will be in opposition to the Intercolonial Railway. On the contrary, it will be a feeder to the Intercolonial Railway, and will bring it traffic, rather than divert traffic from it. We know that Gaspé and Paspebiac are nearer to Europe than any other port along the eastern coast of Canada, and therefore in summer time particularly it will be the shortest route to Europe. This road forms a very important link in what Mr. Fleming called the "short route to Europe." The road from Metapedia, where it branches from the Intercolonial Railway, continues to Gaspé, a distance of about 200 miles, and all along the coast it runs through the most fertile country. Not only that, but it runs through perhaps the finest fishing districts of Canada, and for the short time a portion of it has been in operation it has been developing trade very materially. If it forms connections with the other roads and obtains communication with the Pacific coast, we cannot help its running in opposition to other lines, and if it is a paying scheme, which I think it will, that is no reason why it should meet with opposition in this House. As one of the representatives of that part of the country, I cannot in justice to myself sit here and listen to the hard language that has been used towards this road without stating what the facts are. It is a scheme that has not only a fair, but a bright prospect before it, and if it is built, I have no doubt that it will be found to be one of the most successful, and perhaps, one of the best paying roads in the Dominion.

Mr. FLINT. The hon. gentleman, in his personal anxiety for the success of this enterprise, has perhaps misapprehended the line of most of the criticisms made on this side of the House. Those who object to the Government's attitude with regard to guaranteeing the bonds of this company, are not necessarily hostilely criticising the enterprise itself. All they ask is that it be allowed to stand on its own bottom, and make its way in the world, if it requires credit, upon its own merits. What we complain of is that the Government, by guaranteeing under these circumstances any proportion of the bonds proposed to be issued by the company, are giving that company a false credit in the minds of a large portion of the investing public, and thus tending to injure them as well as to a certain degree the credit of the company itself. Now, I think this procedure will in the end bring upon the Government themselves no small amount of embarrassment; because there are a large number of enterprises of this kind that will be encouraging to cling to the skirts of the Government, and ask the Government to take some part of the funds they may raise by way of loan, and guarantee the interest on a certain proportion of the bonds, not to exceed the amount the Government may have at any time in hand. If this is to be the policy of the Government with regard to schemes of this kind, then I think Parliament ought to take into its consideration very seriously whether it will endorse that policy. I have not made a study of this question so far as to know whether there are any other outstanding undertakings of the same kind; but it does strike me, as it has struck other members who have spoken, that this is a very dangerous course for the Government to enter upon and one which ought to be viewed with very great distrust; and if the Government have not gone too far to retreat, I think they ought to take the first opportunity to withdraw from a position so greatly fraught with danger.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to inform the hon. Minister of Justice that I have here the charter of the company and the amendments of last session, by which he could point out the powers this company has.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer of such good standing that I think I need not do more than suggest to him what unfair treatment of this company or any other company it would be at such a juncture to have their powers discussed, in a discussion which, while interesting on the main question, is not of that character to make the opinion of any hon. gentleman in regard to their powers very valuable, while it might contain an element of danger. I confess that I am not prepared to discuss the borrowing powers of that company at the present moment.

Mr. EDGAR. Their lending powers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Nor their lending powers either. I think it might involve questions which would require far more consideration at my hands than I would be able to give them in a

desultory debate. I think the main question has been very fully discussed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have here the last statement of the earnings of the Baie des Chaleur Railway for the year ended 30th June, 1894, by which I find that with a total mileage of 80 miles, the earnings were $921 for passenger traffic and $957 for freight traffic, the total gross earnings for the year being $1,890. The proportion which the net earnings bore to the total working expenses was 72 per cent; that is to say, they were 27 per cent worse than nothing. I do not want to pursue the discussion further than just to say this: apart from other considerations, and wholly and entirely on public grounds, I think the Government would do well to look into this matter closely, and reconsider it before the arrangement is implemented.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I might state to the committee, in reference to the subject of judges' travelling expenses, which was discussed yesterday, that I have found out from the registrar of the court, that that is, as was suggested by some hon. gentleman, simply carrying forward the old grant which existed before we had the Exchequer Court. A small item was paid last year, owing to the fact that Judge Fournier, being at or near Quebec, went into the city and heard and disposed of a motion by consent of both parties. The item may be struck out on concurrence.

Dominion Police..... $22,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this Dominion police force? Where is it located?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It has the usual strength, there is no reduction, and the headquarters of the force are at Ottawa. The details are all given at page H—16 of the Auditor General's Report. There is an inspector, four sergeants, twenty constables at $1.65 a day, three at $1.50, and eight at $1.25.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the salaries at Ottawa, $2,272?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the commissioner's salary, Mr. Sherwood.

Kingston Penitentiary..... $215,510

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe a certain reduction, how is that effected? Are you estimating for fewer prisoners? It has been the habit to state the number of convicts, but that seems to have been omitted on this occasion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There were 494 convicts at Kingston on 30th June, 1894. My officer went carefully over all the items. I cannot give all the particulars, as my experience of that department is very limited, as the hon. gentleman knows. One of the items of saving is in the convicts' clothing. Through the efforts of the staff, they have been able to obtain material of greater durability than was used formerly, and which, therefore, will not be required to be renewed so frequently. On that item there is a decrease of $4,000, including other articles, such as bedding.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe a reduction of about 25 per cent in the item of tobacco. While we do not want, in the slightest degree, to make the prison an abode of luxury, I would like to know how this reduction has been made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We propose gradually to discontinue that item altogether, as it is a practice which has crept in, and which it is not desirable to encourage. My officers are of the opinion that it would be wholly in the interests of the prisoners to abolish it altogether. We are reducing the allowance to the old prisoners, and not continuing it to the new.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I must say I cannot see why the convicts should be indulged in any luxuries from which many a poor man has to deny himself. In asylums and places of that description, of course, the case is different.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the warden?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Dr. Lavell.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has there been any investigation with reference to him?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; no reason for it. There have been no complaints whatever since I have been Minister of Justice.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice a gratuity given on retirement to Thomas Davis, of $1,963.89.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That would be under the terms of the statute. He was trade instructor.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are the supplies advertised and tendered for? I am surprised to find the very high price of 19 cents for butter. We sold creamery butter at very much less than that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I pay 25 to 30 cents for mine.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think the Minister intends to give the convicts such choice butter as he uses.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I don't give the convicts any butter at all. I find that the 19 cents for butter is for the officers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we will have to send you there for a time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would not mind going there some day in one of the positions we are providing. I should then have the pleasure of living near my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am on the other side of Kingston, unfortunately. But you might do the same as some of your predecessors have done—you might keep a steam yacht there, and so be able to run down and see me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A good suggestion—then I hope the hon. gentleman will not object to the items.

Mr. DAVIN. As the Minister just says, he uses tobacco, it would be well if the Finance Minister in such cases as spoken of, were to give him a quid pro quo.

Mr. DEVLIN. The Minister just stated that there were no complaints against the warden.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would not be understood as saying that there have not been, for I do not know. None have come to me since I became Minister of Justice, but I have not sufficient knowledge of the previous records to say definitely that there were none.

Mr. DEVLIN. I have no reason to believe that there are any charges against him ; I do not suppose there are any.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There are none under consideration, certainly.

Mr. DEVLIN. I read in the newspapers a short time ago that there was a movement on foot to have the warden removed. I would like to ask if it is true that petitions have been received by the department or the Government during the last year to the effect that the warden should be superannuated, and another appointed ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not since I have been Minister of Justice.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that supplies are advertised for for the whole year ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. In what way are tenders called for ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They are advertised for in about forty newspapers.

Mr. GRIEVE. Perhaps the Minister can tell us at this stage the facts as to the binder twine manufacture in the penitentiary. On the 3rd June, I moved for a return showing the quantity of twine manufactured last year, the price received for it, and the parties to whom it was sold. I think it would be well if the Minister could give us that information now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no recollection of that return being moved for. I suppose it was moved for in my absence. But I find from a memorandum here that it is being carefully prepared by the penitentiary officers. It could not be prepared in the department, so word was sent to the officers of the penitentiary and they are preparing the return. It will be ready for the hon. gentleman before many days.

Mr. GRIEVE. Is the hon. Minister able to tell us how much twine has been manufactured for the present season ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have manufactured an average of forty-five tons a month.

Mr. GRIEVE. At what price is the twine to be sold at this season ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The agent is now on the road taking orders. The prices vary. It would be rather inconvenient, and I think detrimental to the public service if I were to answer the hon. gentleman's question very fully. The agent gets general instructions, and, unless the committee presses for the information I would rather not go into details. If the committee presses the matter, I would not feel warranted in withholding the information ; but I would put it to the hon. gentleman, whether it would not be better to ask that question after the season is over.

Mr. GRIEVE. I ask the question, because I understand that the twine is being sold to the farmers for delivery at the railway stations. If so, I cannot see why the department should not give the information to the farmers.

Mr. McMILLAN. I understand that a great deal of the twine is being contracted for in large quantities. But I know, as a matter of fact, that quotations have been given for the twine manufactured in Central prison. Regarding that twine, the farmers are in possession of the information as to what it is being sold for, and if the twine from the penitentiary is to be sold in small quantities to the farmers, they should know at the first possible moment what the price is to be.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have not objected to give the information. The instructions to the agent are that the twine is to be sold in any quantity demanded, small or large. Our agent has instructions, while not unduly competing with others or lowering the price in an unfair way, to protect the farmers from any combination in the trade, and to these lines he is endeavouring to keep.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you sell at cost price ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With a small margin. The guide in selling is, while not lowering the regular price, to ascertain, as nearly as possible, what the price is, or ought to be, and to keep to that, even if those engaged in the trade take a different course.

Mr. GRIEVE. I cannot understand why this information should be withheld. There is hardly a newspaper in the country but is advertising the price of twine as sold in the hardware stores. If these parties are giving the price as a matter of information, the department should not withhold the facts regarding the price of the goods they offer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no attempt to withhold the information, but I cannot answer the hon. gentleman's question, because the prices fluctuate. Even the agent could not give the answer. His instructions are not to embarrass the trade, but to follow the fluctuations of prices.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are in the combine.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, we are trying to prevent a combine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The proper business-like way would be to sell at a reasonable advance on the cost of manufacture. It seems to me that in the case of a Government manufacture, there are difficulties in entering into a sort of union with the various individual manufacturers, and that the actual cost of production to us would be the proper standard.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the other manufacturers are feeling much aggrieved in connection with the work that we are now doing, showing that we are not parties to any combination.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think that every farmer in the country is entitled to know what the prices are that the Government charge for twine, so that he may know whether to purchase from the Government or elsewhere. The withholding of this information is the first step on the part of the Government to entering into a combine with the private manufacturers. The Government have no right to withhold that information from the farmers. They should manufacture twine for a fair amount above the cost of production and the raw material, and they should not hesitate to let the farmer know the exact price at which the twine is to be sold.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see what a very unpleasant business this commercial enterprise is going to be for the Government. It is almost impossible to please any one. We started in with the view that we would be able to employ the convicts in some kind of labour while they remained in the penitentiary, so that they might leave it better than they came to us. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), who has just spoken on behalf of the farmers, will sympathize with us when I tell him that to-day I have seen two letters from farmers who are interested in the binder twine business establishd by the Patrons, and who are complaining that we are selling twine too low to the farmers.

Mr. DAVIN. Is any of this twine being sold in Manitoba and the North-west Territories ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is.

Mr. MULOCK. May I ask whether you are selling it below cost, that is, making it with prison labour and underselling free labour ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not put in that way, nor on that ground, and it would not be correct if it were so put. The letters to which I have referred do not make any complaint on that ground. They simply say that we are selling below the price charged by the establishment that is run by the Patrons of Industry.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister whether the price realized for the Kingston Penitentiary twine covers all the cost of manufacture, putting in the labour as free labour, taking interest on the capital as if it were a private enterprise ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will tell the committee the result of last season's operations. We put in plant at a cost of $41,000. The operations began last spring. Sales to the extent of 120 tons were made, the value being $15,400, at 6½c. per pound. The profits realized on this was $18 per ton, convict labour being estimated at 50c. per diem per man. Thirty-seven convicts were employed.

Mr. MULOCK. In ascertaining that profit, did you charge for capital invested in buildings ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Mr. MULOCK. You have to take into account what an ordinary manufacturer would have to take into account.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We did not take the buildings into account, we took the machinery into account, just the $41,000.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that the rule adopted in the department with regard to all manufactures ? Take, for example, woodenware. Some two or three years ago the woodenware manufactures of the Eddy Company and others presented a petition to this House

complaining that you were underselling them in the market. On that occasion, the Government came to the conclusion to sell all their output of woodenware to those in the trade, or only to market it, at a proper cost, as if it were manufactured by private enterprise. Now, that arrangement is still in force, I understand, with regard to the output of woodenware, and perhaps other manufactured products of convict labour. Are you applying the same principle in the sale of binder twine ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, I am applying the principle I have just mentioned. We estimate only on the labour and the cost of machinery.

Mr. MULOCK. We might find ourselves handicapped, as we are in other industries, and we might find ourselves selling at a profit that would not meet the wishes of the farmers at all.

Mr. GRIEVE. How is that output this year compared with last year ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is larger this year. We had only two months last year, and we used up nearly all. We sell for cash.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any truth in the report that the Binder Twine Company of Brantford proposed to come to any understanding with the Government with regard to price, so as to form a combine both with your company and with the Canada Cordage Company ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have heard nothing officially of the subject. The letter of which I just spoke of was a private letter, and not addressed to my department. I saw a letter expressing great indignation that we were selling the twine too low.

Mr. SPROULE. I inferred that they had, as it was rumoured that they had applied to the Canada Cordage Company, and also to your company to enter into a combine, and I thought it would be interesting to the country to know whether that was true ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have nothing official.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were there any losses made last year in the sale of twine ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. $640 is all that is owing, and suit has been brought for that. We did sell on credit last year. But we collected every dollar, which is doing well, considering the finances of the country. This year we only sell to the trade.

Mr. McMULLEN. In arranging the price of twine this year, have the Government had communication with other manufacturers of twine ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. What has been the basis of your estimate for the cost of twine this year ? Is it the same as last year, that is, taking the price of the raw material and 50c. per day for convict labour ? Does the Government count anything upon interest on the price of the plant ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, and we take the labour at 50c. per day.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do you allow any reduction in the way of machinery ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. And after putting all these items together, you fix the price of twine at a certain figure ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, keeping in view the market price.

Mr. McMULLEN. It was generally understood, when the manufacture of twine was begun in Kingston and Toronto, that the object was to place twine in the hands of the farmers at the lowest possible price, and of course we are anxious to find out whether that intention has been carried out. Now, counting 50c. per day for convict labour, there is of course a very small remuneration, and if twine is sold for that price, I suppose the users could not find much fault. Has there been a fall in the price of raw material, or has it increased ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There has been a fall.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then in regard to the stock carried over, we shall have paid more than it would cost now ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then the price is based on the cost of the raw material ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We got the raw material this year for this year's business.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is there not a specified rate at which binding twine is to be sold to farmers east of Windsor ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no fixed price. We do not want to paralyze the market. As there are other industries of the same kind, our safe policy is to keep the cost as low as possible, but not to unnecessarily affect legitimate business, except when an attempt is made to raise the price and injure the farmers.

Mr. McMILLAN. That does not interfere with other parties. I hold that farmers residing at a distance should have the same opportunity to purchase the product as farmers situated in the locality where the industry is carried on.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We pay the freight in carload lots to all points.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to inquire of the Minister if any correspondence had taken place with the management of the Brantford binding twine factory. I understood the Minister to say there had not been. I should like to inquire whether he was called upon by the manager of that concern, because I understand he was in the city and that he had interviews with manufacturers of binder twine elsewhere with a view to get the price advanced so that more money might be made out of the industry.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He did not call on me.

Mr. DEVLIN. I understood the Minister of Justice to say that this year the business was being carried on on a cash basis.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I said that, but I afterwards corrected my statement, and said it was on the same terms as the trade.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is it true that Mr. Rogers, of Manitoba, is a heavy debtor to the department ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We are suing Mr. Rogers for $600, balance of an account which amounted, I think, to about $4,000.

Mr. McMILLAN. Has there been communication or interview in any manner between the manager of the Brantford binding twine factory and the Government with respect to binding twine ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not with me.

Mr. McMILLAN. Has there been with any member of the Government, or any official ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not able to tell you what happened with other members of the Government.

Mr. McMILLAN. We have a right to know whether such an interview was held with any member of the Government. It is a serious matter if the Government is going to enter into any combine, even with the Patrons of Industry.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 115) for the relief of Helen Woodburn Jarvis (on division).—(Mr. Edgar.)

Bill (No. 110) for the relief of Mary Bradshaw Falding (on division).—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Ottawa Land and Security Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. GRIEVE. Before the committee rose at six o'clock, I was trying to get a little information with regard to the value of this binder twine, and the prices during the present season. I must confess that I did not receive very much encouragement in that respect. Perhaps the Minister will be able to give me some idea of the quality of the twine ; whether it is to be mostly manufactured out of manilla, or sisal, or mixed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Partly from pure sisal and pure manilla.

Mr. GRIEVE. What is the difference in price between the manilla and sisal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I cannot give the hon. gentleman that off-hand.

Mr. GRIEVE. How many feet will run to the pound ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am afraid these questions are too technical for me.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that in a letter I have received from the manager, he tells me that of the two brands of twine which they make, the Maple Leaf, pure manilla, will run 625 to 650 feet to the pound, and the Beaver brand, 525 to the pound. This brand has 60 per cent of manilla in it.

Mr. GRIEVE. I would like to have further information with regard to some of the twine shipped to Manitoba last year ; a quantity of which I understand is still unpaid for. Has the gentleman who purchased that twine given any security to the department for the payment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not that I know of.

Mr. GRIEVE. That seems a strange way of doing business. It is peculiar that the Government should ship twine by the car load or half car load to agents in Manitoba who have no responsibility themselves. I understand that this Mr. Rogers is nothing more nor less than a political wire-puller. It seems strange on the face of it, that the Government should ship out twine in that manner to a man of that kind. I think the experience of members of this House is that as a general rule the people who are hangers-on of the Government and political wire-pullers are not that class of people whom they should trust in such a way. I suggest

that the Government should be more careful in future and get security from persons to whom they ship large quantities of twine.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman is going pretty far in saying this gentleman is a political wire-puller. He is a man of business, and on the $1,700 worth of twine which he bought, $600 is due. On the total sales of $15,400, most business men would think it was pretty good that only $600 remained uncollected. I think every dollar of the $600 will be collected in due course. As to the circumstances under which this was done, I am not in a position to say, but from what I know of the gentleman I would think that it was in the ordinary course of business. Suit has been brought for the recovery of the $600.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the Government know anything of the financial standing of this man, and whether there is reasonable ground to hope that the amount may be collected.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This man is still in business, and I have no reason to believe we will be unable to collect the $600. On the contrary, I have every reason to believe the money will be collected all right.

Mr. FRASER. I think there will be no trouble about it, because a gentleman who is able to put up at a first-class hotel ought to be good for a little amount like that. He is now in Ottawa, right beside the Government, and I have no doubt if they asked him for a cheque he would give it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have asked him by way of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. FRASER. That is circuitous.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But very effective if he has the money.

Mr. FRASER. I am afraid the gentleman will resent such measure as that. What I rose to say was, that I am altogether opposed to this method of the Government doing business. I do not believe they have any right to engage in work of this kind. It is no answer in the world to say that another Government did it. I do not think it is one of the purposes of Government, and I am satisfied that cheap as the Government get the labour, it will be found in the end that they will make nothing out of it, because those who purchase will understand the circumstances under which the goods are produced. Unless there is cash paid on delivery, it will be found that somebody will be getting into the Government. If the Government go into making binder twine, why should they not make boots and hats and everything else? It is logical to think that they might do so. I do not believe that men who are sent to jail should be allowed to go idle, but I do say that convict labour should not enter into competition with the ordinary business of other citizens. Of course this kind of thing naturally grows out of the protective system. It may occur where they have no protection, but it is the twin sister of the whole system, and I hope, as soon as the machinery is worked down, that the Government will stop that kind of business altogether. The Government is putting itself into competition, just as the Ontario Government did, with private citizens. This is not the business of the Government, and the Government will find that it will not pay them. I want to enter my protest against it, as I believe it is not in the best interests of the people of the country.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. member for Guysboro' is a little late in the day with his protest. It would have been more timely when Parliament appropriated the money for establishing this business.

Mr. FRASER. I did it then.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then why say anything about it now?

Mr. FRASER. Simply because you must raise your protest continually.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman thinks there is anything objectionable in the principle, surely the Committee of Supply is not the place to discuss a question of that character. There are no doubt various views entertained of the principle of the Government entering into business of any kind, either in connection with the penitentiaries or otherwise; but the hon. gentleman will remember that the common consent of this House was given and no serious challenge offered, to the proposition made by the Government at a time when binder twine was selling at nearly three times its price to-day, and when the farmers of the country felt that they were in the hands of a monopoly that was crushing them. Not only with the almost unanimous assent of this House, but with the assent of the farmers from one end of the country to the other, the Department of Justice brought down a proposition that was not only of great benefit to the farmers of the country, but that solved to a great extent that most difficult problem of how the state could employ prison labour; and I say with deference that this is hardly the time, when that business is in progress, to discuss the principle. If the opinions of hon. gentlemen have changed, and they seriously object to the business, it is in their province to challenge the sense of the House in regard to it, and if possible prevent the Government going any further; but while it is the duty of the Government to carry on the business, of course they must get the necessary supplies for doing so, and the other questions which have been put in reference to the

conduct of the business are alone, I think, relevant at this stage of the Supply Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We had a discussion on this subject many years ago, and I remember very well on that occasion, when the former Prime Minister, Sir John Macdonald, sat on this side of the House, he was very much opposed to the Government engaging in any industry any part of the products of which would come into competition with the products of the ordinary labourers of the country. I did not subscribe to that view then, and I do not subscribe to it now; but I cannot help noticing one observation made by the hon. Minister of Justice in reference to the monopoly in binder twine. Why, Sir, the Government of which he is a member put a very high protective duty on binder twine in order that the poor fellows throughout the country who are engaged in that business might be enabled to live by the operation. Then the Government entered into competition with them, and the hon. Minister has discovered that the manufacturers of binder twine enjoyed a monopoly and were really engaged in fleecing the farmers by the prices they charged. In the employment of prison labour, there are, of course, two things to be considered—in the first place, how far you can avoid entering into active competition by labour that costs very little with those who have to pay for the labour they employ; and, secondly, how you can best train men who have been idle, and who have been offending against the ordinary laws of honesty, to earn an honest living after they have served their time in the penitentiary. If you are to qualify a man to discharge duties for which there is no market, the training you are giving him will be of no practical advantage. You are to take care that the training you give him will be of some use to him, will command a market price in the community at large. With regard to the question of competition, there is this fact to be borne in mind, that if the men who are confined in the penitentiary were out, they would be entering into competition with somebody, if they were honestly earning their living. If you put them at work in the penitentiary and thus enable them to pay for their keeping there, I do not know that you are doing the public any serious injury. If you are training a man to be a carpenter, or a shoemaker, or a tailor, and he is enabled by means of his labour to pay the expenses of keeping him in the penitentiary, how much more is his labour coming into competition with the labour of others than if he were outside the penitentiary honestly engaged in the same trades in earning his living? The product of his labour is entering into competition with the product of the labour of others as much in the one case as in the other. If he were outside of the penitentiary and engaged in active employment, you would not complain, and you would not seek to run him out of the country. You want more people in the country than are here at present if there is a market for the products of their labour, whatever they may be. A man is sent to the penitentiary because he will not labour, but is endeavouring to live at somebody else's expense; and surely you do not want him to live there at somebody else's expense in a still greater degree than before. You want him while there to do something towards earning his living; you want him to be as light a charge, if he is to be a charge at all, upon the public during his confinement as he would be if he were enjoying his freedom and earning his living as an honest man. So, I think the question we have to consider is how we can employ the labour of those confined in the penitentiary in a way that will be the least burdensome to the tax-payer. If we make the penitentiaries self-supporting, so much the better; to that extent the community will be relieved of taxation. If the suggestion of the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) were adopted, that the prisoners be employed on public works, perhaps that would be found to be the most useful way of employing them. If they were employed at making colonization roads, or on other public works, in such a way that they would not escape from the control of the state, that might be found to be the least expensive way of employing them. But the important thing to be kept in view is to make the institutions in which they are confined self-supporting, and to give plenty of work to those people who are not disposed to work voluntarily.

Mr. TAYLOR. Like the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I have never favoured employing convict labour to compete with free labour. But at the time the manufacture of binder twine at the Kingston penitentiary was established, the cry among the farmers that they were being ground down by a hugh monopoly, the Canadian Cordage Company, convinced me that if such a thing existed and it could be broken up by the employment of prison labour, the sooner that could be done the better. The same thing would follow to-day if prison labour were not employed making binding twine for the benefit of the Canadian farmer, for I am credibly informed, and am satisfied I can prove it, if a commission were granted, that a combine exists to-day between the Patrons of Industry binder-twine manufactory, and the Canadian Cordage Company, so that our farmers would pay much more if it were not for the work of the Kingston penitentiary. I understand that the price of the Patron article to the farmers was 6½ to 7 cents per pound, while I know that the other is sold and delivered at a much less price. For that reason, I am quite willing that the penitentiary should continue to turn out binding twine for the purpose of keeping the combine between the Patrons

of Industry and the Cordage Company from overcharging the farmers, as they certainly did to a certain extent this year, and would do to a very much larger extent were it not for the industry at Kingston.

Mr. FRASER. At the time this vote was first taken, I protested against it, and I will continue to protest against it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Challenge the sense of the House.

Mr. FRASER. It is all very well to talk about challenging the sense of the House when the hon. gentleman has a machine majority at his back. I am not saying this particularly of the hon. gentleman's Government, but any Government with a majority at its back is going to carry the items of appropriation. Are we to challenge the House on every occasion when we dissent from an item in Supply ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On every point of principle.

Mr. FRASER. Why, there is not a principle underlying a single appropriation, so far as the hon. gentleman is concerned, which might not be challenged.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is extreme.

Mr. FRASER. There is not an appropriation which is not a violation of some principle. So far as the hon. member for Bothwell is concerned, I am at one with him in believing that these people should be made to work, but they should be kept employed on Government work, and not enter into any particular business, because if they enter into one you cannot object to their entering into others. My hon. friend says that were it not for the Government manufacturing binding twine, the farmer would not get it so cheaply, and he says that it was in the interests of the farmers that this prison factory was started. Now he says the farmers have joined in a combine with the very parties whose exactions they ask to be relieved from.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not the farmers.

Mr. FRASER. The binding twine company in the interests of the farmers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not the farmers.

Mr. FRASER. Then the farmers are divided into two classes—those in the binding twine industry, and the other farmers ?

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. I thought that protection was intended to lower the price of articles, but here we have the extraordinary argument made that protection to an industry raises the price, and that on account of the very protection given the binder twine industry, the Government has to enter the lists in order to cheapen the price to the farmers. I have never heard from hon. gentlemen opposite such a pitiful give-away of the whole question.

Mr. DAVIN. What has that to do with the question ?

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman would like very well if we were to abstain from discussing the question in this way. What is the question ? An hon. gentleman says that there was a combine which had to be put down in this way. Another hon. gentleman says that the price is so high this had to be done. The very existence of the works at Kingston depends on the state of things I am now discussing. If that be the state of things caused by protection, we had better find out what other businesses in Canada are conducted in such a way, and where we find that, by the existence of a combine the articles manufactured are made dearer, we should then start a prison factory in order to cheapen them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Take glass.

Mr. FRASER. Yes, I wish the hon. gentleman would run our glass works, which he knows are worthless, and which were killed by his policy.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You are getting a dividend.

Mr. FRASER. No, I am getting nothing. I will sell the hon. gentleman my shares, and guarantee to get him all the stock at 10 cents in the dollar, so that he will have a margin of 90 per cent on which to start glass works, and then let him try to break the combine which his protection has formed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The glass works are there yet.

Mr. FRASER. Yes, and the hon. gentleman can have the whole thing for 10 cents in the dollar.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The business is still being carried on.

Mr. FRASER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; they are not doing a single thing. A couple of citizens are doing a little business.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I saw more than two citizens at work.

Mr. FRASER. There are two citizens carrying on a little glass work, but the glass works in which the company put their money are not doing anything.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Your company is one of them. Your company is doing something.

Mr. FRASER. It is not, for you have killed it, and I invite you to take the whole thing at 10 cents in the dollar, and start

the works in the interest of the poor glass-blowers, and of the people who buy glass from the combine in Montreal. Are the people who buy lamp chimneys to be treated differently from the farmers? Why should they? If the Government can enter into competition to give the farmers cheap binding twine, why not enter into competition to give the people cheap glass? Logically, the same argument that hon. gentlemen opposite apply in the case of binding twine should apply in every other case where there is a combine; and that only proved that the Government have not the right and are not acting wisely in carrying on a competition in any business.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the hon. gentleman has discussed the question fairly. He ought to know that if there was a combine, as it was generally believed there was, lessening the duty on it would not make binder twine any cheaper, because the combine exists in the United States as well. You might take off the duty altogether, and not lessen the price. The prices are fixed by consultation with the manufacturers in the United States, and, therefore, it was thought desirable to commence operations for the purpose of lowering the price of binding twine for the Canadian farmers. That could not have been accomplished by taking the duty off. But when half the duty was taken off, I remember correctly, there was no material reduction in the price.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes there was.

Mr. SPROULE. I speak from my own knowledge, because, two months after half the duty was taken off, I bought the goods myself at the same price as they had been sold at before. The parties selling twine through the country sold it at no lower price than before the reduction of duty. The cry then still was that the duty was too high, and, for the purpose of satisfying the farmers—because this was a commodity in which they were vitally interested, especially those in Manitoba—the Government were induced to commence the manufacture at Kingston where they could use the prison labour. There are two features of this case to which special attention has been called. In the first place, the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) objects to this manufacture because it brings the prison labour into competition with the same kind of labour outside. But the employment of prison labour in any line will do the same. The hon. gentleman says: Why not employ them in public works? But who constructs our public works? Do not the workingmen of the country? If you employ a prisoner to do the work which can be done by one who is not a prisoner, to that extent you compete with free labour.

Mr. FRASER. But we should save the money we have to pay for the labourers.

Mr. SPROULE. But are you not saving the money now just the same? You are making these men practically earn their living, and if they do that, the Government have not to pay for their living. Where, then, is the difference? It is not very long ago since these men were engaged in making brick, and that was complained of as competition with free labour. They were put to making boots and shoes with the same result. To employ these men at any labour is to compete with labour outside, and you might as well engage them in this as in anything else, for there was a crying need for the production of cheap binder twine. Whether it was the result of the monopoly or of some other cause that we do not understand, the price was high, and there was a strong demand from the farmers that the Government should do something to reduce the price of this product. The Government did something and the price of binder twine has been reduced? What do we hear from those interested in the other concerns? Take the manufactory established by the Patrons of Industry in Brantford. Some time ago one of the head men, I have forgotten whether it was Mr. Mallory, the grand worthy president, or Mr. Currie, speaking in my village, stated that he could prove that the Patrons had done great good to the farmers. He said that some time ago the farmers had been paying exorbitant prices for binder twine; the Patrons started a factory and had succeeded in bringing the price down to the lowest point it had reached in the history of the country, and, notwithstanding that, they were making a large profit by it. And, on the strength of that, he tried to induce others to take stock in the company. I am credibly informed that afterwards, the same parties, Patrons of Industry binder twine factory, applied to the Cordage Company to arrange prices at which twine should be sold, practically to make a combine so as to keep their profits up. Then the Government said: We will give this twine to the people at the lowest price it can be manufactured for, to show that there is a reasonable profit in the manufacture of it and when other companies, whether the Patrons of Industry Company or the Cordage Company or others, are selling above a reasonable profit, we will keep our rates and will turn out enough twine to compel these people to keep the price down. And that was the result. Sir Oliver Mowat did the same in Toronto. I say he was right in doing so. He employed prison labour only, and I contend that there is nothing wrong in that. There is not a farmer in this country who will say that there is anything wrong in that. And even though it does bring prison labour into competition with labour outside that is not reasonable ground for objection, because the same argument will apply to the employment of prison labour in any line

with a view to making the prisoners self-supporting.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was glad to hear the Minister say that the farmers had been fleeced by the Cordage combine. How often, as I remember, when we spoke of the high duty increasing the prices, were we told that the farmers paid no higher than they would pay if the duty was removed. I must say this, that I am under the impression that this Government would never have taken up the manufacture of binder twine but for the action of the Ontario Government. That Government started a factory in the Central prison, and they were followed by the Government here at Ottawa. I believe that these prisoners should be kept at some sort of labour. I understand that in the Central prison and at Kingston they were engaged for a long time in making brick. But, for some cause they were deprived of the means of continuing that work. It then became necessary for the Government to find some other employment, and this was established in order to furnish employment for the prisoners and to break up the combine. The combine has been broken up, and I hope the Government will never be a party to fixing prices under any other combine with the Canada Cordage Company, the Patrons of Industry or any other, and if these others attempt to form a combine, I hope the Government will keep the price down and so make a combine useless. In answer to a question that I asked, the Minister stated that nobody had interviewed him as to prices, but I gathered from what he said that it was within his knowledge that something had been done, some communication received from the president of the Cordage Company in Brantford, or some member of the Cordage Company; and I would ask him if it is within his knowledge that such was the case. Has any communication been received by any member of the Government respecting the price of cordage.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was the communication to which I referred the complaint that our prices were too low. This was from the Patrons of Industry cordage establishment, but this letter was not addressed to me.

Mr. McMILLAN. There was a letter addressed to some person?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I believe so.

Mr. McMILLAN. That was all I wanted to know—the Patrons addressing the Government here wanting to enter a combine with the Cordage Company and the Government to put up the price.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And we would not do it.

Mr. HENDERSON. So it would appear that the effort to increase the price to the farmers came from the farmers themselves. But there is no evidence whatever, there is not even an insinuation, that the Government has in any way acceded to the request of the Cordage Company at Brantford to form a combine. Now, to my mind, it is clear, even after all that we have heard about cheap labour and the manufacture of binder twine in prisons, that binder twine can be made as cheaply by independent as by prison labour. In 1893 the Brantford Company, whose president, I believe, is a Mr. Stratford, sold about 800 tons of binder twine. Of this quantity they manufactured about 380 tons. They bought from the Central prison about 186 tons, and from the Consumers Cordage Company about 234 tons. They supplied their consumers, the farmers throughout the country with twine, and many of the farmers did not know but that they were receiving twine manufactured in Brantford. No doubt this company in Brantford sold at a profit what they bought from the Consumers' Cordage Company, and yet it was sold as cheap as the Central prison twine at Toronto and the twine they had made themselves. This is conclusive evidence that the price at which twine can be made by independent labour, with its greater skill, the ability of private companies to buy material at lower prices, their closer knowledge of the markets, is quite as low as that at which it can be produced by prison labour. I approve very much of the policy of the Ontario Government and the Dominion Government in manufacturing this article. I think a very fair statement was made by the Minister just this afternoon when he said that, while the Government had no intention of embarrassing the regular trade, they intended to use this manufacture as a means of preventing an undue inflation of the price. I think that the whole enterprise of the manufacture of binder twine in the Central prison at Toronto, and the penitentiary at Kingston, can be justified on that single statement. Now, with regard to the value of the twine and giving the price in the House, I am very much interested in that question. I would like to get it, but I realize that perhaps the Minister of Justice is not justified in making a price for twine, as we know it is quite impossible to give any general answer to that question unless we had a sample of the twine before us, and knew the number of feet per cwt. He might give us a quotation of 5 cents or 6 cents, but unless he knew the weight of the twine, he would have no idea of its value. I believe in Kingston they manufacture two different qualities of twine. I have seen them, and in my judgment they are very fair qualities, and are very good twine. One of them, I understand, is a pure manilla, and the other is a mixture of sisal and manilla. One of them is said to measure 525 feet to the pound, and the other one, 650 feet. As a matter of curiosity, to-night

after six o'clock. I measured a quantity of twine, and had it weighed, and I verified the fact that it measured 640 feet to the pound. Now, the better twine, to my mind, is always the cheaper twine for the farmer to buy. You may say that one twine is worth so much, and another one is worth so much, but unless you produce the twine and show the quality of it, no information whatever can be obtained from the mere quotation of price. Therefore, it would be misleading perhaps to the House, and misleading to the farmers, and perhaps be an injury to the good object we have in view, if a price were to be cited. I understand, however, that any farmer or any business man in the country can ascertain the price by writing to the proper party in Kingston and getting it in the ordinary business way.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of Justice if he could tell us what is the gross amount received for the sale of binder twine manufactured in the years 1893-94 ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was none manufactured in that year. 1894-95 is the first year. We manufactured only two months last year. As I have already told the hon. gentleman, the total amount received was $15,400 for last season, and there are $650 still owing.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman will look at his report of the penitentiaries for the year ending 30th June, 1894, he will find on page 3, under per capita cost of convicts of the Kingston Penitentiary, binder twine, cash expenditure, actual cost for 1893-94, $24,997.63. I want to understand how it is that you did not get back your actual cost.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the machinery.

Mr. DALY. Look at the first column.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister said that $41,000 was expended for machinery. The machinery was put in in the spring of 1894. Was it paid for in the fiscal year closing 30th June, 1894 ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I could not tell you off-hand.

Mr. MULOCK. I should like to ascertain that, because it is material. The contract was made with Mr. Connor to have the work all completed in the spring of 1894.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The amount was paid in 1893-94, and that is what makes that amount of $24,000.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman will find on the same page an item for $48,000. That is additional machinery. Now, where is the item for $41,000, which the hon. gentleman gave us before six o'clock.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Between those two items, additional machinery and $24,000.

Mr. MULOCK. But this statement should be made in a way that will explain itself.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose it would be more satisfactory.

Mr. MULOCK. Here is a distinct contract made for putting in this binder twine machinery, and that contract was for the sum of $40,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It cost $41,000 to put it in.

Mr. MULOCK. The contract was $40,000, and that was to include putting it in. Will the hon. gentleman explain what the extra $1,000 was for.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will wait I will find all these things from the Auditor General.

Mr. DALY. On page H—21, the hon. gentleman will find the particulars.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What number of men are employed in the penitentiary work ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Thirty-seven last year, over forty this year.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood the Minister to say that this industry had solved the question of prison labour ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I said it had tended to solve the question.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It was for that reason I thought that all the prisoners must be employed on that work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I meant to say that this assisted in solving many of the problems which surround the difficult question of prison labour ; but the whole question has certainly not been solved, for this work occupies a comparatively small number of the prisoners at Kingston, where there are nearly 500 men.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It was for that reason I made the remark.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If I said so, it was not what I meant.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How do the authorities arrive at the price to be charged for twine in selling it ? Do you add the cost and the charge for labour and interest on investment on machinery, and then add a profit ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think in deference to the committee I must draw the line there. I have answered that question at least twice. I must insist on new questions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps as the hon. Minister is a legal gentleman, it may be worth while to furnish him with a precedent. One of his father's most energetic supporters made me repeat an answer to a question thirteen times over.

Mr. McMILLAN. The hon. gentleman has not yet answered a question I put to him. He simply said it would injure other persons.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I can now give some more information.

T. P. Connor, supt., at $1,500	$ 189 04
John Price, asst. supt., at $900	113 40
Wm. Charlton do at $720	90 74
J. E. Sullivan, engineer, at $2.25 p.d.	96 75
Mill and machinery, J. Connor	40,000 00
Customs duty on mill ($30.313)	8,336 08
Aprons, English oak leather, 4	60 00
Boiler tubes, (3½-inch) 56 feet	17 00
Barrels, 120 at $1	120 00
Capstans, 6 at $4.50	27 00
Capstan tubes, 6 at $2.25	13 50
Freight on materials	380 03
Flyer heads, 2	9 35
Gears (various Nos.), 30	112 35
Int. and insurance on manilla	377 31
Manilla and sisal hemp—	
Manilla, 47⅝ tons at £23 7s. 6d	5,417 75
do 52½ tons at £22 17s. 6d	5,844 56
do 50 tons at £20 7s. 6d	4,957 92
do 50 tons at £19	4,623 36
Sisal, 56,000 lbs. at 3½c. (less dis.)	1,948 45
Maple leaf bags, 5,002 at 10c	500 20
Nippers, fine, 2 at $20	40 00
Oil, machine, 210 galls, at 30c	63 00
do cylinder, 42½ galls. at 65c	27 63
do engine, 46½ galls. at 45c	20 92
do extra cordage, 5,404.03 galls. at 11¾	634 97
Screws with spur wheels, 6	7 50
Sundry small supplies	15 60
Steel pins, 2,000	38 38
Spindle tubes, 3	15 00
Shipping tags, 50,000	30 00
Toes and links for breakers, 286	100 65
Wrapping paper, 6,064 lbs. at 3c	181 92

These amounts represent a large portion of the total sum.

Mr. MULOCK. How many tons of twine were sold ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have answered that question four times, and I will not do it again. Let us have new questions.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman can take any course he likes. The Minister has stated that this twine is sold at cost. He has expended, according to the Auditor General's report, at least $24,969, I call his attention and the attention of the committee to some figures. On page 3 of the Minister's report for the year ending 30th June, 1894, there appears a heading "cash expenditure, actual cost 1893-94," which does not warrant him in assuming that it is part of the capital put into plant, but is the cost of manufacturing twine. There is an item, "binder twine, $24,997.63," entered as cost of manufacturing the twine. The hon. gentleman acknowledges that all the twine that was manufactured was sold, and that the gross amount received from sales was between $15,000 and $16,000, either received or receivable. That leaves a shortage of $8,000 or $9,000 less than the cost.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There may be a confusion as regards the season of the year.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman tell me the number of tons he sold and on which he realized ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. One hundred and twenty tons, as I have told the hon. gentleman before.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman did not tell me anything of the kind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I told some hon. gentleman opposite. At the end of the year we had 360 tons, and also some raw material.

Mr. MULOCK. What authority is taken to have binding twine sold on credit ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is done on the authority of Council.

Mr. MULOCK. Was there an authority of Council for the sale made on credit to Rogers ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am speaking of this season. I do not know what authority was obtained last season ; it must have been done by the head of the department.

Mr. MULOCK. In regard to the sale to Rogers, can the Minister say by whose authority the sale took place ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On the authority of the Minister and of the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. Then there would be some evidence furnished as to his credit ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was not in the department at the time.

Mr. MULOCK. Would there not be a report from Kingston ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not know.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose sales are made direct from Kingston ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. A purchaser would apply to the authorities at Kingston, and the authorities there would have to communicate here, if the sale was made with the authority of the Minister. Is there anything on record here ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We know that the man is being sued. I think the hon. gentleman has mentioned that subject for the tenth time to-day. Perhaps it is due to the fact that the man who is sued is in Ottawa and has been around the buildings ; and it might make him a little uncomfortable to be talked about all the afternoon. These are the cold facts : that the man has not paid and suit was brought.

Mr. MULOCK. I know nothing about the person who is in debt or whether he is in Ottawa or not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then you have not been listening to the discussion.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister is wholly inaccurate. He is here for the purpose of answering proper questions before we give him the money to spend, and he should do so. He will find that he will make much more satisfactory progress in passing items if he endeavours to manifest a reasonable degree of courtesy in answering.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Thank you.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister will probably get wiser on that point before he is a great deal older. I intend to continue to ask such questions as I deem necessary in the public interest, and unless we get satisfactory answers, the Minister will understand that he is to blame for the lack of progress.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not in the slightest hurry, but I object to stupidity—that is all.

Mr. MULOCK. I object to impertinence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So do I.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister is commencing to recover a little of his old tactics since he has been able to return to his duties, and since his head has again commenced to assume that imaginery size that it had some time ago. He will find he will make a good deal more progress if he will just confine himself to the discharge of his duties for which he is placed in the Cabinet. If he paid $41,000 to Mr. Connor, what is the extra $1,000 for. The contract was for $40,000, nothing more nor nothing less, and we are entitled to have details of the other $1,000.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I see the amount in the Auditor General's Report as payment to Mr. Connor is given at $40,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is right. I will answer the hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Somerville). The amount was paid to Mr. Connor as stated there, and as set forth in the contract. The additional amount, as I am informed, and it is all the information I can give, was for machinery required in addition to the contract. The items, I fancy, are outlined in the Auditor General's Report. I read all of them, and I suppose the hon. gentleman will find the articles that made the $1,000 among them. All Mr. Connor got was the $40,000 on his contract.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Justice intimates that this Mr. Rogers is probably in the gallery of the House; but the Minister must understand that as members of Parliament we have duties to perform, and for my own part I am not at all uneasy as to whether Mr. Rogers may be in the gallery or not. I want to know how long the defalcation existed before the Government took steps to try and collect it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Every effort was made to collect it, and when the facts were reported to me a suit was brought.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was a draft made on him?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not follow the clerks around my department to know how they transact the details of the business. I do not know the colour of the man who wrote the letter.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have been informed, and I would like to know if this gentleman for whom the Minister of Justice feels so sensitive is not the president of the Conservative Association for Manitoba?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I believe he is not, nor do I believe he ever was.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think my informant was right, and I fancy he occupied that position.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) would be better authority on that than I am.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no doubt that accounts for the tardy action of the Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They would not have sued him at all if he was.

Mr. GRIEVE. I quite agree with much that was said by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) with regard to the establishment of the binder twine industry in the Kingston Penitentiary. The action of the Government is to be commended on that ground, and I believe in giving credit where credit is due. It is a well known fact that a huge combination existed in this country which extorted exorbitant prices out of the farmers. The Government of the province of Ontario and the Patrons of Industry did what they could to break the back of that combine, and the Federal Government, following up the good example, established the industry in connection with the Kingston Penitentiary. I give them credit for that, but I do find fault with the way they have of disposing of that twine. They will sell a carload or half a carload to some person who apparently has no financial standing whatever, but if a farmer who pays one hundred cents on the dollar regularly will send an order for twine, of 100 pounds or 500 pounds——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He will get the same treatment exactly.

Mr. GRIEVE. No, but you will ask him to send the money with the order or pay c. o. d. I am not aware that a single farmer in the country has received credit, nor do I think it is right they should have credit, for I do not think it is business-like to give credit for twine. We all know that twine is a cash article, and that the farmers all pay cash for it. The member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) commended the Minister of Justice for not giving the prices to the House, as he said it would be misleading to do so. That I cannot understand. You manufacture in Kingston pure manilla, pure sisal, and a mixture of sisal and manilla, and why cannot you give the prices of these three kinds? It could not be misleading. Any man who has been accustomed in the past to use binder twine knows the quality that he uses, and the argument of the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) does not amount to anything.

I was sorry to hear one statement made in the House this afternoon: it is a statement which was calculated to do a great deal of injury to a certain industry in this country, and should not have been made unless the gentleman who made it had the facts before him. I refer to the Patrons of Industry, who established a binder twine factory in the city of Brantford a few years ago. They are putting their twine on the market, and it was stated here that they went into a combination with the Consumers' Cordage Company of Canada. Now, Sir, if that statement is not true it should not have been made here. Nothing that could be done or said, could tend more to depreciate that industry before their own people, or before the farmers of this country, than the bare fact that the Patrons have entered into a combination. That industry was started to burst a great combine, and if the Patrons who are supporting that industry come to the conclusion that the directors of the company have instructed their manager to make overtures to the Government here and to the Cordage Company of Canada to enter into a combination. I take it in hand to say that the great stock of twine they have this year will be left on their hands. I believe that the farmers would have nothing to do with it if the Patrons have entered into a combination. I therefore repeat that hon. gentlemen should be careful about the statement they make. If the statement is true, there is, of course, no fault to be found with hon. gentlemen for making it; but if it is not true, it should not have been made here.

Now, Sir, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that there was no reduction in the price of binder twine when the duty was reduced from 25 per cent to 12½ per cent. I think the hon. gentleman, in that respect, is wrong. I have used, in the past, and I use at present a considerable quantity of twine, and I know of my own personal knowledge that after the reduction in the duty was made, binder twine was sold on the market at from 2 cents to 3 cents a pound less than before. Now, I hope the Government will be careful in the future with regard to placing the twine on the market. The Minister states that there are still some arrears from last year. I hope he will see that in the future the business is conducted more on business principles. I know nothing of Mr. Rogers, whose feelings, it is said may be hurt. I care not whether his feelings are hurt or not, because I have a great deal of contempt for gentlemen in his position. I have no use for political hangers-on. You may find scores of them in the lobby. I never knew one in my life who was worth enough powder to blow him up; and if the Government have many more such characters to relieve, I will find no fault with them if they give them twine enough or rope enough with which to hang themselves. There is, at present, I have no doubt, still a combination, not perhaps in regard to binder twine, but in regard to rope, which is made of the same class of material, and in the same manner, and by the same class of workmen. People who have been purchasing rope for the last few years know that it has been selling on the market at 2 cents or three cents per pound more than binder twine. Rope has not yet been manufactured in the prisons, nor in the farmers' binder twine factory at Brantford, so that the cordage combination has still a monopoly of rope. I give the Government credit for establishing this industry in the interests of the farmers of the country; but I hope they will be careful to sell the products in a business way, only to people who are able to pay 100 cents in the dollar, and that they will not have to come down to the House and announce that certain parties are still in arrear.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says that after the duty was reduced the price fell 3 cents a pound. At the time the duty was 25 per cent, the price was only 2 cents a pound, and the reduction of the duty to 12½ per cent was equivalent to a reduction of 1 cent a pound, so that I do not see how the price could have fallen 3 cents a pound. That is not reasonable. I made inquiries of the hardware men after the duties were taken off, and I found that they sold binder twine at the same price then that they did before.

Mr. GRIEVE. The hon. gentleman knows that he had to pay 18 cents a pound for twine when it was subject to a duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. We were not paying 18 cents a pound then.

Mr. GRIEVE. We did pay that at one time. The following year, without any reduction of duty the price was reduced to 15 cents, but after the reduction of duty, there was a drop to 3 cents a pound. There might have been that reduction without any reduction of duty.

Mr. SPROULE. If there were other causes for the reduction in price, the hon. gentleman cannot fairly attribute it to taking off the duty.

Mr. HENDERSON. With regard to the drop in price of binder twine, I have followed this subject for years, and my firm conviction is that neither the manufacture at the prison, nor the reduction of the duty has had anything to do with the reduction in price. I believe the real reason is the fall in the price of the raw material.

Mr. GRIEVE. Why does that not affect the price of rope?

Mr. HENDERSON. Years ago, when twine was selling at 18 cents a pound, manilla was worth as much as £58 sterling per ton, whereas to-day it is selling at £18 sterling per ton. It is quite possible under these circumstances, to reduce the price of binder twine made from manilla from 18 cents a pound down to one-third of that price. In 1893 the Consumers Cordage Company was manufacturing twine cheaper than the Central Prison or the Brantford factory; and we must remember that the Brantford factory had free money, because the farmers had subscribed it, and the Central prison had freedom from taxation, and almost free labous, while the Consumers Cordage Company had to pay for everything. But those who had been engaged in the industry for years, and had a large experience in the business, were able to buy their raw material at the proper time, and at the best advantage. We know that it came out in evidence at Toronto that in one transaction the Central Prison lost $10,000 by purchasing raw material at the wrong time. The Brantford institution has been able to make 15 per cent profit by buying twine from the Consumers Cordage Company, and selling it to the farmers. I think the reduction of duty, which to-day amounts to little more than half a cent a pound, has little or nothing to do with the reduction in price, but I supported the principle of protection to that industry, and I believe I was right in so doing. I believe that industry was as valuable to the people of our country as any other industry. I never considered that its protection had any effect in enhancing the price; if I had thought it had, it was my determination to join with others to reduce that protection. When it was represented to the Government that those who had this protection were using it to enhance the price, the Government reduced it one-half; but I do not think that reduction of duty had anything to do with reducing the price. I am pleased that the farmers of Canada are to-day getting this article at the low price they are, and I think that the policy the Government are pursuing in manufacturing it in an institution and in a way that will absolutely prevent the enhancing of the price by any organization outside, whether the Cordage Company, or Mr. Stratford's company at Brantford, is the true policy, and I trust it will be continued for years to come.

Mr. GRIEVE. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question at all. I made the statement that binder twine sold much cheaper than rope made out of the same material. He says that the reduction in the price of binder twine is due to the reduction in the cost of the raw material. If that is the case, how is it that for the last two years the farmers who have been getting binder twine at 6½, 7½, and 8 cents a pound have had to pay 12½ cents a pound for their rope. I believe now that if the Government of Ontario and the Patrons had not gone into the manufacture of binder twine, the farmers of Canada would be paying the same price that they pay for their rope.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not pretend to be a practical rope maker, but I can readily understand that when you have to twist two together, and then two more, and then join a dozen or more together, you have to employ a great deal more labour than you do on the article of binder twine, and the cost would be greater. Besides binder twine is a cash article, sold in large quantities, for which there is ready sale, quick returns, and consequently small profits. That is the principle of business all over. The larger and readier the sale and the quicker the cash returns, the smaller the profits. Rope is an article manufactured in the regular way, sold on long terms of credit, and it is not unreasonable that the profits would be larger than in the case of binder twine.

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot believe the statement of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), that it is the price of the raw material alone which makes the product dearer, because I was one of a party in 1891 who telegraphed to Philadelphia and Londonderry, Ireland, to find out at what price binder twine could be laid down in Canada. We got from Philadelphia an offer of binding twine, 650 feet to the pound, laid down at Montreal at 8½ cents, and from Londonderry we got an offer of the same article at nearly the same price, while at the same time our farmers were paying 14 cents a pound. That was before the duty was removed.

Mr. HENDERSON. No doubt the hon. gentleman may be correct, because we know that years ago the Americans manufactured

almost entirely sisal twine, a cheap article. They sold their manilla to the people of Canada very largely and used the sisal themselves. We had a superior article of binder twine to what they had at that time, and consequently the American price would be of necessity lower. As I have said already, the low-priced article was not a cheap article for the farmers. It pays a farmer better to give 10 cents for a good article than 8 cents for a poor one. Take binder twine, 500 feet to the pound at 5 cents, and another of 700 feet to the pound at 7 cents, the 7 cent article would be as cheap as the 5 cent. And the same may be said of the 8-cent, 10-cent and 11-cent article. The higher priced article is better because it works more readily. There is less stoppage in the machine, fewer sheaves are left undone, and less time is lost. The farmer has not to go along picking up the sheaves as he has to do in the Northwest, where, I am told, a great many sheaves are not picked up at all. If they would get a good article and ignore the poor American stuff, it would pay them much better, even if it did cost them a few cents a pound more. I scarcely think that the question raised by the hon. gentleman has any point, when you consider that it is the fact that our farmers have been using a better article than they have in the United States, and the better article is the cheaper in the end.

Mr. MARTIN. When I asked the question with regard to the amounts due the penitentiary for binder twine sold by the Government, I did so because there was a rumour in Manitoba which came to my ears, that the Government had used this business for political purposes by allowing their friends to buy this twine on credit. The hon. gentleman, in answering the question, gave me the name of one person who, he said, was the only one who was now a delinquent. The special report that I referred to was amply justified in this case, but the hon. gentleman declined to give the names of the other persons to whom binding twine had been sold on credit for fear that possibly they would not deal with the Government again. I wish to join with the hon. members who have taken the stand that it is very improper indeed for the Government to sell binder twine upon credit. As has been stated by the hon. member for Halton, binder twine is not a credit article. It is sold by the other establishments concerned on a cash basis, and it is quite unfair for the Government to adopt a different principle. It is also very dangerous indeed for the Government to adopt the principle of selling on credit, for the reasons that I have pointed out. Whether it be true or not that they sell to their political friends on credit, there will be the feeling throughout the country that there are favours of that kind extended. For that purpose I would strongly urge on the Government the advisability of pursuing the same course in regard to this trade that the other persons in the trade do. I had intended at that time to suggest to the Minister of Justice the advisability of giving the names of those persons to whom the twine had been sold on credit and who had afterwards paid for it, with the view of clearing up the suspicion that came to my ears. If it were true that they were ordinary business men in the trade who were in the habit of buying goods on credit and paying for them, then no reflection would be cast upon the Government; but if, on the other hand, they were friends of the Government who should not have been trusted in this matter, the House should know it. It seems to me that no injury can be done to them if they were ordinary business men who were in the habit of buying goods on credit and paying for them when due.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have not the slightest objection to give the information to which the hon. gentleman refers to any hon. gentleman in this House. I merely put it to the sense of the House as to whether it would be wise in the interests of business, to publish, on the mere request of an hon. gentleman, those names. There is no desire for secrecy. The hon. gentleman is welcome to the information. I admit the right of hon. gentlemen to ascertain those facts in connection with any business in which the public is concerned, but unless there is grave reason in the public interest, I do not think we ought to mention those names in debate. Of course if the hon. gentleman finds that there was favouritism shown, it would be his duty to bring that matter to the attention of the House, and the department fears no investigation of that kind.

Mr. DALY. I heard the name of one gentleman to whom binder twine was apparently sold on credit—Mr. Robert Rogers, of Clearwater—but to what amount I do not know.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. $1,700.

Mr. DALY. And, it appears, that on that $1,700, he owes us $650, according to the statements made here. I can only say that from my knowledge of Mr. Rogers, his long business experience, and great capacity, and the large business he is carrying on as a merchant and wheat dealer, the sale to him was perfectly justified. He is a man of business reputaion, and not a mere political hanger-on as has been alleged. I think the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) himself will say that Mr. Rogers is good for $650. It may be found that there is reason for Mr. Rogers not paying the $650; there may be some dispute in regard to it. I know that Mr. Rogers is worth $650, and many other similar sums besides.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know anything about that; it is a delicate and a difficult

matter to say what a man is worth. But I know that, under the circumstances, it was grossly improper for the Government to sell Mr. Rogers this twine upon credit. I say that, knowing all the circumstances the hon. gentleman has referred to. But I may say that the opinion generally held in Manitoba, on the hon. gentleman's own side of politics as well as on the other, and independent of politics altogether, that it was a gross piece of political favouritism to sell binder twine to Mr. Robert Rogers on credit. I do not hesitate to say that, but without making any improper reflection upon Mr. Rogers. What public reason can there be that the names of these parties are not given? I do not want to get those names for any purpose of my own. I do not want to get them privately, but across the floor of the House, so that every one in Canada may have the same knowledge that I have. With regard to the one person whose name has been given to us as a delinquent it has been found —or, as, perhaps, some members would not care to take my word, it is alleged—that the sale was an improper one. There can be no doubt that Mr. Robert Rogers is one of the principal political supporters of the hon. Minister of the Interior, in Manitoba; he is a gentleman who devotes a very large portion of his time to political work, and is known, generally speaking, as the chief organizer, or as the person in charge, as I may put it, so far as the Conservative affairs in Manitoba are concerned. That I say without undertaking to say whether Mr. Rogers is worth the amount or not. Mr. Rogers is a personal friend of my own, and I do not want to go into personal matters. But the Government have no right, in an article such as binder twine, which is well understood to be a cash article, to discriminate among members of the trade, and to sell to a political partisan and manager of their own, on credit. What is the result of it? Mr. Rogers is put in a position to use the Government property without paying for it, if he so desires. Surely that is not proper. I have no reason to suppose, from my own knowledge that there is any other person in the province who bought binder twine on the same terms. I know nothing about that; but I think the hon. Minister of Justice will see that unless the names of the other persons are named, suspicion will fall on a great many other people being in the same position. I do not care, for my own part, whether the hon. Minister mentions the names of the other parties or not, but surely there can be no reason for withholding them. If the Government do right they will do as others do, they will sell for cash, so that they do not need to care whether these men continue to be customers of theirs in the future, or not. And if it turns out that they are ordinary business people, no harm is done to them or to the Government by the announcement of their names. But if they are men whose relations with the Government are those of hangers-on, it will be seen that the action of the Government in selling to them on credit is without justification. I do not suppose that the Minister of Justice at the time knew anything about the action when the twine was being sold, but I am certain that there was a general feeling in Manitoba against it. The report came to me from persons dealing in binder twine, who asked me to investigate it in the House, and that investigation so far has been confirmatory of the suspicion in the minds of these people that the Government were using this business in a partisan and political way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that whatever else has resulted from this discussion, it must be clear to the hon. Minister himself that it is highly in the interests of the public that any transactions that the department may have with the public should be conducted on a strictly cash basis. I cannot conceive of anything more likely to produce unfortunate scandals than allowing articles of this kind to be sold on credit to any man, whether a Reformer or a Conservative, whether in Manitoba or Ontario. Every principle of business calls upon the Government, when they engage in the manufacture of this kind, to dispose of their product for cash, and nothing else; and I would feel that an extremely strong argument was presented against their going into the business at all if they were compelled to give credit, whether it were the custom of the trade or not. Far better make a reasonable reduction, if there were a custom—which, I understand, is not the case—of giving credit, and dispose of the goods for cash rather than to allow credit. In every case, sales of binder twine should be made for cash, or c.o.d.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That subject, of course, is one of great difficulty to deal with, and I would only suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should consider those difficulties. We have now, I am informed, the very strong opposition of the Cordage Company, and of the company of the Patrons. I have learned since six o'clock that these two companies are, at any rate, acting together, whether as a combination or not I would not venture to say. They are very much incensed, to my knowledge, with the competition they have experienced at our hands, small, comparatively, though it be. If, on entering the field, we tie our hands and feet, and decline to do business with customers so greatly sought after, we might find ourselves, at the end of the season, in a bad position. I think it is almost too early in the history of the business to make a pledge to Parliament on this point. I appreciate what the hon. gentleman says about the necessity of keeping the business above

the suspicion of favouritism, either personal or political. That, of course, is a subject that will be jealously watched by Parliament, and, if there were ground for suspicion long continued, no doubt it would result in the abolition of this branch of penitentiary labour. With this statement, I hope the committee will believe that the subject will be given careful consideration, but, entering the field, we must, to a certain extent, be guided by existing usage. Refusing credit in cases in which credit would be given by those who are, to a certain extent, our rivals, we might find ourselves in an unfavourable position. The showing we made was not a bad one—$15,000 brought in in about two months. Evidently the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) himself believes that Mr. Rogers is able to respond to a judgment for this $650 if we get it. And that just reminds me that it may be that Mr. Rogers has some defence, though, according to my side of the case, he has none. But, according to all I have heard, he is well able to respond to this judgment. But, even supposing this amount was lost, our showing for the initial year would still be a satisfactory one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not speaking from the point of view of the merits of this case or the merits as to Mr. Rogers. But looking at it strictly from a business point of view, I think the Minister would be better advised in making, I was going to say, almost any reduction, and dealing for cash, than on the credit system, and I think that would be the experience of almost any man who has had anything to do with the collection of accounts by the Government. There is an intolerable deal of trouble when the Government enter into courts to collect moneys from anybody, and both the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance know that our books are full of debts due to us which have remained over due for years and years, and which it is not found at all desirable to collect by process of law. I foresee that if this manufacture assumes, as it will probably, considerable proportions—because I take it that the hon. gentleman expects to dispose of $200,000 or $300,000 worth per annum, judging from the scale on which the manufacture is carried on—and if he goes into the credit system, he will find that trouble, and bother, and annoyance that will be given to himself and his department, will overbalance any other advantage that might occur.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would say to the Minister that in his report, page 2, he will notice that the per capita cost is given at $456.10, and the revenue, $8.47½. Is that the per capita revenue for all the inmates of the penitentiary, and is it all that we received during that year?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The difficulty is in the way these are made out. Additional machinery for binder twine made a confusion, that is what makes the discrepancy.

Mr. McMULLEN. What other occupations are the prisoners at Kingston engaged in besides the manufacture of binder twine?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There are no other industries in reference to goods put on the market.

Dorchester Penitentiary $48,576

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The increase is owing to two additional guards, and one additional teamster. Hitherto only one teamster was employed. This has been considered an unsafe practice. There are so many uses for which these teamsters are employed that it is considered unsafe to use the convicts as drivers outside the grounds.

Mr. BOWERS. I would like to call the Minister's attention to page H—36 of the Auditor General's Report, where he intimates that there seems to have been some irregularity in the purchase of articles for the warden, which are detailed on page H—27.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Speaking off-hand—that was before my day—I would say to the hon. gentleman that it is a question of consideration, I take it, of the Penitentiaries Act, which I have not under my hand, in regard to how far this allowance for the furnishing of the warden's apartments was within the statute. I see that the Auditor General thinks that the purchase of these articles was irregular, and he refers to a practice that has obtained for many years, referring back again to a letter of his in 1893, where he drew the attention of Parliament to the subject. I candidly state that at this moment I am not able to go into a consideration of that matter. I may say that the question raised by the Auditor has been conceded, to a certain extent.

Manitoba Penitentiary $47,793 90

Mr. McMULLEN. When did the contract end for the supplies of these penitentiaries?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With the fiscal year.

Mr. McMULLEN. Have new contracts been entered into?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Contracts for next year have been advertised for, and will be received to-morrow.

Regina Jail..... $13,768 40

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Militia is very anxious to take up his estimates, as he wishes to be absent for a part of next week. If the committee has no objection, I should be glad that it be done. One item can be reserved for discussion afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. So we will reserve the item of the Royal Military College.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, with the understanding that it will be open for general discussion.

Pay of Staff, Permanent Corps and Active Militia $361,950

Mr. DICKEY. I reduce this item by $20,500, leaving the amount $341,450.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman had better explain on what principle he proposes to act, and what his reasons are for proposing the reduction.

Mr. DICKEY. This is a vote for payment of staff of permanent corps and active militia, which was last year $401,482, and in addition to that there was a vote in the supplementary Estimates of $45,000, making altogether $446,000. I propose to reduce the permanent corps to 800 men, and the reduced vote contemplated is to carry out that view. That will reduce this estimate to $341,000, instead of $446,000 last year. I may explain to the committee that I propose to drill the city corps and artillery, for which no provision appears in these Estimates, and as I was not able to prevail on the Finance Minister to give me any amount for that purpose, I had to adopt stringent reductions, and consequently I propose to reduce the Estimates submitted by something like $70,000 or $80,000 to provide money for the drill of those corps, and this sum of $20,500, which I strike out, will form a part of that sum. I am able to do that in this particular item by reason of the reduction of the permanent force.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. member propose to reduce the number of commissioned and non-commissioned officers, or only the number of men ?

Mr. DICKEY. Simply the number of men.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to insist on the matter, although looking at the condition of the House it might not be convenient, but the Minister will remember that on the discussion of an item in the Supplementary Estimates an understanding was arrived at that he would give the committee some general idea, if he had one, as to how he proposed to deal with this somewhat thorny question of the expenditure on militia. That may be done when the discussion on the Royal Military College comes up, and I have no objection to the discussion standing over till that time. But I should like to know from the hon. gentleman, after his term of warlike service, what his general views are on the subject of the militia, both permanent corps and volunteer militia. Does the hon. Minister wish to give that information now or hereafter ?

Mr. DICKEY. I do not know that I wish to give it at all. If at all, I think it better to say hereafter, when the discussion on the Royal Military College takes place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In regard to this item, you propose to take the money from the pay of the permanent corps ?

Mr. DICKEY. Entirely.

Salaries and Wages of Civil Employees.. $57,000

Mr. DICKEY. I reduce that item to $55,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe you have reduced it already.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes.

Military Property, Stores and Buildings. $97,000

Mr. BOWERS. I see in the Auditor General's Report, K—77, under the item of Rents of Military Properties : " Lunenburg—Kaulback, C.E., 50 cents." What does that item represent ?

Mr. DICKEY. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the information just now.

Mr. BOWERS. Then I observe there is a similar item at page K—79, under the head of Rents of Military Properties ?

Mr. DICKEY. That is for property connected with the old fort.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The committee has passed a vote for inspection of stores. I asked for information with respect to a gentleman in the city, whose name was connected with an appointment to such a position, and who received assurance from the late Minister that he would be appointed, as I am informed, and received notification of his appointment and made his arrangements on the faith of that notification, but who, unfortunately for him, was passed over. I refer to Major Watson.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The statement of facts I have from him in writing, and the copy of the letter sent to him indicates very clearly that he did receive most positive assurances from the late Minister that he would receive an appointment. Acting on those assurances, he changed his position and incurred liabilities, which he was justified in doing, and afterwards, without cause assigned, was not appointed. I want to know what the facts are, whether that gentleman was treated badly, whether a promise has been made and broken, and what reasons induced the department to refuse to ratify the promise made by the hon. gentleman's predecessor.

Mr. DICKEY. I am afraid I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information he wants. I have, of course, heard of the case to which he alludes, but I have no knowledge of it personally, and I am unable to say how far even, he is correct in saying there was

a written promise. I know Major Watson's services, of course.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not make the positive statement from my own knowledge.

Mr. DICKEY. I understand that. I know of Major Watson and his services, and personally I may say that I am most anxious to do anything I possibly can for him. I am unable to give the hon. gentleman the information about what was done in the department by my predecessor. If it is a personal matter, as I understand, Major Watson would have a complaint against my predecessor in office: but I do not suppose there is any complaint about the qualification of the officer who was appointed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As I understand it Major Watson had the promise from the Minister of his appointment, and a written notice from another Minister congratulating him upon the appointment. But beyond this he has received no official notice of the appointment.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman will see, that however interesting these facts are from a personal standpoint, they really are not in the public interest, and I do not suppose they would concern this particular vote. The hon. gentleman's experience in politics will, of course, furnish him with examples in his own experience where he was not able to carry out what he expected to. I am not able to say anything whatever about the facts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman leads us to infer that personally he knows nothing about the matter.

Mr. DICKEY. Nothing whatever.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And there is no record in the department?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, there are records in the department concerning it, but I do not know that it would be proper for me to give verbally a statement of them. If a motion is made for them I can bring them down.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the Minister bring down the correspondence without any further notice?

Mr. DICKEY. Well, of course, I would not like to promise that, without looking at the correspondence. I have never seen it, nor did I know it was in existence until I spoke to the deputy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will examine the correspondence and let us know at a later stage.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, I will.

Mr. BOWERS. There are several properties in St. John rented at 25 cents, and 50 cents, and $2.50 a year. It would be curious to know what kind of properties could be rented for that in a city.

Mr. DICKEY. I only know of the Park property which is leased to the city for $51 a year. It is, I suppose, a valuable property intrinsically, but we do not want to occupy it, and we handed it over to the city to take care of it at this nominal rent.

Mr. BOWERS. It seems strange the property should be rented at such remarkably low sums. I trust the Minister will give us the information later on.

Mr. DICKEY. There are a good many militia properties rented at a nominal sum. That 25 cents might be a relic of an old rent of 2s. to preserve the title. A good many of our properties are an encumbrance rather than a benefit, because of the expense of water rates, and maintaining them, and we are glad to get them off our hands.

Mr. CASEY. I see it stated in the "Canadian Gazette" and other papers, that Major General Herbert is coming back to Canada. Other papers say he is not coming back. Might I ask the Minister to state what are the facts?

Mr. DICKEY. The latest information I have is, that it is very uncertain whether or not the General will return. I do not think he will return to Canada at all.

Mr. CASEY. How long is it since he went away?

Mr. DICKEY. On the 8th March, I think, and his leave extends to the 1st of July.

Mr. CASEY. If there is need of a Major-General it would seem that he should be here at the time when the camps are coming on Does the Minister know anything about the appointment of a successor to General Herbert?

Mr. DICKEY. When I came to the department I found that the General was on leave until the 1st of July. I have had a good many communications with him, the last being a telegram in which he said that he expected to leave. Afterwards I heard that he did not intend to leave.

Mr. CASEY. Do you mean leave the service or leave England?

Mr. DICKEY. I mean to leave England. I am just informed now that the General is on his way coming out, but I have no official information of it.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister does not officially know whether Major-General Herbert intends to remain in his present position or not?

Mr. DICKEY. No.

Mr. CASEY. When does his term of office expire?

Mr. DICKEY. November, I believe.

Mr. CASEY. As a matter of fact at the present time, the Minister does not know whether he is going to have Major-General

Herbert from the 1st of July to November as the officer commanding the forces, or whether the General is going to resign, or what is the intention about his successor. It seems to me a very loose way of doing business that the Minister does not know of the movements of an officer of his rank and high pay.

Mr. DICKEY. I understand the hon. gentleman to complain of the length of leave given to the General. The leave was granted, I believe, on account of urgent private business.

Mr. CASEY. I was not complaining of that.

Mr. DICKEY. Then the hon. gentleman knows as much as I do. He knows that the General's leave expires on the 1st of July, and I understand he is on his way out here.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman did not know that when I first asked the question.

Mr. DICKEY. I did not officially.

Mr. CASEY. There have been so many rumours about this General resigning, and so on, that it would seem proper to ask the question whether the Minister knew anything about it, and it seems he did not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that at a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee a short time ago, Lieut.-Col. Macpherson gave evidence on a question which was asked him as to arrears of rent due on military property in Annapolis. In reply to a question put to him he alleged that a member of this House was largely in arrears for property which he had rented from the Government there—property which had been originally rented by a man whose name I forget; that this member of the House had the lease assigned to him and had paid two years' rent, after which he excused himself from paying any more, and was now in arrears. The member of the House in question was brought before the committee and gave an emphatic denial to the whole thing, alleging that neither directly nor indirectly was he a lessee of the Government, and neither legally nor morally liable to pay the rent, and that the statement made by Lieut-Col. Macpherson was entirely erroneous. Lieut-Col. Macpherson made the statement, the question arose whether he had personal knowledge of it or whether the Deputy Minister, Col. Panet, had. It was then understood that the Deputy Minister was absent from Ottawa. I think, in justice to the public as well as to the member of the House in question, the hon. gentleman should see that his Deputy Minister attends the Public Accounts Committee and settles that matter some way or the other.

Mr. DICKEY. I would be perfectly willing to do so. Perhaps it would be better for me to say nothing whatever about the matter at the present time. Immediately that I heard the rumor I called for the papers.

Mr. McMULLEN. Some questions have been put to the Minister in regard to certain small items for rent on page K—77 of the Auditor General's Report. There are a number of these items which I think he should make a note of, and say why they are set down as rents.

Mr. DICKEY. I would be glad to give the hon. gentleman the information on any particular items he may mention. There are a large number of these properties and details in regard to them all would make a very large and bulky return.

Mr. McMULLEN. For instance, I see the corporation of Toronto is put down for $100, and immediately after that, Yarmouth, P. Power, for 25 cents. Then, there is an item, Sir S. L. and Lady Tilley, $21.

Mr. DICKEY. I will get these and also the one about Mr. Kaulbach. I think perhaps it would be interesting to the House if I got all the 25 cent ones.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice also at page K—62, purchase of land for Sussex Permanent Camp, George H. White, $7,000.

Mr. DICKEY. That was paid last year for the camp grounds at Sussex, in pursuance of the policy adopted some years ago of having one permanent camp ground in each division.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Minister say how the value of the property was arranged?

Mr. DICKEY. It was bought at private sale. The value was fixed by the report of the officers of the department on the ground. It was thought to offer superior advantages for a camp ground, and for that reason it was purchased.

Mr. McMULLEN. Could the Minister say how many acres?

Mr. DICKEY. I am told about 300 acres.

Mr. RIDER. I would like to inquire of the Minister if the fact of these military properties having been leased entitles the Government to sell them at private sale, and not by auction or by public tender. I notice that the other day, in answering a question in regard to a property situated on the east side of the Richelieu River in the county of Iberville, opposite Isle aux Noix, the Minister of the Interior said it was sold under the provisions of the revised statutes of Canada, chapter 55, section 5, subsection 3, because the property had been under lease. I would like to ask if the fact of the property having been under lease gives the Government this privilege.

Mr. DICKEY. No. As I understand, the law does not make any difference at all as to the powers of the Government. I think, however, that the Government has power under the statute to sell these properties if they are not required for militia purposes, and they are not necessarily to be sold by public action.

Mr RIDER. Whether they have been under lease or not ?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes. I do not think that is an element in the matter at all.

Mr. CASEY. In regard to rifle ranges, I would like to ask the Minister whether any change is in contemplation in regard to the Ottawa range.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes. Of course, that is not a matter than can be answered very definitely. So far as I have been able to come to a conclusion, I think the present range is not one that we can depend upon for many years, and my personal opinion is that if we can secure land near the city at anything like favourable rates, we had better buy now than later, because Ottawa is a growing city, and prices are likely to go up. I hope to be able to get a very satisfactory place.

Mr. CASEY. Has the Minister any place in view at present ?

Mr. DICKEY. There is a place at Rockliffe beyond the park, on which the Dominion Rifle Association took an option, which option they are willing to give the Government the advantage of.

Mr. CASEY. I inquired with regard to this range because it is one in which the whole country is interested, in connection with Dominion matches ; and in view of the introduction of modern weapons, the present range will soon be out of the question. It is absolutely impossible to get a range there long enough to test the qualities of the Lee-Metford weapon. The amounts seem to be the same as last year for construction and maintenance. I have not looked into the details, but would like to know if any new constructions are intended.

Mr. DICKEY. There is no special construction in prospect this year, and that vote was taken with a view to meeting the exigencies that may arise. The reduction is in the line of the general reductions which the hon. gentleman will observe through the whole of these estimates.

Mr. CASEY. I notice that we had a good deal of trouble last year in getting the particulars of the Halifax drill shed. That was put under the head of public works, the Minister of which did not know much about it, and the Minister of Militia, though in and out of the House frequently, did not seem anxious to explain.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman understands that the plans of these drill sheds are always made in my department to suit militia requirements, but, of course, we have nothing to do with the expenditure of the money.

Mr. CASEY. I hope that when this item comes up in public works, the hon. gentleman will be here to give explanations in case the Minister of Public Works should know as little about it as he did last year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask if, during the past season, some military property in Quebec was leased to a party who tore down a portion of the building ?

Mr. DICKEY. There was no lease granted until recently. When I came into office, I was informed that a person in Quebec was tearing down an old historic building, and I immediately stopped the work. I subsequently went down there and found that although he was tearing a portion down, it was for the purpose of putting another story on top. This had been used as a military store house, but was shut in by a wall twelve feet high, so that nobody could get in to see it. The man expended about $1,500, in the best of good faith, under a verbal promise of lease from the former Minister of Militia ; and though he had, perhaps, no legal standing, I concluded that as the work would largely increase the value of the property, and in view of all the circumstances, I would carry out the promise made. The lessee is spending about $3,000 in a permanent direction on the property.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Where is the property situated ?

Mr. DICKEY. Right behind the Grand battery. It is what is called the F magazine.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is it being used for by the present lessee ?

Mr. DICKEY. I could not tell. I made some pretty stringent restrictions in the lease as to the use it might be put to. It is a very shallow building, varying from twelve to fifteen feet deep, and I cannot see that the present holder can make much use of it except, perhaps, as a tenement house.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the rental ?

Mr. DICKEY. The rental is nominal, but the lessee undertakes to spend $2,000 in permanent repairs the first year. It was not in use but was vacant.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How long does the lease run ?

Mr. DICKEY. Twenty-one years.

Warlike and Other Stores..... $55,000

Mr. DICKEY. I wish to reduce that to $31,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where are you going to make that reduction ?

Mr. DICKEY. Pretty much all along the line. A very considerable proportion will be made on artillery ammunition, probably close on $7,000.

Mr. CASEY. What reduction will there be ; what vote for artillery ammunition ?

Mr. DICKEY. We do not have to ask for particular items. I expect to distribute the reductions pro rata among the items. The total reductions will be made by close economy all along the line. But I can tell the hon. gentleman there will be a larger percentage of reduction on artillery ammunition.

Mr. CASEY. As the hon. gentleman is asking for each service separately, he ought to tell us the reduction on each item.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman, I think, is mistaken, these details are not given in the items. They are there for the information of the House, and, of course, I am bound to give the hon. gentleman all the information I can with respect to them.

Mr. CASEY. I hope the hon. gentleman does not intend to reduce the items for competition. I am obliged to differ from the hon. gentleman as to that.

Mr. DICKEY. I am sorry I have to do it.

Mr. CASEY. I think enough could be saved on other items to make up this other one. The artillery is one of the most important branches of the service, and one to which our young men seem to take most naturally. I think it is a great pity that the practical part of the artillerists' training should be restricted in this way. In this branch, as in the infantry, the shooting is the great thing, and if you restrict that you restrict the real object for which the force exists.

Mr. DICKEY. I realize fully the force of what the hon. gentleman says, but it was a question between drilling the artillery and cutting down other items.

Mr. CASEY. What is the use of drilling them if you do not teach them to shoot.

Mr. DICKEY. We must do the best we can for this year.

Clothing and necessaries $55,334 00

Mr. DICKEY. I want to explain to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in regard to a recent statement and inquiry of his concerning oil-skins. No oil-skins have been purchased for years past. A few oil-skin blankets were purchased, which are in perfect order, the only case at all similar to that to which the hon. gentleman referred was the purchase of knapsacks, second-hand, from the Imperial authorities. They were kept in our stores, and I believe they were very poor. But that would be twenty-five years ago or more.

Mr. LANDERKIN. From whom do you buy clothing now ?

Mr. DICKEY. From three firms—the Sanford Manufacturing Company, Watson & Co., of Toronto, and H. Shorey & Co., Montreal.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What amount to each ?

Mr. DICKEY. During the year H. Shorey & Co. were paid about $10,500 ; the Sanford Manufacturing Company about the same ; Boisseau & Co. had only a contract for the great coats.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When was that entered into ?

Mr. DICKEY. Last year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And the others ?

Mr. DICKEY. Last year also.

Mr. CASEY. Are they annual contracts ?

Mr. DICKEY. No ; for three years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the number of great coats ?

Mr. DICKEY. We bought 200 artillery great coats last year, for which we paid $1,396.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many great coats does the hon. gentleman purchase for the infantry ?

Mr. DICKEY. I do not think we bought any last year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are supposed to purchase every three years ?

Mr. DICKEY. Five years is supposed to be the life of a great coat.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is included in the term "necessaries" ?

Mr. DICKEY. Last year it included boots of various kinds, moccasins, mitts, gloves, gauntlets, capes and mufflers, and underclothing of all kinds ; also combs, brushes and other similar articles.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose that is only for the permanent corps. That is a large appropriation for the purpose.

Mr. DICKEY. Last year we spent $14,000. There are a good many things, such as snowshoes and moccasins, which were bought last year.

Mr. CASEY. It seems pretty extravagant. I see there is a large reduction in the allowance for clothing. Does that mean that there were large issues last year which are expected to wear for some time, or that the issue per man is to be restricted ?

Mr. DICKEY. According to the statement of the superintendent of stores, there

has been an undue economy in that branch of the service. He complains very much that the grant is not sufficient.

Mr. CASEY. But you are reducing it still further.

Mr. DICKEY. I am speaking of the grant as it is now, he claims that it is not sufficient. However, the hon. gentleman will see that I took an extra vote on the supplementary Estimates of $33,000 for clothing for this year, which, of course, enables me to stock up pretty well.

Mr. CASEY. What allowances in lieu of clothing, are those for the Highlanders.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, for certain corps.

Mr. CASEY. What allowance in lieu of clothing are made for permanent corps ?

Mr. DICKEY. Non-commissioned officers have a certain allowance. Uniforms and forage caps, the city corps chiefly supply at their own expense, and the rural corps, too. The hon. gentleman understands that there is a certain class of clothing served out. Some regiments prefer a better kind of clothing, and they get the equivalent of the issue from the stores.

Mr. CASEY. As much as they please ?

Mr. DICKEY. No, they get a certain value. For instance, in case of a uniform, they would get the value of the ordinary uniform, then, if they wanted a better uniform, they would spend as much more as they wanted.

Mr. HUGHES. The chief expenditure under this heading is forage caps. All the rural corps wear Glengarries. An allowance is made for each corps, and each corps buys its own Glengarries. The value of the forage cap is not given.

Provisions, Supplies and Remounts..... $130,000

Mr. DICKEY. I wish to reduce that to $117,500. That reduction is entirely in the first items, rations, forage, fuel, &c., for permanent corps. I am able to reduce this item on account of the reduction in the permanent corps.

Transport and Freight..... $45,000

Mr. DICKEY. I wish to reduce that to $36,000. There will be a smaller number to be transported.

Mr. CASEY. How is the rate of transportation fixed ?

Mr. DICKEY. It varies on different routes. It is a little better than the ordinary rates of travel, but first-class.

Mr. CASEY. Is the accommodation paid for at the same rate as first-class ?

Mr. DICKEY. No ; cheaper.

Mr. CASEY. I think it ought to be obtained as cheap as excursion rates.

Mr. DICKEY. I think it is something like that.

Mr. CASEY. The accommodation given is certainly not better than is given to excursion passengers.

Mr. DICKEY. The only railway I remember much about is the Grand Trunk Railway, to which my attention was called during the arrangements for the camp, and that was 2 cents per mile.

Miscellaneous and unforeseen Contingencies $15,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice by the Auditor General's Report that money from the contingencies has been paid to persons who received injury or became ill in the service during actual drill. I brought the attention of the late Minister of Militia, not the latest, to this matter some time ago. About five or six volunteers in the Grey battalion became ill while at drill, and I tried to impress upon him that when others who had contracted illness in camp were receiving aid, these men should be dealt with likewise. I was never able sufficiently to impress upon him the case of those young men who contracted typhoid fever and were laid up for a long time, in fact one of them died. I asked that he should remunerate the others for their illness and the time they lost.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They must all be dead now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They are there yet, and their claims are there yet. I want to revive their claims, and I want to get the Minister to popularize the force and the service in that district, which was rendered somewhat unpopular. I am sorry to say, by the refusal on the part of the Minister to acknowledge the claims of those who deserved them, and who deserve them as well as any other claims that are here. I notice any number of people who are paid for illness which they contracted in the service, and I do not see why there should be a discrimination made against these. I am able to establish the claims of these parties to the satisfaction of the Minister, and I can establish beyond doubt that they contracted the illness in the camp, a long and serious illness, that they were put to great expense, and got no compensation whatever. I think their records are in the department, and I would impress upon the Minister the need of doing something for these men. I hope he is susceptible to good impressions, and I think he should look after those soldiers who became sick. He will be doing something to serve the force and be rendering justice. I pressed this matter on another Minister of Militia, and if it had not been for his evil surroundings, I think he would have paid the amount. I appeal to the present Minister to take up this claim, and see that they are paid.

Mr. DICKEY. If proof is made, I will have them paid.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If so, I will prove them.

Mr. DICKEY. It will depend entirely on what proof is presented; if the hon. gentleman can prove the cases, I will have them paid.

Dominion Cartridge Factory, including free ammunition for rifle leagues..... $44,000

Mr. HUGHES. There are a great many rounds of Snider ammunition stored in various magazines throughout the country. I hope in a very short time this arm will be superseded by a better one. I suggest the desirability of giving this ammunition free to the rifle associations for distribution, or, if not, that it be sold to them at the lowest possible price.

Mr. DICKEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many rounds of ammunition per annum can be turned out by the cartridge factory?

Mr. DICKEY. About 2,000,000 rounds with the present staff. We are putting in extra power.

Mr. CASEY. Could not the machinery turn out a larger number with an increased staff?

Mr. DICKEY. The additions I find are chiefly for manufacturing artillery shell.

Defence of Esquimalt, B.C., 1895-96—

Dominion contribution towards capital expenditure for works and buildings.. $77,500

Pay and allowance of a detachment of Royal Marine Artillery or Royal Engineers 47,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many more instalments have to be paid towards this work?

Mr. DICKEY. The Dominion expenditure towards capital is $80,000; we still owe $77,500. The total amount is £30,000 or $146,000. This is the second and final vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid I may perhaps be charged with exposing the nakedness of the land, but I desire to know how near these fortifications are to American territory?

Mr. CASEY. They are within range.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think they are within three miles of the Island of San Juan.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. These fortifications will command the channel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose they are less than three miles. I am afraid they command and are capable of being commanded.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We would not admit that.

Resolutions reported.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It might interest the Minister of Justice to know that he will have time to consider the legal point of the question raised by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) touching the Atlantic and Lake Superior Road, for, I think, the project will not go through.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will devote Sunday to it.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 24th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Annual report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery for the Dominion, for year ending 30th June, 1894, with a partial report for services during six months ending 31st December, 1894.—(Mr. Montague.)

CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 130) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Mr. LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The main provision of the Bill does away with the class of civil servants known as third-class clerks. In order to perform the work done by that class, the Government by this Bill take power to employ writers, who will begin at $400 a year and reach after a time a maximum of $600 a year. Of course, the Bill will not affect in any way the third-class clerks now in the service; it only applies to future appointments.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE PENITENTIARIES ACT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Penitentiaries Act.

Mr. LAURIER. Explain.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The main provision in this Bill is to change the schedule of salaries, which will result in a saving to the country of about $4,000 a year—not, of course, to affect the salaries of the present officers, but to put them on a uniform basis. At present the department is to some extent embarrassed when removing officers from one point to another, because, while there may be no charge against an officer of wrong-doing, it may be highly necessary for the discipline and organization of the staff to change an officer here and there; but experience has shown us that in carrying out the change, we are sometimes met with a disparity between the officers who are exchanged.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—REPLY TO ADDRESS.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I acknowledge with thanks the Address which you have loyally adopted in reply to the Speech with which I opened the Session, and I rely with confidence upon your assurance that the important measures submitted to you will receive your full consideration.

The Citadel,
Quebec, 20th June, 1895.

CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. Gibson) asked, Whether all, or any of the following persons (and if so, who?) are, or have recently been, in the public service, on the extra or regular staff? If so, in what branch of the service? At what rate of remuneration, and on whose recommendation have such appointments been made, and where did such appointees reside at the time of their appointments: R. O. Brown, J. McIntosh, R. White, J. Johnson, S. Wilson, J. Kennie, J. Paisley, J. Watson, J. McGuire, J. R. Clark, O. Clewlo.

Mr. WALLACE. Some of the persons referred to appear to be employed in the Customs service. They were employed on the recommendation of various members of Parliament and others. Their names, residence at the time of employment, rate of remuneration and length of service are as follows:—John F. McIntosh, preventive officer in charge at Kaslo, B.C., employed 1st July, 1893; salary $1,000 per annum; residence at time of appointment, Woodbridge, Ont. Richard White, preventive officer, Fort Erie, Ont.: employed 27th August, 1893; salary $1.50 per day; residence at time of appointment, Toronto, Ont. S. H. Wilson, employed as relieving officer at Campbellford and in other cases where permanent officers have been or are absent because of sickness or in case of death or dismissal from office: employed July 1893; salary $50 per month; residence at time of appointment, Toronto. John Paisley, acting officer at Niagara Falls, relieving officer John McGovern, who is absent through illness, and for a time relieving officer in charge at Fort Erie Grove: employed August, 1892, at $45 per month; place of residence at time of appointment, Orangeville, Centre Wellington. J. A. Watson, acting officer, at present employed in the Customs Department, Ottawa; employed 23rd January, 1893; salary $1.50 per day; residence at time of appointment, Northwest. O. S. Clewlo, formerly an acting officer at Toronto, but recently appointed permanently as a preventive officer attached to that port: temporarily employed, 9th October, 1893, at a salary of $1.50 per day; present salary $500 per annum; place of residence at time of appointment, Toronto.

CARRIAGE OF MAILS—METEGHAN, DIGBY COUNTY, N. S.

Mr. BOWERS asked, 1. What is the amount paid by the Government for carrying the mails between Meteghan and Meteghan station, via Meteghan River, Digby County, N.S.? 2. At what time was the last contract made? 3. Was it let by public tender, or was it a renewal of the old contract? 4. Have the Government had any correspondence with other parties offering to carry mails for a sum less than that now given? 5. If so, with whom, and what was the amount tendered? 6. Was the offer made before the present contract was ratified or renewed? 7. If so, why was the lower offer not accepted?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the first question, $200 per annum. No. 2. 8th November, 1894. No. 3. It was a renewal of the preceding contract. No. 4. Yes. Nos. 5 and 6. On the 4th December, the department received an offer from Mr. W. Gorman for the service between Meteghan and railway stations at the rate of $72 per annum, with an inquiry as to when the service would terminate, but as the contract did not expire until 31st March, 1895, he was told that the department was not then in a position to deal with the future contracts. No. 7. When the contract was renewed in November, 1894, Mr. Gorman's offer was overlooked. My attention having been called to this renewal, I gave instructions to give notice to the contractor of the cancellation of the contract.

STATE FUNERALS—HON. THOMAS WHITE.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked, Whether the Honourable Thos. White was not buried at the expense of the state? If so, what was the cost of the funeral?

Mr. OUIMET. No. The only expenditure incurred by the Government was the cost of a special train to convey the members of the Government and members of Parliament to Montreal to be present at the funeral. The total expenditure incurred in connection therewith being $734.40.

MAIL CONTRACT BETWEEN ATHLONE AND TOTTENHAM.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Mr. Mulock) asked, How long has the contract awarded to S. E. Turner in 1895 for carrying the mails between Athlone and Tottenham to run? What are the terms of the contract? Why were tenders invited in 1895 for carrying the mails between Athlone and Tottenham? Why were the notices inviting tenders withdrawn? What were the terms of the previously existing contract which was renewed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. This contract will expire on the 31st March, 1899. 2. A daily service between Athlone and Tottenham, via Colgan and Keenansville, Loretto and Romilly, for $300 per annum. 3. Tenders were invited in accordance with the practice of the department in all cases where the termination of a contract is approaching. 4. Notices were withdrawn because the existing contract was renewed, and the intention of dealing with the tenders abandoned. 5. The previous contract provided for a daily service between Athlone and Tottenham via Colgan, Keenansville, Loretto and Romilly, for $300 per annum.

SUPPLY OF GROCERIES FOR THE CAMP AT LAPRAIRIE.

Mr. MONET (Translation) asked, Whether tenders were called for supplying groceries for the camp at Laprairie, in 1893? If so, what are the names of the parties who tendered, and the amounts of the several tenders?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (for Mr. Dickey). (Translation.) Tenders were called for supplying groceries for the camp at Laprairie in 1893. The following are the names of the tenderers and the amounts of their several tenders:—

—	Potatoes per pound.	Groceries per ration.
	Cents.	Cents.
A. Charlebois & Co.	1¼	3¾
H. Sylvestre & Son	1½	4
T. J. Boudreau	1⅝	4⅛
Demers & McGee	1⅝	4¼

Mr. MONET (Translation) asked. Whether tenders have been invited for furnishing groceries for the camp to be held at Laprairie during next summer; and if so, whether the contract for such groceries has been awarded? To whom has it been awarded? What are the names of the parties who tendered, and the amounts of the several tenders?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (for Mr. Dickey). (Translation.) Tenders were invited for furnishing groceries to the camp to be held at Laprairie during the summer of 1895. Following are the names of the parties who sent tenders and the amounts of their several tenders:—

—	Potatoes per pound.	Groceries per ration.
	Cents.	Cents.
Demers & McGee	1¼	3¼
H. Brossard	1	3½
H. Sylvestre & Son	1	3⅝

The contract for potatoes was awarded to Messrs. H. Sylvester & Son. The contract for groceries was awarded to Messrs. Demers & McGee.

THE FIELD BATTERY OF MONTREAL.

Mr. MONET (for Mr. Beausoleil) (Translation) asked. Will the Field Battery of Montreal drill this season? If so, when? If not, why not?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (for Mr. Dickey). (Translation.) The Field Battery of Montreal had their drill for the year 1894-95. Authority has not yet been given for the Battery to go through drill in 1895-96.

READING ROOM—FRENCH-CANADIAN JOURNALS.

Mr. MONET (for Mr. Bruneau) asked, 1. Whether the Government are aware that there are in the United States over a million French-Canadians? 2. What French-Canadian newspapers, published in the United States, are received in the reading room? 3. Have the Government never had complaints from French-speaking members on the ground that no French-Canadian journal,

published in the United States was received in the reading room? 4. Is it the intention of the Government to see that for the future French-Canadian papers from the United States shall be received in the reading room; and if not, why not?

Mr. FOSTER. With regard to the first question, the Government is not willing to tie itself down to so definite a point as that. We are willing to take the statistics as read. By rule 119, authority is given to the Clerk of the House to subscribe for newspapers published in the Dominion, and to such other papers, British and foreign, as he may, from time to time, be directed by the Speaker to subscribe for. The only paper printed in French, and published in the United States, which is on file in the reading room, is the "Courier des Etats-Unis." There has been no complaint made either to the Clerk of the House or the Speaker from French-speaking members on the ground that no French-Canadian journal published in the United States was received in the reading room.

SALE OF LAND TO H. S. FOSTER.

Mr. RIDER asked, 1. What was the date of the lease to H. S. Foster of the Government land consisting of over 135 acres, situated on the east side of the Richelieu River, in the County of Iberville, opposite Isle aux Noix? What was the term for which it ran, and the amount of annual rental payable under it? 2. Has any offer been made to purchase the property from the Government for $2,000, or any other sum in excess of $600? 3. Was a recommendation made to the Government at any time to sell this property at auction? 4. Does the Government know the value per acre of this property when it was sold to H. S. Foster in May, 1894? 5. Did the Government take any, and what steps, to obtain a full report of what the value of this property was in May, 1894?

Mr. DALY. In reply to the hon. gentleman I will say: 1. The lease to Mr. Foster was dated 1st July, 1888, and was for a period of five years from the first of that month. Like all other leases of the same kind, however, its provisions continued to be in force from year to year without the lease itself being expressly renewed, the department having continued to receive rental at the same rate until the purchase was finally closed. The rental was $25 per annum. The department had previously been paying $5 per month for the care of the property. 2. No offer was ever made to the Government to purchase the property for $2,000, and no offer of a larger sum than what was paid by Mr. Foster was ever made at any time except in January, 1875, when Mr. Alex. Dufresne offered $800 for it. In the period of over nineteen years which elapsed between 1875 and 1894 the land had been stripped of its timber, and the official valuation reduced from $1,000 to $600. 3. No recommendation was ever made to the Government at any time about selling this property at auction. 4. The officer in charge of the Ordnance and Admiralty lands of the Government valued the property at $600 in 1888, and held to the view that this was its value when it was sold to Mr. H. S. Foster in 1894. 5. This question has been fully answered in reply to question No. 4.

DREDGING AT COLE'S WHARF, BEDEQUE, P.E.I.

Mr. YEO asked, What amount was paid for dredging at Cole's Wharf, Bedeque, P.E.I., during the past winter? Who were employed? What was paid for mud-digger per day? What time per day, for men and for teams? What time was each man employed? How does the cost of dredging with mud-digger compare with similar work done by the steam dredge?

Mr. OUIMET. The following is the answer to the hon. gentleman's question: An amount of $201.87 was paid for dredging at Hurd's Point Wharf, in Bedeque Bay, P.E.I., during the past winter. The following were employed: John Ramsay, foreman; John Gardiner, working digger; Spurgeon Gardiner, labourer; Damois Perry and team, hauling mud; Curtis Lord and team, hauling mud; Reuben Robbles, working digger; Charles Lord and team, hauling mud; John Rose, labourer; Lewis Holland, hauling mud. The sum of $4 per day was paid for mud-diggers, including the services of the owners. The sum of $1 per day was paid to labourers and $2 per day for a man and team. John Ramsay was employed 13¼ days; John Gardiner, 10¼ days; Spurgeon Gardiner, 10½ days; Damois Perry, 12 days; Curtis Lord, 8½ days; Reuben Robbles, 9¾ days; Charles Lord, 9¼ days; John Rose, 8¾ days; Lewis Holland, 10 days. The cost of the work done by mud-diggers is much more expensive than the cost of dredging by a steam dredge, but the two cannot well be compared. Mud-diggers can only be employed in very shallow water where a steam dredge cannot work.

EMPLOYMENT OF GEORGE MOIR.

Mr. GRIEVE (for Mr. Macdonald, Huron) asked, Is George Moir, formerly of St. Mary's, Ont., now, or has he at any time been, in the employ of the Government? If so, when was he employed? For what length of time? What remuneration did he receive, and what was the character of his employment?

Mr. WALLACE. In reply to the hon. gentleman I would say: 1. George Moir is not now, but was in the employ of the Department of Customs. 2 and 3. He was employed from 1st June, 1893 to 28th February,

1895, viz.: at the Minnesota Transfer, St. Paul, Minn., for the month of June, 1893. At Chicago from 1st July, 1893, to 31st October, 1893. At Duluth during the month of November, 1893. At Winnipeg from 1st December, 1893, to 30th September, 1894. At Duluth during October and November, 1894. At St. Paul from 15th December, 1894, till 15th February, 1895. At Winnipeg, balance February, 1895,—since which time he has not been in the employment of the Department of Customs, or in the service of the Government. 4. He received a salary of $90 per month while at Winnipeg, and $3 per day while at points in the United States—salary paid in United States being refunded by railway companies—at Winnipeg he was acting as assistant to Inspector G. H. Young. At Chicago he was examining baggage sent in bond to Canada. At Duluth and St. Paul he was supervising the transhipment of bonded goods and grain in transit to Canada.

REV. FATHER PARADIS.

Mr. MONET asked, Whether the Government have given or promised to give a certain sum to Rev. Father Paradis, with a view to the colonization and repatriation of the Canadians of Michigan, U.S., at Vernon, in the district of Nipissing, Ont.? If so, to what special purposes were the moneys to be applied?

Mr. DALY. The sum of $200 has been paid to the Rev. Father Paradis, as a grant towards his personal expenses, incurred in the colonization and repatriation of Canadians from the state of Michigan, at or near Vernon, in the district of Nipissing, Ont. Father Paradis has travelled to and fro and has devoted much time and energy to this work, and he has neither received nor been promised any payment or reward other than this $200, so far as the Government is concerned. In addition to this, however, the department has deposited with the President of the Repatriation Society in Montreal, Mr. J. D. Rolland, the sum of $1,000 to aid Father Paradis' colony in its initial stage, subject to the condition that none of this money shall be used to pay for the transportation of the settlers or their effects, all being required to pay their own way into the country.

STEAMSHIP LINE BETWEEN CANADA, FRANCE AND BELGIUM.

Mr. LEPINE asked, How many tenders have the Government received for the establishment of a line of steamships between Canada, France and Belgium? What are the names of the parties tendering and the amounts of their several tenders?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that eight offers have been received: Two from Furness, Withy & Co. (Limited); one from the Hamburg-American Packet Company; two from the Colomba Belge Steamship Company; one from L. de la Barriere et al, as representing a Bordeaux syndicate; one from C. N. Armstrong, and one from Marsan & Marsan. Some of these were not within the terms, I think, of the advertisement for tenders. As a decision has not yet been come to on the matter, it is not considered best to give the amounts of the tenders at the present time.

SHEIK'S ISLAND DAMS.

Mr. LAURIER asked, 1. When is it expected that the contract for the building of the Sheik's Island dams will be completed? 2. What amounts has now been paid to the contractors? 3. Is any sum due to the contractors now? If so, what is the amount?

Mr. HAGGART. The two dams will be completed on the 1st September, 1895. The weir will be completed in 1896. The amount paid to the contractors up to the 20th June is $214,310, and the amount due is $2,705.

PAYMENT FOR PRE-EMPTION LOTS IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. LaRIVIERE moved for:

Return of all correspondence, petitions, memorials or other documents, relative to the claims of settlers in Manitoba and the Territories, having paid for their pre-emption lots, when others were allowed homesteading the same as a second homestead.

He said: In making this motion, Mr. Speaker, I beg to offer a few remarks. The former Lands Act allowed homesteaders at the same time that they took their homestead to take the next claim as a pre-emption; and, in most cases, especially in the early settlement of the province of Manitoba, settlers took 320 acres instead of 160—that is they took 160 acres as a homestead, and the adjoining quarter-section of 160 acres as a pre-emption for which they were to pay a fixed price according to the regulations. At first it was one dollar an acre, and later on it was increased to $2.50. Afterwards, by an alteration of the Lands Act, a second homestead was granted to those who had completed their duties on their first homestead. After securing their patent, they were allowed to take a second homestead; and in some cases they were even allowed to take as a homestead the pre-emption lot which they had formerly secured. At the same time some of those settlers who had taken homesteads under pre-emption were compelled to pay for that pre-emption; after performing their homestead duties for three years, they were compelled by law to pay for the pre-emption during the following year, otherwise those pre-emptions would be taken away from them, that is to say, they would be deprived not only of the right to pur-

chase, but at the same time they would lose the improvements that might have been made thereon. In most instances the settlers, not knowing that later on there would be an alteration in the Lands Act and that they might be able to secure the next lot as a homestead, paid for their pre-emption, and in many instances had to borrow money and give as security not only that pre-emption itself, but even the homestead for which they had performed homestead duties. Now, most of those who had neglected to pay, most of those who did not obey the call of the land office to pay for that pre-emption, were afterwards rewarded for their neglect by being allowed to homestead their pre-emption without any further cost. Now, the homesteaders who have performed their duties faithfully and who afterwards complied with the regulations of the office by paying for their pre-emption, are in a worse position to-day than those who have neglected to perform their duties. I understand that petitions have been forwarded to the Department of the Interior asking that these parties be put in the very same position as those who have had the privilege of homesteading their lands, that is to say, they wish either to be recouped by receiving a grant, or to be allowed the 160 acres for which they have petitioned. I am not going to suggest any manner by which their claim might be settled, but I think it is only fair that the petitions and the memorandum accompanying the same should be put before the House, so that we may be able to look into their case, and to accede to their request, if justice requires it.

Mr. DALY. There is no objection to the correspondence and papers which have been moved for being brought down, and they will be laid before the House at the earliest moment.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION OF LOCOMOTIVE BOILERS.

Mr. CASEY moved :

That it is expedient to provide for the inspection of locomotive boilers by Government officials in the same manner as is now provided in regard to marine and other boilers.

He said : The matter which I wish to bring before this House by this motion is doubtless new to many of us. My attention was called to the subject by a resolution which was passed at a recent session of the different brotherhoods of railway employees. I find that the men most directly interested in this question, the engineers, firemen and others employed about a train, are unanimous in believing that there is as good reason for subjecting locomotive boilers to Government inspection, as there is for enforcing a similar inspection upon marine boilers. In conversation with several of those gentlemen, they have convinced me of the force of their contention, and I think it proper to bring it before the House to enable the members to consider the question, and the Ministry to express their views upon it. It will be remembered that all marine boilers in use at present are subject to Government inspection, on account of the great risk to life and property involved by the danger of the explosion of such boilers. I will not at this moment go into the particulars of marine inspection ; they are probably quite familiar to the House, certainly to the Goverment. But I do urge that the number of lives and the amount of property depending upon the safe operation of a locomotive, are much larger than the number of lives and the amount of property depending upon the soundness of many marine boilers. Not only the boiler of every passenger steamer, but the boiler of every tug boat and small river craft must be inspected ; whereas, only a few lives, and a comparatively small amount of property, may depend upon the state of that boiler.

In the case of a passenger train, for instance. nearly everybody can see that not only the lives of the men employed about the engine, and of the other trainmen, but the lives of a large number of passengers, equal to the crew and passengers of many a steamer, depend upon the solidity and strength of the boiler of that locomotive. Not only all those on the engine are liable to be instantly killed by an explosion, but the passengers on the train behind are liable to be killed and mangled by the severe accident which would necessarily follow the explosion of the engine. Then it is not only by an explosion of the boiler that lives are lost ; lives are lost by the explosion of tubes, gauges, &c., in connection with the boiler, which should all be subject to the same inspection, of course, as the boiler itself.

I have here a copy of the "Locomotive Fireman's Magazine" of March last, giving details in regard to accidents of that kind. There is a list of accidents resulting in death to engineers and firemen, in which I find that one resulted from the blowing out of a plug, fifteen from boiler explosions, one from a bursted arch pipe, four from bursted gauge glass, three from tubes bursting. During the past year, on the railways of America, twenty-five deaths have been due to the explosion of locomotive boilers, or of some of the tubes, or gauges connected with the boilers. The article summarizes the result as follows : "The accidents, taken in the order of frequency, stand as follows : collisions, falling from engine, misplaced switches, boiler explosions, struck by obstruction, cattle on the track, runaway engine, and unknown." Those are the most frequent causes, and collisions are put down as the most fruitful source of railway disasters ; derailment and misplaced switches are a close second, while boiler ex-

plosions, land slides and cattle on the track are of about equal importance. It appears to me that the lives of the brave men in charge of locomotives are entitled to as much protection at our hands as are those of the men in charge of marine boilers. A slight obstruction on the track is liable to cause the death of the men on the locomotive, and a slight collision may have a like result. These are causes of accident against which we cannot effectually provide, but it is within our power to adopt measures whereby engineers and firemen can be protected, so far as mechanical skill can protect them, by instituting an honest inspection, and thus protecting them against sources of danger arising from boiler explosion.

I think the House will almost entirely agree with me that these men are entitled to that protection. When we add to the value of their lives the value of the property itself, and the lives of passengers who may be in the cars behind the engine, I think a sufficient prima facie case has been made out to enable me to ask the House to adopt this resolution. No doubt the Minister of Railways will have something to say in regard to it, and I will reserve any further remarks I have to offer.

Mr. HAGGART. As the House is aware, all locomotives belonging to Government railways are inspected and tested periodically; in fact, the most thorough inspection that is possible is made with respect to them. I believe all the other railways in Canada follow the same rule. The Grand Trunk Railway has inspectors who do nothing else than inspect locomotive boilers, and the same remark applies to the Canadian Pacific Railway. This inspection is made in the interest of the railway companies themselves; it is of the most thorough description, and is as efficient as any Government inspection could be made. Another question arises, as to whether this Parliament has jurisdiction to appoint inspection for locomotives in the different provinces. I understand the legislature of Quebec by recent enactment exempted all locomotives of railway companies in that province from inspection by Government officials as regards boilers. After making inquiries of the different railway companies, the department came to the conclusion from the replies made that the present inspection is of a most thorough kind in every way. As to the legal point, whether we have jurisdiction or not, I am not competent to judge: but in my opinion, that inspection should be left to be exercised by the provincial authorities, if necessary, and I see no reason at present from the information in the hands of the department why any legislation is required in the direction proposed by the hon. gentleman. Perhaps, under these circumstances, there being a doubt as to the jurisdiction, the hon. gentleman will withdraw his motion.

Mr. CASEY. The question of jurisdiction is no doubt an important one, and one worthy of full consideration. As to the necessity of Government inspection, I am inclined to think that the men in charge of the locomotives, and who have to bear the risk, are better judges than the railway companies or even the Minister of Railways. We have already had the experience to which I have called attention. Six locomotives have been blown up during the past two years in Canada, and on one occasion two men were killed on the engine. So I say the engineers and the firemen are the best judges as to the necessity of Government inspection. But as to whether we have jurisdiction or not, is a point which may be argued. For some reasons I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman insisting on the authority of the local legislatures. If his contention is correct in regards to the inspection of locomotive boilers, it will also stand in regard to some other matters concerning railways which I hope to bring before the House at a later period of the session, and on which I claim the jurisdiction of the province should supersede that of the Dominion. I shall be happy to quote his authority on that occassion when the opportunity arises. As the Government are evidently opposed to passing this resolution in its present shape, and base that opposition on the ground of doubt as to jurisdiction, I would be foolish to press the resolution, as it would necessarily be lost, and I therefore move, as suggested by the Minister of Railways, that the motion be withdrawn.

Motion withdrawn.

COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANIES, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. FLINT moved for:

Copies of all petitions and correspondence between the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, or any of its promoters or directors, and the Government in relation to the company's undertaking. Also, for copies of all correspondence between E. Franklin Clements, J. D. Rolston, Frederick Bard and other promoters of the South Shore Railway Company of Nova Scotia, or any of the directors of the said company, and the Government up to date of proceedings in the courts of Nova Scotia to wind up the said company. Also, copies of all petitions, agreements and correspondence between the said company and the Government, with reference to the obtaining of a charter for a new company, from the Dominion Parliament, and relating to the undertaking of the said company, or the undertaking of the company proposed to be incorporated.

He said: In asking for these papers I desire to make a brief explanation of the present situation of affairs as to the undertakings of these two companies, the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia and the South Shore Railway Company of Nova Scotia. I may premise, however, that, as there may

possibly arise a discussion later, upon application made to this Parliament for extension of its powers, and for placing the South Shore Railway within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, it is highly desirable that all this correspondence should be in hand in order that the discussion may be undertaken intelligently by those who are interested. There are two companies at the present time chartered by Act of the legislature of Nova Scotia with a view to undertaking railway constructions along the south shore of the province of Nova Scotia, beginning at the town of Yarmouth and proceeding westward to Shelburne and Lockeport. A charter was granted by the legislature of Nova Scotia in the session of 1892, for a company known as the South Shore Railway Company which is now making application here for an extension of its powers, and asking to come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament under the provisions of the British North America Act. That charter of date, the 30th April, 1892, gave power to build a railway from Yarmouth to Shelburne, and provided that unless the work was completed within four years from the passing of the Act, or, reasonable progress towards completion satisfactory to the Governor in Council made within two years, the Act should cease and determine. This company began operations in October, 1894, after the expiry of the two years stipulated, and the charter therefore became lapsed. I am aware, however, that at the present time there is pending a suit brought by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia to set aside this charter, and the contention is made, that although the company only began work after the expiration of two years, yet that as they had four years to complete the road to Shelburne, they are thereby protected. That is a matter which is still before the courts. This company began operations in October, 1894, and did some work. It was to be a standard gauge road. A large number of workmen were engaged from October to February when the company ceased operations. The payments to contractors, and to those who supplied food and material, and to the engineers, and to the labourers then stopped. Work was abandoned, and the contractors' plant was moved. Suits for large sums were entered against the company in the Supreme and county courts of Nova Scotia, judgments were obtained and executions issued to sell the available assets of the company which could be made liable to the judgment and execution creditors. About a week ago, I understand, the advertisement of sale was withdrawn owing to some kind of a compromise among the creditors, but the judgments exist against the company. Work has been abandoned so far as that company is concerned. The South Shore Company then, having been incorporated in April, 1892, and having done nothing upon the undertaking until the autumn of 1894, found that in the interval, owing to the very just demands of the people along the south shore for railway communication, another company was organized and obtained a charter during the session of the provincial legislature of 1893. This company is called the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, and it has obtained powers to construct a narrow gauge road, from Yarmouth to Shelburne and to Lockeport, the extension to Lockeport not being in the charter of the South Shore Company. It was thought by the promoters of this company, that the undertaking of a standard gauge road, would involve too large an outlay, and that a narrow gauge line might possibly be successful in attracting sufficient capital and in meeting the demands of the community for railway accommodation satisfactorily. They obtained a charter one year after the South Shore Company obtained their charter, and having organized in November, 1893, they commenced work on the 17th April, 1894. The narrow gauge company, or the Coast Railway Company, then had commenced practical operations in building their line towards Shelburne from Yarmouth. I expected to be able to have the last report of the provincial engineer showing the amount of work they had done up to date, but I have been unable to lay my hand upon it. However, up to the present time the Coast Railway Company have worked vigorously on the road, having secured a subsidy from the Government of Nova Scotia of $2,200 a mile. They also obtained free right of way, from the municipalities along the whole route. The town of Yarmouth, and the municipalities of Yarmouth, Argyle, Barrington and Shelburne gave this free right of way to the Coast Railway Company, thus showing the interest that the people as represented in those councils took in the undertaking of that company. They continued their work during the season of 1894 from the 17th April to some time in December, when, owing to the inclemency of the season, work was stopped, to be resumed again about the 1st of April of the present year, since which time operations have been continued to the present time. I am informed that they have graded and have about ready for the rails about twenty miles of the undertaking. All the stone work along this distance is done. There are two iron or steel bridges to be built, which are contracted for, and are to be delivered so that the company may have trains running over the greater portion of that distance before next winter. Now, the advocates and friends of the South Shore Railway pointed out that that undertaking would be more satisfactory and more in the interest of the public on account of its being a standard gauge; and a great many of the public, thinking that, as this road connected with the standard gauge road known as the Dominion Atlantic Railway, it would be of advantage, notwithstanding its increased cost and the increased

difficulty of procuring the necessary capital, to build it as a standard gauge road, the Coast Railway Company during the session of the provincial legislature of 1895 procured an amendment to their charter permitting them to construct a standard gauge road instead of a narrow gauge road : and negotiations were entered into with the provincial government, and I understand that a contract has been agreed upon between the provincial government and the Coast Railway Company providing that the road shall be a standard gauge road, and that to that end the necessary amendments shall be made in the company's contract with the Government. Consequently, there can be no conflict of opinion on this much controverted point. On the other hand, the advocates of the narrow gauge road pointed out that it would be sufficient to do all the work required of any railway on the south shore for the next quarter of a century. They also pointed out that the amount of capital required to construct it would be very much less than in the case of a standard gauge road, and that there would be greater probability of a reasonable return to the investors. But the financial supporters of the Coast Railway Company, feeling the pressure of the popular demand for a standard gauge road, have agreed to carry out the terms of the amended charter, and construct a standard gauge road in place of a narrow gauge road. Consequently, for the purposes of whatever discussion may arise as to the ability of these two companies to carry out their undertakings, that question is henceforth practically eliminated. Now, the South Shore Railway Company has a Bill before this Parliament asking for extended powers, and asking for the privilege of constructing a road from Shelburne to Lockeport, with power to continue its construction to Halifax. This of course makes the subject of all the greater importance to this House when it comes to be dealt with, because already there is a charter for a company to build a road from Shelburne to Halifax, and that company has made a contract with the Dominion Government for a subsidy, and also with the provincial government for a subsidy for the construction of that road. If this charter should be granted here, it will to a vary large degree interfere with the credit and opportunities of the Coast Railway Company and the Southern Railway Company which have already contracts with the provincial government.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman able to say what the outstanding contract with the Nova Scotia government provides—a standard gauge or a narrow gauge ?

Mr. FLINT. The present contract provides for a narrow gauge road ; but I am informed on the authority of the company that that contract is to be amended in the direction proposed by the company. They are to build a standard gauge road, and the local government, without perhaps entering into a binding contract at present, are preparing to enter into a contract for that purpose, and the contracts for the bridge and other works now going on are made on the basis of a standard gauge road. Of course, it is quite apparent that where it would require considerable argument with capitalists and railroad men to induce them to enter into an undertaking to build a 3-foot gauge road, it would require much more to induce them to undertake the construction of a standard gauge road. The greatest care should be taken by all governments and all parties concerned that as little opportunity for friction as possible is afforded ; and it is quite apparent that if the South Shore Company, after having completely broken down in this undertaking—a company which is to-day a bankrupt concern, which is before the courts of Nova Scotia under an application to wind up its affairs——

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). That is not so.

Mr. FLINT. I am speaking from information which I have had very recently. The company has been attacked in the courts of Nova Scotia on the ground that its charter is void ; and when a company of that character comes before this Parliament asking for power to extend its operations to such an extent as to require three or four times as much capital as the original undertaking required, in the face of the fact that all the towns and municipalities along the line of the rival undertaking have granted a free right of way, and that the provincial legislature has granted a subsidy and entered into a contract with the rival undertaking, this Parliament should hesitate long before involving these companies in a conflict which a resolution of this House to assist one of them would involve. I think it will be the duty of this Parliament, when these papers are brought down, and when the fuller information which will then be available is before the House, to look very carefully into the situation, and to see that by no Act of this Parliament shall the present prospects of the Coast Railway Company be interfered with. At the present time, notwithstanding the fact that they have no subsidy from the Dominion authorities, I think they are in process of completing the first twenty or thirty miles of their road. And this Parliament should hesitate before reviving the charter of a bankrupt concern, and giving it power to injure the credit or status of its rival. We all know that railway building in Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces—in fact in all the provinces of Canada—requires the utmost assistance from every possible source in order to achieve success. This undertaking required Dominion and provincial assistance : and

where the one company has proceeded with the work, met all its liabilities promptly, and is carrying out, to the fullest extent, all the requirements of its charter, this Parliament should hesitate before raising its hand in the slightest degree to injure the prospects of its complete success. We must all recognize the fact that we are not so particularly concerned in the success or failure of the individual investors in a company as we are in the securing of successful railway communication to the people. The people along the south shore of Nova Scotia have felt, ever since a railway policy was inaugurated by this Government, that they had a strong claim to its assistance. The local Parliament has certainly done its full share in holding out inducements to these various companies. The Dominion Government has also promised assistance upon the plan which they have pursued since the inauguration of its policy of subsidizing railway construction. Had the South Shore Railway Company been able to go on and complete their work, had they shown themselves possessed of the necessary financial strength, I believe they could have successfully appealed to the Dominion Government to use its best endeavours to prevent the waste of public money which would be involved by giving a subsidy to one road when another road, running almost identically through the same line of country, was subsidized by the provincial and local authorities. If this question be fully investigated, after the correspondence is before us, I believe it will be seen that the only proper course for this Parliament will be to allow these companies to fight the battle out between themselves, without any assistance from the Dominion Parliament whatever. They have both gone to the local legislature for incorporation, they have undertaken operations under the charters and powers given by the local legislature, and I believe they should be left with those powers to do the best they can to realize the expectations of their promoters and the people who are served by the railway. One matter I forgot to mention in connection with the Coast Railway Company is this: At the time the charter was granted that company, the South Shore Railway Company was, to all appearance, internal and external, a dead letter. The capitalists had not come forward, nothing was heard of the investors, and it was considered by the public, and all those interested in railway construction along the south shore that they had given up the undertaking. When the narrow gauge road was first advocated, before a charter was granted, friends of the undertaking, representing the interests of the people along the south shore of the counties of Yarmouth and Shelburne, interviewed a prominent gentleman connected with the Dominion Government. They received verbal assurances of friendliness and support from the Dominion Government, and I have it upon the best authority that the late premier expressed himself also very favourable to the scheme of completing the narrow gauge road under the impression then existing that it was impossible to raise the capital to build the more expensive standard gauge road. They went forward with the assurances of sympathy from the leading men of both Governments, and from people holding all sorts of political views. Since then a strong demand was pressed upon the attention of the company to build, if possible, a standard guage road, so as to avoid transhipment at Yarmouth; and, yielding to this pressure, the capitalists connected with the Coast Railway Company agreed to construct, and the local government agreed to facilitate the construction of a standard gauge road.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What evidence is there of the action of the local government of Nova Scotia with regard to the standard gauge?

Mr. FLINT. I would say frankly that the only evidence I have is the personal assurance to me of the authorities of the Coast Railway Company, given, apparently, in good faith. I have said that the Coast Railway Company stands in the position of a substantial company meeting its liabilities, carrying on its operations, and prepared to carry out its contract, having given bonds and substantial and ample security to the local government for the completion of the road to Lockeport within the time stipulated. We have the company in that position as contrasted with the South Shore Company which has abandoned its work, which has judgments entered out against it to a large sum, and which has all the difficulties to meet of reorganizing the company, securing new capital, and building the road without local subsidies or local assistance over identically almost the same route. Under these circumstances, when these papers are brought down—and I earnestly hope that they will be, at the earliest moment, in order that we may have them in our hands when discussing this subject—I think the House will find it would be very much to the advantage of the Dominion, and people along the south shore that this rivalry should cease, and that there should not be any action on the part of this Parliament to restore to the South Shore Railway Company its powers. In my humble opinion, those powers cannot be used to carry on that work, because it comes into direct opposition to other roads subsidized by the Dominion and local governments. The tendency of all this will be, perhaps, to paralyze the construction of a railway around the south shore of Nova Scotia, rather than promote it. I trust the Government will bring this correspondence down at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FORBES. Before this motion is carried, I would like to say a few words emphasizing what has been said by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). I would endeavour to urge upon the House and the Minister of Railways the absolute necessity of bringing down these papers as speedily as possible. I cannot see that any objection should be made by the department or any of its officers; and I beg to assure the hon. Minister and this House that when the papers are brought down, I think I can show the House and the Minister that they have been misled by the promoters of the South Shore Company in entering into the contract referred to in the motion before the House. The Coast road was incorporated, as the hon. member for Yarmouth has said, under a local charter. It began its operations bona fide, after having entered into a contract with the local government and filed security to the extent of $396,000, signed by wealthy capitalists who are able and willing to respond in money to carry out their contract to the full and to build the road from Yarmouth around the shore to the town of Lockeport. They had to connect at Shelburne River with the Southern Railroad, now known as the Hervey road, which will continue it to New Germany on the Nova Scotia Central in the county of Lunenburg, ultimately intending to connect with Halifax, thus giving complete connection between Yarmouth and Halifax, taking in all the towns along the south shore, accommodating immediately over 60,000 people, and passing through eight or ten principal villages on the south shore, which are now situated from twenty-eight to forty-five miles from a railway station. The object of the people along the south shore in upholding the scheme known as the Coast road and the Southern Railway or Hervey line, is to give railway connection and accommodation to the people in that part of Nova Scotia. At the time the Coast Railway entered upon its operations there was no other road in contemplation. A charter had been obtained for a road, but nothing had been done in it, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Yarmouth. It was considered as a lapsed charter. Capitalists did not look upon it with favour. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) himself denounced the scheme known as the South Shore road, and publicly advocated the Coast road, known as the narrow gauge road, and put himself on record in correspondence to the same effect. He interested himself to secure a subsidy from the Dominion Government to the Coast Railway, and the people identified with that scheme felt that they were certain to get the support of both the Dominion and local governments for this long desired road. Politics, it was supposed, would not be allowed to interfere to prevent or delay the construction of the line called the Coast road, to the construction of which line the five municipalities along the south shore had petitioned the Goverment for support, and had petitioned the representatives of their counties to support it and in every way had sought the assistance of both governments. The local government responded to the unanimous demand of the people, and agreed to enter into a contract with the Coast road, provided they would give solid assurance that the road should be undertaken and completed. The company gave that assurance: they entered into bonds for a large amount. That bond is enforceable both under the laws of Canada and under the laws of the United States.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is to build a narrow gauge line?

Mr. FORBES. That is to build a narrow gauge road, as the hon. Minister says. The hon. Minister knows that the people who are to be supplied with railway connection by this scheme are in favour of the narrow gauge line almost unanimously. The hon. member for Shelburne, on the 4th March, 1893, wrote a letter to one J. D. Rolston, to this effect:

Ottawa, 4th March, 1893.

J. D. Rolston, Esq.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of yours of to-day, informing me that Mr. Jacob Bingay and other wealthy men are interested in the South Shore Railway Company, and propose to build a narrow gauge railway from Yarmouth to Lockeport.

As you are aware, Mr. Atwood and others are already engaged in this enterprise.

Now, these are the promoters of the Coast road.

Delegates from the municipalities of Argyle, Barrington and Shelburne proceeded to the United States, where they met this gentleman and others interested in building a narrow gauge railroad between these points, and reported so favourably that the several municipalities have passed resolutions pledging themselves to pay for land damages for right of way and station grounds. I have also been requested by the municipalities in my county to do all possible to aid Mr. Atwood in his enterprise, and to secure, if possible, a subsidy for the road; and in compliance with their request, and in company with Mr. Atwood, I have waited on the Premier and Minister of Railways, and urged them for that assistance.

I presume the gentlemen you represent have very recently become interested in this matter, and probably sinc Mr. Atwood's action. I need not say that I trust that the existence of rival companies may not debar our long suffering county from obtaining railway privileges or delay that long desired benefit.

I am, as yet, entirely ignorant of your organization, and am, therefore, unable to form any opinion as to the probability of your proceeding with this work. As the representative of the county of Shelburne, I feel myself bound to consider any proposed application for a railway passing this, my county.

I am yours very truly,

N. W. WHITE.

Again, on March 7th, 1893, the same distinguished hon. gentleman wrote to Mr. Atwood, as follows:—

Ottawa, 7th March, 1893.

My dear Mr. Atwood.—Your favour with inclosure is at hand. I herewith inclose a copy of my application for subsidy and a copy of Sir John Thompson's reply.

This is the application from the hon. member to the Government for a subsidy to the Coast or narrow gauge railway:

I have not yet had a letter from the Minister of Railways, and having first received a copy of the specification, I intend waiting on him again with it. A day or two since I was interviewed by J. D. Rolston, of Yarmouth, who was here for one day, trying to get some support for the South Shore Railway Company. He handed me a letter, a copy of which I inclose, and, after some talk, wished a reply in writing. I send you a copy of it. Knowing he wanted to use it, if possible, to aid his scheme, I recapitulated what had been done by the municipalities and by you, so that if he showed the letter, he would at the same time have to make known the real position of your company, and I do not think he would get much consolation out of my answer.

I at once saw Sir John Thompson and explained to him the situation, told him who the incorporators were, the offer which had been made, and my firm belief that this was only an attempt to squeeze a larger sum out of you.

A number of delegations have been here from many constituencies asking for railway subsidies, but no new subsidies will be given this year to any one.

I am confident we shall get a subsidy next year.

Yours truly,

N. W. WHITE.

Now, a year after that, in July, 1894, the South Shore Railway gets a subsidy from the Dominion Government for $3,200 a mile for thirty-five miles, a total of $112,000. This would put the South Shore Railway, called the broad gauge line, in direct antagonism with the Coast Railway, or what was known as the narrow gauge, around the south shore of Nova Scotia. If anything would bolster up the road and help it go forward and do bona fide work, it would be for the Dominion Government to give it $3,200 a mile in competition with the Coast road, only getting $2,200 per mile from the local government. The South Shore Railway Company, with its bonus from the Dominion Government, undertook this work only as late as October, 1894, whereas the other company had been going on faithfully doing work since March, 1893, and had been expending money in construction work since April, 1894. From October, 1894, the South Shore Railway Company built ten miles. On 27th February, 1895, they approach the Dominion Government asking the Minister of Railways for a railway contract, and it is for a copy of that contract that the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth asks, and which motion I am now seconding. That contract and the papers in connection with it, will show, I think, that previous to 27th February, 1895, the Government, or certain of its members, were notified that the South Shore Railway Company were absolutely bankrupt, that they had failed to pay their workingmen their honest wages, that they had compromised with them for 33 cents in the dollar for their labour, that they had failed to pay their sub-contractors and engineers, that they had failed to pay for their supplies, and were about to petition the courts of Nova Scotia, under the Winding Up Act of the Dominion of Canada, to be put into liquidation. A few weeks after that a petition was presented through its solicitors in the city of Halifax asking the court to appoint an interim liquidator to take charge of the affairs of the South Shore Railway Company. They made affidavits declaring it to be insolvent, that they were unable to pay their bills, and desired their property to be divided equally among all its creditors. This was considered to be an abandonment of the scheme, and it was supposed by those who were interested in railway extension around that shore, that the South Shore Company had gone up. They discharged all their sub-contracts, carried away all their tools and donkey engines, and donkeys and nothing further was done. Now we find that application is being made to Parliament to revive that old charter, which, as the hon. member for Yarmouth so clearly pointed out, had expired, and I trust that when the documents, papers and contracts are brought down, that what I have said here will be amply and fully verified. Now, it would seem by the statement of the Minister of Justice that the old company, known as the Coast Railway Company, is still supposed to be a narrow gauge road. I am well aware that the Minister of Justice, when Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was most earnest in his solicitations on behalf of the South Shore Railway Company and he stated most particularly "I think I can safely say that the Federal Government will not aid a narrow gauge road. But I shall consult my colleagues." I am reading a letter from Sir C. H. Tupper dated in the spring of 1894. I think in this letter the hon. Minister puts himself on record as opposed to a narrow gauge road. Now, I submit to the hon. gentleman two propositions. If I can assure the Minister that the Coast Road Company are changing, with the consent of the local government, their plans and are preparing to construct a broad gauge line along that shore, will he withdraw his opposition to the Coast road, and will he withdraw the grant of a subsidy to the South Shore line and promise it to the Coast line? If the hon. gentleman will do that, I shall be able to give him the most positive assurance that the Coast road will change their narrow gauge to a gauge of 4 feet 8½ inches. If he will give me his assurance now, if he will shift his bonus to the Coast Road Company, as the people of that section of Nova Scotia desire, I will give him the most ample assurance that the Coast road will go on and build a broad gauge road. They have the legislative power, subject to the approval of the

Governor in Council, which consent is granted by publication in the "Royal Gazette." Further than that I want to ask the Minister and the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) as well, whether they are prepared to put themselves, in direct antagonism to 99 out of every 100 people on the south shore of Nova Scotia who favour a railroad of any kind and desire the matter to be kept out of politics? The people along the south shore are anxious to have railway connection through their towns and counties, and it will be a pity if this opportunity is lost to them because of opposition between the Federal Government and the local government, both of them promoting rival enterprises through those counties: and if the whole scheme is to be killed by reason of rival politics, then surely I say the people will throw the blame upon the hon. member for Shelburne, backed up, as I presume he is, by the Minister of Justice. I want the people in that section of the province to know, first of all, that the South Shore Railway Company is to-day asking the assistance of Parliament to bolster up a bankrupt company, which will result in running parallel two railways around the south shore of Nova Scotia. Further than that, the Southern, or Hervey Company, has two contracts to construct a road from Shelburne towards the city of Halifax; first of all, to the town of New Germany, and the south shore under a contract with the Federal Government, and with a subsidy from the Federal Government, will be a rival to the Hervey road and the Coast Railway. Surely the object of this Government is not to grant subsidies to rival railways through the same section of country, passing through the same towns and villages, and wasting the public money in such an extravagant manner by putting in operation enterprises without any bona fide object in view, knowing as they should know, that one railway is amply sufficient to satisfy the wants of that section, or any other portion of this country. Then, again, the papers when submitted to this House will, I am sure, prove to the Government that the object in getting a contract signed between the South Shore Company, known as the bankrupt company, and the Ottawa Government, was to help them get some blood money or repayment of their debts from the Coast road. I have it straight from those who are most intimately acquainted with the matter and know all the details of the several schemes, who say that the South Shore, backed up by Messrs. Bingay, Williamson, the member for Shelburne and others, are trying to fortify their position so as to make the best possible case with the Minister in the matter of getting a subsidy with the object in view. Now that is very plain. We know what that means. The South Shore Railway Company has to-day debts recorded in the way of judgments against it, of over $36,000, and these along with unrecorded judgments against it, amount to over $125,000. Their only object is to squeeze out of the rival companies, that known as the Coast Railway Company and the Hervey Railway, such a sum of money as will satisfy those several debts, or as will enable them to pay as great a percentage as possible, and perhaps pay an assessment for political purposes, in consideration for which payment they will perhaps abandon their enterprise and leave the Government free to allocate the subsidy to whatever company they might see fit, so long as the South Shore Company is out of the way and provided for. That appears to be the scheme which is on foot. I do not want the Government, nor the hon. member for Shelburne, nor any other member in this House, to lend themselves to this scheme. If the process of the Kilkenny cats is to be repeated, and these two rival companies are brought into operation, whereby they will rival one another, capitalists will be disgusted, and will be very averse to coming forward and prosecuting any similar enterprises in the future. Therefore if the Government, when the papers come down, assure themselves by the record that the people are unanimous, and if in any possible way they can so handle the subsidies that a broad gauge railway will be built by the South Shore or the Coast line or any other company, the Government will be perfectly right in doing so. But when I see the Coast Line Company, which has expended $150,000 of hard cash and has paid all its bills which are due, is to-day going on with the work of construction of a broad guage railroad to the extent of employing over 150 men with teams and other appliances along the proposed road, and the South Shore line is at the same time proposing to carry a line through the same towns and villages on to Lunenburg, and is endeavouring in every possible way to throw cold water on the enterprises known as the Coast Line Railway and the Hervey Road, I hold that the Government would not lend its support to what is known as the South Shore line. Further, I wish to say that I have positive assurances that the contract which the Coast line company were induced to sign with the South Shore line last February was practically a bogus contract. It was signed by the president of the South Shore line two weeks after he had resigned his position.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). That is not so.

Mr. FORBES. I am told that it is so.

Mr. HAGGART. Who told you so?

Mr. FORBES. The documents will show this when they are brought down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They show nothing of the kind.

Mr. FORBES. I am told the contract will not show the name of the ex-president of the South Shore Company. The name pur-

porting to be signed is not even that of the ex-president.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I have the contract here—a duplicate of it.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. gentleman has no right to speak as representing the Government. If so, the motion had better be altered so that the hon. member for Shelburne be requested to bring down the papers. I do not know that the hon. gentleman has the documents.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I have a duplicate.

Mr. FORBES. Almost all the hon. gentleman's actions in this railway matter have been in duplicate, and the contract may be the same. I only desire to urge on the House that care should be exercised in dealing with this matter, and if, as I honestly believe, there is a possibility that the Government have been imposed upon, it will be their duty to look into this matter with the utmost care. I have my information from those connected with the original contract and from parties who are well acquainted with the whole transaction. I again urge on the Minister of Railways that he should submit the documents to the House as speedily as possible. Within the next two days a Bill will be brought before the House upon which light will be thrown by these documents, and they will be of interest.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), who made this motion stated that this matter would eventually come before the House when the Bill for the incorporation of the South Shore Railway came up for its third reading, and, I think, a great deal of discussion might have been spared till that time. However, as a number of statements have been made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), and the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes), who have attempted to give a history of these two roads, it may not be out of place for me to correct some of the statements they have made and give some additional ones which will throw light on the matter. It is a fact that the South Shore Company was first incorporated. It obtained a charter from the local legislature in 1892. It is also a fact that for some months, at all events, nothing was done under that charter. The gentlemen who obtained it were not financial men, to say the least of it, they were not able to build a road, they were not men of very much influence, and consequently the people in the counties of Yarmouth and Shelburne, who were extremely anxious to secure railway accommodation—who live 70 odd miles from a railway station, and in order to reach it have to travel all night on a stage coach, and are then 100 miles further away from the point towards which they generally travel than they were before they left—were impatient, and believing those gentlemen who were incorporators of the company were not likely to build the road, had very little faith in it. About that time an engineer by the name of Mansfield, and Mr. Atwood, of Philadelphia, and the subsequent president of the road, Mr. Robertson, came through the country and professed their ability to build a narrow gauge road, not of three feet, but a narrow gauge two feet in width. They represented to the municipal councils and to the people that that kind of road would be very much better for them, that it would cost less, that they would be able to run trains two or three times a day instead of once a day, and so anxious were the people to secure a railway that we supported even the two-foot narrow gauge road they desired to build. Mr. Atwood came to Ottawa, and subsequently, as the hon. member for Queen's stated—and he read my letter—I urged on the Government the granting of a subsidy for a two-foot narrow gauge line, which we considered better than a stage coach. Mr. Atwood professed at that time to have all Philadelphia behind him to build the road. It was to be built immediately; whether he got a subsidy or not he would commence work at once. But nothing was done. After a while those gentlemen quarrelled among themselves. Mr. Mansfield came to Shelburne, and he handed over the correspondence which had taken place between himself, Mr. Atwood and Mr. Robertson. I have a letter here from Mr. Robertson, which he wrote to Mr. Mansfield, dated Barrington, 3rd August, 1893. It is as follows:—

Barrington, 3rd August, 1893.

Dear Mr. Mansfield,—I was glad to get your letter this morning. I hope Mr. A. can arrange business so as to come to Nova Scotia this month. I see I am helpless, I am out of it altogether, not even an incorporator dependent upon him and his associates. I have got everything so far, and could get the extra subsidy from Ottawa if Coast Line Company was organized. Delays have weakened our position. In the meantime Hervey and his engineer have last week been in Shelburne and are to make a colourable beginning at New Germany to hold that charter. All during the summer I have urged Mr. Atwood to get organized by securing $55,000 subscription to stock and payment of 25 per cent on that, namely, $13,750 in cash. We could then have made contracts with the municipalities and local government, and have secured the charter and whole thing against all comers. Had I have taken Yarmouth men in last winter as incorporators, I would have been all right. I could have gone to them and got subscriptions; it is too late now. I wanted, hoped and believed, that Mr. A. could furnish cash to organize, and with construction company we could have made some money, and it did look well. I have spent, as you know, considerable cash and sacrificed everything for this, and now I am on my back, prestige weakened and helpless, unless he can come to time this month. I am afraid he can't get necessary cash. He has made one or two suggestions to me about organization which will not do. It must be genuine, not colourable, to secure confidence here, and I

have told him so. From his letters I cannot get encouragement I am looking for, and I hardly know how to move. Your letter this morning gives me a little hope. I await his return to Philadelphia from Maine, and I shall write him plainly, that something must be done at once to save our enterprise. I have at least half a dozen letters here awaiting his arrival. Once he said to me, he wanted to see the road go, and asked what subscription I could receive in Nova Scotia, and to make it a success he was willing to give his entire time for nothing to make an enterprise successful. All these things make me think he cannot succeed as he wishes. It would be utterly useless, he failing, for me to attempt to solicit stock in Nova Scotia.

Supposing, now, he should say he can't get subscriptions to organize and begin, and I ask him what he will take for charter, prospectus, printing, &c., that has been done, and get assignment or agreement for assignment to me, do you think we can get started in Boston and you and I take hold of it and work it, having the road built for company at actual cost, we being content with positions and payment for our time and trouble? I believe you and myself could work it all right. I know there is lots of go in myself, and I do want to see it go ahead, and if I can only inspire capitalists with some confidence in me, added to your reputation, we can yet secure it. We want $13,000 to organize immediately, and after that with any backing we can get there all right.

Now, this is a matter that requires prompt action, if anything can be done by you. Next week I will certainly hear from him one way or other, and my letters to him will show him what must be done, and bring matters to a head. Can't you go to Boston, consult with your friends and advise me how to act if he fails? I will at once ask his figures and get proxies from directors named in charter, and come to Boston and meet you and your friends. I can make things go this end all right, if I am only backed up financially; but I have now nothing of my own to work with. Once we get started, we can work it through all right. You have a prospectus to work with, and we can underwrite sufficient bonds to make a beginning this year.

I see now where mistakes have been made. Of course, if Mr. A. should come to time, I feel there is more money for both of us on the lines he has laid down; but the enterprise must not fail if possible. A good six months has been lost, but I propose now to take the thing up vigourously on the lines of this letter, if I can do so, and Mr. A. will listen to transfer of charter. His failure to raise the money now defeats present charter, as now situated, as I must inform him I shall have to withdraw and take another position of entirely different nature, in order to support my family. Without my assistance, I don't believe he could get any extension of charter next year from the Assembly, nor do I believe present rights of way would be confirmed again to us, unless good financial standing of company was shown.

Write me fully about this letter, and tell me what I can depend upon if this move has to be made.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) THOS. ROBERTSON.

Now, I have got another letter of about the same character, dated 10th August, 1893, another dated August 17th of the same character, another one dated August 24th, and another one dated August 25th, but I do not think I need inflict them upon the House. Well, Sir, it is perfectly plain from these letters that there was no financial backing whatever for the two-foot narrow gauge road, to be built by the Coast Railway Company. You can well understand that when these letters got into the hands of those who were, at all events, competent to consider them, that support was withdrawn from that company. Now, it is true they got some rights of way from the municipalities in the meantime, but these rights of way are not such as have been stated by the hon. gentlemen (Mr. Forbes and Mr. Flint). They are a little in error about that. In the first place, the municipality of Yarmouth gave a free right of way. The municipality of Argyle did not give a free right of way, but it did this: It gave a subsidy of $5,000 towards the payment for the right of way through the township of Argyle, provided the road was completed to Lockeport. The municipality of Barrington gave a free right of way, but they attached the condition to it, that the company were to construct and operate a steam ferry, between Barrington and Cape Sable Island. Therefore, even these rights of way are considerably trammelled, and are not just as have been represented to the House. These letters are dated up to September, 1893, and as it has been suggested to me it would be better to read them, and as they come from the president of the narrow gauge road, I shall do so. Here is another letter, dated 10th August, 1893:

Barrington, 10th August, 1893.

Dear Mr. Mansfield,—I have no spare copy of prospectus to send you, but have written for one which gives you charter and considerable necessary information. We have $1,500 per mile subsidy from local government.

I may say that in the meantime an application was made to the local government, and the local government, or Mr. Fielding the Provincial Secretary, wrote an evasive letter. Perhaps I should not say an evasive letter, but I will say, a letter to which a great many conditions were attached, promising, under certain circumstances and conditions, that he would give them a subsidy of $1,500 per mile for this two-foot narrow gauge road. It is that to which Mr. Robertson alludes here. He continues:

--and I am certain of $1,500 from general or Dominion Government; so you can say we have $3,000 subsidy per mile. We have entire right of way for roadbed, stations, &c., the whole 50 miles. I have no word from Mr. Atwood yet, as he has not returned from Maine. What do these sporting camps consist of, and what do you think they represent financially? I do hope that Mr. A. will get along and that we shall have some good news soon. We must not get discouraged, but prepare for the worst, and get a sheet anchor to windward. Our only plan, if he fails, is to buy him out and organize a company. What do you honestly consider are the prospects for this? I will keep you posted. Write often and fully

what you think our chances of success would be on this new line. In confidence.

I remain yours faithfully.
(Signed) THOS. ROBERTSON.

Mr. Atwood had some sporting camps. I believe, in the backwoods of Maine, and that is what was referred to in the letter. Here is another letter, dated 17th August, 1893:

Barrington, 17th August, 1893.

Dear Mr. Mansfield,—I wish you would give me a short report, such as you gave Mr. A. after you went over road, as to estimate cost of building the 91 miles, Y. to Lockeport (2 feet gauge). I want something to work on. You can give me separate report, dated about time you made your examination last February. I want to be prepared to interest local capital, and make same so that it will be attractive and yet reliable. I think you know what I want. I may see you in a few days.

Yours truly,
(Signed) THOS. ROBERTSON.

Please send this, if possible, by return mail.

Here is still another letter, dated 24th August, 1893:

Barrington Passage.
Shelburne County, 24th Aug., 1893.

Dear Mr. Mansfield,—I received yours of 19th August this morning. I cannot come to see you at date you fix, for I am not prepared. My last letters from Atwood are dated Farmington, 25th July and 1st August, and from the Camps, 12th August. In the latter he said he would return to Philadelphia within a few days. Since 20th July he has not read any of my letters, as all have been sent to Philadelphia, and await his arrival there. Since 20th July, as occasion required, I have advised him upon such points of information as I thought necessary to success of enterprise, and in perfect good faith have done my share to secure success. I have also frankly stated my personal position and what I deemed it was necessary to do to retain our charter and rights of way, and have asked him to say to me positively, prospects of organization, &c., in his hands, because I cannot wait longer and must do something else, because I do not feel that I could successfully fight the whole question again before the legislature and municipal councils. And it is then for me to give up the proposed enterprise and lose what I have put into it in time and money, or to ask Mr. A. upon what terms he will transfer charter and its present privileges to me. If this can be secured so that I can use it, there are two courses open to us, and we must close the one will succeed. The first, to try and get capitalists in Boston or elsewhere to take place of Atwood and associates and work it out on that plan; or, second, for you and myself to attempt to secure the necessary local stock in this county and go ahead as a local enterprise. Now, before I come to see you I want your advice as to which plan to adopt. If the latter, I must know something of what I can do before I approach Atwood. I can easily interview a few men in Yarmouth and along the line, and obtain an idea of what chances I would have to obtain 550 $100 shares, which is necessary to have before we can organize. To do this latter thing I wanted to know from you what your estimate of cost of road per mile, fully equipped, would be, if built by a company for actual cost.

I know no one would have secured as much as I have for this enterprise, and to think that I placed so much confidence in Atwood, as it is all in his hands and I have not a word to say. My first intimation came from you, when we met last spring, and I have fought against suspicions in the hope that all would yet be well with Mr. A., but the summer is gone, my time has been frittered away, my ready money spent, and I have nothing whatever to show for it. Write me what course you advise; give me your estimate cost per mile, fully equipped. I shall have heard from Atwood, and I can then spend two days in Yarmouth and come to Boston; for, when I come, shall go and see Mr. A. personally, and I would not stop in Boston longer than to see you, going for the afternoon. If a change has to be made, it must be done quickly, and I will not wait to secure terms for transfer of charter by letter, but will go to him in person. A few moments' conversation with him will settle terms of transfer, if possible, and I can then return to Boston with something to talk on, and before 15th September can, I believe, have my company going with local capital. You can have 10 miles located and under contract pretty soon after that, and then we will hold the fort.

With a local company I believe I can get $4,000 per mile subsidy, instead of $3,000, but, of course, I am not certain of that. If we could have $4,000 and all stock subscribed, which would give us another $1,000, we could sell $3,000 per mile of bonds without going out of Nova Scotia. Write me fully, and if I leave for Boston before letter can reach you, will telegraph.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) THOS. ROBERTSON.

Barrington, 25th August, 1893.

Dear Mr. Mansfield,—I have yours of 22nd (this morning). Atwood has not written or arranged for a meeting because of his absence in northern Maine. From your letter of this date I judge your idea to be that other parties are to be secured in Boston to place in charter of Atwood and his associates, and not to solicit local capitalists. If the first is your idea, why I have no particular estimate of cost per mile, except to satisfy my own curiosity, for I have never learned the amount from either A. or yourself. As I wrote you fully before this week, I have nothing to work up yet, as, placing thorough confidence in A.'s representations, neither any name or any of my friends is in the charter. Everything is in A.'s hands. I have asked him to tell me if I can expect organization this season, plainly stating my personal position and difficulties I saw in the way of success in securing continuance of subsidy, right of way, &c., &c., already secured by me, if we had to go over the fight again next winter. He wrote me last 12th August, from northern Maine, and I have no knowledge that he has yet returned to Philadelphia, where at least a dozen letters from me are awaiting reply, all written since 18th July. I have told him plainly what I have sacrificed for the enterprise, and, in justice to me, I want him to say one thing or other definitely, so that I can go at my old business of insurance to earn a living for my family. Now, can I come and talk to you and other parties before I get that reply from him? If, say, nothing can be done this year by him, then I propose to at once go to Philadelphia and find out upon what terms I can get charter transferred to me, so that I can try through you to float it elsewhere. I cannot understand his long visit to Maine. Candidly, I believe he is waiting there in the hopes something will turn up to help him out when he comes back to Philadelphia, but such a course is not fair to myself. Suppose I should come and see you at once, before I know where I

stand, we might discuss a plan; but, as we could not handle charter, we could not approach any one else about it. For the past fortnight I have been almost tempted to drop the whole matter, go back to my old business and pocket my loss of time and money. Sargent, with whom I consult, says, hold on, and your letters give me hope. I have decided now to see Atwood in Philadelphia as soon as I know or can find out he has returned there, and learn about things for myself, and, if I can get control of charter, to secure it. I will do anything in reason to carry out the project, but, as I have told you, I am a poor man myself and have paid out my ready cash during the past year. I have perfect confidence in you, and if you say (if charter can be controlled by us), that we can get started, I will do all in my power to get ahead with it. I propose to lay the whole matter before Father Sullivan, and await an immediate reply to this and previous letter, which I hope to receive Thursday morning next, letter leaving Boston by Tuesday boat. At present it is my hope to sail from Yarmouth next Saturday night, if I learn Atwood is in Philadelphia before that date. Keep writing to me, but if I leave, will telegraph you, so that we can see each other in Boston. If I can make arrangements with him, shall return at once to Boston and remain there and Greenfield until we secure something with which you and I can go back to Nova Scotia. I do pray that light may arise in this darkness to bring us success. You speak of hearing from Hemeon. Be careful, as he is no friend to me. Will explain when we meet.

Your friend,
THOS. ROBERTSON.

Barrington, 31st August, 1893.

Dear Mr. Mansfield,—Your letter to hand this morning. It is unnecessary to say anything more. I have lost confidence in A. He wrote me last Saturday; letter this morning; nothing new; same old story. I have made a proposition to him to secure control of charter, and have asked him to wire me Monday a date and place of meeting. What I want to know, if it is possible to secure in Boston other parties to take place of Atwood and his associates? I have an offer in this province of funds to go ahead, but I would be in a better position if capital and funds were obtained out of this province. What is done, however, must be done quickly, as the season is nearly gone and Clements is moving with some few parties to get in the swim. As soon as I hear from A., in reply to my proposition made to-day, shall see you, but can't you hold out something to build on? See Manning and Hancock, and do best you can so as to be prepared if we need it. I may write again to-morrow or Saturday. Atwood promised to write me Monday something to be depended upon. Have you heard from him? Saw S. Tuesday; he is blue, but ready to make another attempt to warm the project into life. I will certainly know what I can do with charter next week.

Yours in haste,
THOS. ROBERTSON.

Barrington, 4th September, 1893.

Dear Mr. M.,—I have a letter from Mr. A. this morning, but same old story. He receives one from me this morning in which I tell him, that if he can't do anything, I can, and asking him upon what terms I can control the charter. To that I shall have some reply in a few days, and will advise you. If I get in a position to control charter, shall see you at once, of which I shall advise you by telegraph. Everything hangs on a thread now—simply, what will A. do under the circumstances? If he will not give me the charter, everything drops to the ground, and I withdraw from it. That is the position of affairs. I will lose my time and money and all of us be fooled.

I hope, however, for a different ending of this matter. A few days will decide it.

Yours faithfully,
THOS. ROBERTSON.

As I said before, the reading of these letters made it quite evident that no financial backing, to say the least of it, was behind the Coast Railway Company at that time. That brings us to September, 1893. In the meantime, the South Shore Railway Company fell into the hands of capitalists in New York who were men of financial position and standing, and they commenced in the fall of 1893 to make surveys. About the same time the Coast Railway Company put a small force in the field. The South Shore Company had a very large force of engineers in the field.

Mr. FORBES. That is not true.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). The hon. gentlemen need not deny it; I know what I am talking about. The South Shore Company had one set of engineers making a preliminary survey, and another set of engineers following them and making a location survey; while the narrow gauge people had but a small force in the field. The South Shore Company, after having had location surveys made of twenty miles of their road, sent their plans to Halifax, in order that they might be confirmed by the provincial engineer and the Government. The Coast Railway Company got ahead of them, however, and three days before the South Shore Company filed their surveys for the twenty miles, the Coast Railway Company filed their surveys for seven miles. The local government and the provincial engineer confirmed the seven miles for the narrow gauge company, and refused to confirm the first ten miles of the South Shore, but they did confirm the second ten miles of the South Shore. So that things stood in this way, that the local government had confirmed the first seven miles for the Coast Railway Company, and for the second ten miles they approved of the plans for the South Shore Railway Company. After this, some work was done. The Coast Railway Company commenced work in May, 1894, a short time before the South Shore Railway Company, and the South Shore Railway Company began in the fall of 1894. The Coast Railway Company began with a small force which they increased during the summer, and the South Shore Railway Company began with a very large force in the fall of 1894. Every obstacle, apparently, was thrown in the way of the South Shore Railway Company. They purchased and

paid for a very large part of the land through which they ran their road.

Mr. FORBES. That is not true.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I have had the deeds in my possession, and know what I state to be the facts.

Mr. FORBES. They have not spent $200 for right of way.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I say that they purchased and paid for a very large portion of the land through which they ran, and the road near the town of Yarmouth they were unable to obtain, because there was a dispute regarding the value of the property; and inasmuch as the third arbitrator had not been appointed by the local government, and inasmuch as the local government declined, for some reason or other, to appoint him, the consequence was the land could not be appraised. That is the reason why the portion of the railway near the town of Yarmouth has not been paid for. Both of these roads have built about an equally number of miles. It has been stated here that the Coast Railway Company have built twenty-five miles, but if you read the provincial engineer's report you will see that, at all events, up to January last they had built about an equal quantity, some fifteen or sixteen miles, and that the provincial engineer condemned very strongly a portion of the road constructed by the Coast Railway Company as not being up to the mark. Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken of the South Shore Company as a bankrupt concern, which had actually gone into insolvency, and against which there are judgments still standing, and for the winding up of which there are proceedings now pending in court. That is not quite true. It is a fact that Alexander, Bergin, and Farrar, who were associated with the road, came to grief. The company itself did not, but these individuals who were associated with the company, and who were putting up a certain amount of money to aid in constructing the road, came to grief; and when that happened, parties in Yarmouth, and elsewhere, principally Yarmouth, not knowing what effect the failure of these individuals would have on the road, took action, and obtained judgments against the South Shore Railway Company, and recorded those judgments. The last recorded was one obtained by a Mr. Murphy, engineer, for the sum of $400. That was the only one unsettled.

Mr. FLINT. Was there not a judgment for about $29,000 recorded against the company in favour of the contractors?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I will explain all that in a moment. I said that in Yarmouth some persons had brought actions against the company; but these very people have investigated and reorganized the Company. Strang & Lee was one of the very firms who are now organizing the company.

Mr. FORBES. They put that debt into stock.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). If they did, it represents work done on the road.

Mr. FORBES. They compromised at 36 cents in the dollar.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I say that these people have gone into the company. They have reconstructed the company, and it is to-day in a better position than ever. I will give the names of these people. They are: D. H. Andrews, of Boston, whose reference is Shawmut National Bank; W. B. Strang, whose reference is National Bank of New York; Grosvenor H. Hubbert and M. B. Wheeler, reference, National Bank; J. D. Williamson and associates, Hanover National Bank. I can give you a dozen of references, but probably if I were to give you references known in the city of Ottawa, that would be even more satisfactory. Therefore, I will give you Mr. Magee, president of the Bank of Ottawa, and the general manager of the Bank of Ottawa; Mr. E. S. Clouston, manager of the Bank of Montreal; Drexel, Morgan & Co., and J. Edward Simons, president of Fourth National Bank, of New York.

Mr. FORBES. What are those certificates?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I am giving you references of the stability and financial standing of the men engaged in the enterprise at present.

Mr. FORBES. Who are the men?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I have read you the names, and I give you the references. As I have said, these judgments are all arranged, they were transferred into the hands of D. H. Andrews, and have been arranged in this way. These people have taken stock in the road, that debt represents actual work done on the road, and the gentleman who issued executions at the suit of these people, the other day, and advertised them in the Yarmouth "Herald," so that these advertisements would reach here at a very opportune time, had no authority for issuing the executions.

Mr. FORBES. Who?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Look at the Yarmouth "Herald." His costs were paid, and he had no control over those judgments with one exception, and that was the judgment obtained by Mr. Murphy, which has since been paid. What the object was in issuing executions on these judgments without the authority of the judgment's creditors, and in putting the advertisement in the Yarmouth "Herald" only a few days ago, so

that it would reach here at an opportune time—what the object was I am not going to say, but those are the facts.

Mr. FLINT. Is it not a fact that the Italian navvies were paid off at 33 cents in the dollar?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I know that they were paid and settled and satisfied. I do not know what they were paid. I know there could be very little coming to them, because they received their board, and everything of that kind while they were there. So that the South Shore Railway Company, I think, hon. gentlemen will conclude, is in a very different position from that represented by the two gentlemen who last addressed the House. It has been said that proceedings have been taken in this course to wind up the concern. That is the fact: Mr. Farrer commenced proceedings in the court at a time of panic, when he saw these judgments entered up, and commenced proceedings for the winding up of the concern. But he has withdrawn his proceedings, and there are no proceedings of that kind going on just now. These things have all been settled, and satisfactorily settled. Now, let us turn our attention to the narrow gauge or coast railway. In the Coast Railway Company, they have spent some money upon the road. I believe it is a fact that they have paid their workmen up to the present day. I do not desire to say anything that is not exactly correct with regard to them or to anybody else. But, so far as I have been able to ascertain they have never financed their road; they have not made permanent arrangements for the building of the road. It is true, they obtained a contract and a subsidy from the local government, but they obtained that contract a very considerable time after the subsidy was granted by this House to the South Shore Railway. Now, I have copies of Mr. Fielding's letters, and I will read them both. From this we can get the dates for comparison:

Halifax, N.S., 4th February, 1893.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of the letter of this date signed by Mr. George E. Mansfield and yourself, on behalf of a company to be incorporated, asking aid from the provincial government for the construction of a two-feet narrow gauge railway from Yarmouth to Lockeport, according to specifications attached to the application.

In reply, I have to say that the representations made by you, Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Thomas Robertson, when you waited on the Government, made a very favourable impression. There is a disposition on the part of the Government to grant a subsidy to the proposed road. I must point out to you, however, that, while narrow gauge railways may not be altogether new, they have never been introduced into our province. Your proposal, therefore, contemplates a departure from the old-established custom of our Government in railway matters. Before committing the province to the endorsement of your scheme, it will be necessary for us to make some further inquiries. If the result of these inquiries confirms the statements made by you respecting the utility and safety of the narrow-gauge road, our Government will be prepared to assist your company in obtaining from the legislature a charter on the usual terms and conditions of railway charters, and to grant for the line of railway from Yarmouth to Lockeport a subsidy of one thousand five hundred dollars ($1,500) per mile, payable on the completion of 30-mile sections, as proposed by you, such subsidy, however, not to exceed one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars ($135,000). The subsidy granted will, of course, be in all things not herein stated subject to the laws of the province of Nova Scotia.

Yours faithfully,

W. S. FIELDING,
Provincial Secretary.

Leonard Atwood, Esq.,
122 Boellit Building,
Philadelphia.

Now, it was to that letter that he referred when he said he had a subsidy of $1,500 a mile. Now, here is a second letter:

Halifax, 14th February, 1894.

The local election came on on 15th February.

Mr. CAMERON. On the 15th March.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Yes.

Halifax, 14th February, 1894.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 13th instant respecting your company's railway project.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. To whom is this letter addressed?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). It is written by Mr. Fielding to Mr. Thomas Robertson.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who was he?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). He was the local candidate for Shelburne.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Strange coincidence.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne):

If your company are prepared to promptly produce satisfactory evidence of their proper organization and their financial resources for carrying out their enterprise, our Government will be prepared to advise the granting of a subsidy for a three-foot gauge railway from Yarmouth to Lockeport, the distance not to exceed ninety miles, for a subsidy of two thousand two hundred dollars ($2,200) per mile.

We shall, however, impose the same condition as has been stipulated for in other railway contracts of recent date, viz.:

That the company shall not be entitled to claim payment of any subsidy until they have fully completed and equipped the whole line and put it into operation.

That was changed afterwards:

The work to be commenced immediately after the execution of the contract, and to be continuously prosecuted, and to be completed on or before the first day of May, 1896.

A satisfactory bond to be given in a sum equal to twice the amount of the subsidy.

Specifications to be subject to the approval of the provincial engineer.

This letter is not to be regarded as a standing offer to your company. Unless your company are prepared to avail themselves of its terms immediately and enter into a contract to the satisfaction of the Government, this letter must be considered as cancelled.

Yours faithfully,
W. S. FIELDING,
Provincial Secretary.

To Thos. Robertson, Esq.,
President,
The Coast Railway Co. of Nova Scotia.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was the result of the election?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). This letter was used in the canvass.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who was elected?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Mr. Robertson was elected. The standing offer was withdrawn, and another condition was put in the contract. The contract was entered into long after the subsidy had been granted here to the South Shore Railway Company. It was provided that the Coast Railway Company must build the first ten miles and spend $50,000 or $60,000 on the next ten miles before they could get the subsidy for the first, and the condition that they must build to Lockeport dropped. When they entered into that contract with the local government they undertook to build a narrow gauge road, and a bond was given by parties in Philadelphia under the penalty mentioned by one of the hon. gentlemen who spoke to build the road. What that amounts to I do not know. The penalty most certainly could not be recovered, and what damages could be recovered in case the road was not built. I leave the gentlemen who are interested in these narrow gauge railways to determine. Now, as I said before, both of these railway companies have graded some fifteen miles of road side by side. The South Shore road is broad gauge, and the provincial engineer in his report said that the road as built by the South Shore Company is an admirable one and he commends it very highly indeed. There can be no doubt that the best outcome of these troubles would be some amalgamation of these two roads. And I may say that offers have been made to that end. And I say here, and I have the documents here to prove what I say, that the persons who were manipulating the affairs of the South Shore Railway Company and the two gentlemen who are putting up the money for the Coast Railway Company actually came to an arrangement by which the Coast Railway Company agreed to sell out. And if you doubt what I say, I will read the letter. I am not going to read all these. I have here the letter of Mr. Alexander who was the chairman of the South Shore Railway Company.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne).

Mr. FLINT. He went into insolvency. He was one of those millionaires.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He was not worth a million.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I would like to call attention to the date of the letter, 8th December. Now, that is the very time when the Coast Railway Company left off work. They assign now as the reason for leaving off work last winter, that the weather prevented them from carrying it on. But, Mr. Wheaton, the engineer of that road, did not say that in his report to the provincial engineer. This is what the provincial engineer says:

Mr. Wheaton also gave a statement of works which he says will be proceeded with during the winter, but this we cannot deal with at present.

So that they evidently intended to work during the winter; and I can say besides that the newspapers of both Shelburne and Yarmouth contained advertisements asking for tenders for ties for the whole road from Yarmouth to Lockeport, although a great portion of it had never been surveyed. They were also calling for tenders for fencing the whole road. But the work was stopped about the 8th December, 1894, the date of this letter, which I will read:

To Geo. A. Fletcher, Esq.,
Care Mitchell, Fletcher & Co.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

I am informed by Mr. Williamson that a proposition has been made you for us for our purchase of all rights and properties of your Nova Scotia railway and construction company, including Halifax assistance, as heretofore discussed, on the following terms, namely, we to repay you expenditures as only verified, deliver you $50,000 bonds and 400 shares, par value $100, stock South Shore Railway Company, as capitalization $750,000. Stock to be trusteed for three years, and we take care of Thomas Robertson for a small amount, and that you have accepted same. This proposition, if so accepted, we now confirm. Wire us to-day your acknowledgment of receipt of this telegram and confirm your acceptance.

H. E. ALEXANDER,
Chairman, South Shore Railway Syndicate.

Mr. FLINT. That is for the company.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). That is to Mr. Fletcher, from Mr. Alexander as chairman of the South Shore Railway syndicate, not as an individual. And here is Mr. Fletcher's answer, dated Philadelphia, 8th December, 1894.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What company does he represent?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Brill were the two gentlemen who put up the money for the narrow guage.

Mr. FLINT. I think the hon. gentleman is making a mistake.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I know what I am talking about. Here is the telegram :

To H. E. Alexander.
16 Wall St., New York.

I confirm and accept your offer of to-day for myself and associates.

GEO. A. FLETCHER.

Then a lot of correspondence ensued after that. As appears by these letters, Atwood & Robertson were both present at those arrangements, and both agreed to them ; and they went down to Nova Scotia to see Mr. Fielding, of the local government, to get the local subsidies given to the Coast Railway transferred to the South Shore Railway Company. Mr. Fielding refused to transfer the subsidies, and the consequence was that the thing fell through. Here is the last letter, dated at Philadelphia, 24th January, 1895 :

H. E. Alexander, Esq.
Chairman, South Shore Railway Syndicate.
16 Wall St., New York.

We are very anxious that our contract embodied in your exchanged telegrams of the 8th December, 1894, shall be promptly performed. It should have been done before now. We have waited upon your convenience, though always ready to do our part, until we feel that we should be expected to wait no longer. May we ask you to fix the earliest date at which the thing will be closed.

GEO. A. FLETCHER.

This shows that they were not so anxious to complete this road, but that they were willing to sell out to the South Shore Railway Company, provided these moneys were paid, and that Mr. Robertson was taken care of for a small sum of money. Now, the contract with the local government is for a narrow guage road. The hon. gentleman says they have given up all idea of building a narrow gauge road, and that now they are going to build a broad gauge. We have no proof of that. On the 29th December, 1894, the president of the road got up a plan, and made an application to extend the narrow gauge road from Shelburne all the way to Halifax, and this is his letter :

Yarmouth, 29th December, 1894.

Dear Sir,—I beg to inclose herewith a map of western Nova Scotia, showing the location of the line of the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia (Limited), from Yarmouth to Lockeport, in the county of Shelburne ; and also the proposed extensions to cover which amendments to our charter will be asked for at the approaching session of the legislature. * * * We desire to extend our lines of railway from Lockeport to the city of Halifax, passing through all the towns and villages along the southern coast of Nova Scotia. The town council of Yarmouth and the municipal councils of Yarmouth and Argyle, in the county of Yarmouth ; and of Barrington and Shelburne, in the county of Shelburne, have already granted free rights of way to the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia (Limited). We commenced active operations in August of this year, and have now over twenty miles graded ready for the rails. We have suspended grading during the winter months, but the right of way will be cleared over sixty miles of our line during the present winter, and contracts made for rails, sleepers and fences. The entire line will be under construction next year, and we expect to have trains running over a very large portion of it before the close of 1895. The promoters of the Coast Railway Company believe that the needs of the southern counties of Nova Scotia will be best served by a line of railway between Yarmouth and Halifax, not built with a view of giving a shorter railway connection than now exists between those points, but rather with the intention of connecting each village and town with Halifax in the east, and the town of Yarmouth in the west. They propose a three-foot gauge railway, because it can be more cheaply built and operated, and more likely to give some return for the capital that will be invested in such an undertaking. The Halifax merchant and manufacturer will, by this route, be brought in close connection with the entire population located along nearly 300 miles of our coast.

I read this letter to show that on the 29th December, 1894, the president of this road had no idea of changing it into the standard gauge road, but up to that time he wanted to build a three-foot gauge, and extend it all the way to Halifax, and he did so because the people, as he states here, were in favour of it, and because it would be cheaper.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Oshawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Ontario.)

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 34) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 9,

Mr. COATSWORTH moved the addition of the following provision :—

Provided always, that nothing in this Act or in the said approval of the Governor General shall be held to give effect to the said arrangement in so far as such arrangement may be (if it be) contrary to any existing contract with any municipality or other party, unless such municipality or other party shall consent thereto.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was that provision before the committee and approved by it ?

Mr. TISDALE. That provision was not submitted to the committee.

Mr. MULOCK. When this Bill was before the Committee on Railways it appeared that the company were asking powers to

make certain traffic arrangements with other railway companies, not named, and which were not petitioners. It occurred to some members of the committee, myself among others, that if we were to grant that power without the consent of the other companies, they not being present, we might be affecting their arrangements. In effect, the Bill was seeking to amend the corporate powers of other companies, not petitioners here, and had not appeared as petitioners, and of such changes the public had no notice. I discussed the matter briefly before the committee, and subsequently the solicitor of the company, Mr. Clarke, spoke to me and said he was quite willing to guard the rights of any other contracting parties. That would get over the objection taken to the Bill by myself and others, and I think the Postmaster General took that view as well. This is a provision simply to prevent any contracts made by any other companies being interfered with by powers conferred on unnamed companies.

Mr. LISTER. I object to this matter being settled across the Table. This amendment was not submitted to the Railway Committee, and the committee of the House has a right to obtain an explanation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think any objection can be taken to the amendment. It only refers to parties interested, and they have all agreed to do it. It is simply a provision that in so far as regards any municipality interested in the roads that exist, and which are receiving legislation at the present time, their arrangements or contracts under bonus by-law or agreement shall not be affected by this legislation. It is purely a private matter between the parties, and I do not think that when the interests of the company and of the municipalities are protected by the amendment, any objection can be taken to it.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 10.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). In section 9, which has just passed the committee, it is declared that this company may enter into agreement with the Canada Southern Railway and other roads. I have an amendment to propose, which deals with the question of the passenger rate that should be charged by this new company. I bring it up in connection with this road for this reason: That the Canada Southern has acquired, or will acquire, this Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo road, that that road, which is now controlled by the Michigan Central, is a Vanderbilt road, and this Vanderbilt road is controlled by the New York Central, all these being Vanderbilt lines, having their headquarters in the Vanderbilt offices in New York; and the New York Central, which is the great road owned by the Vanderbilts, is a two cent per mile road. By a statutory enactment of the state of New York, the New York Central is limited to that passenger rate. If that is so, and I am prepared to prove it, then the Canada Southern, if it acquires the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo line, which I believe is the present intention, will represent the New York Central, and it should accept a two-cent passenger rate in Ontario, such rate having been enacted by the legislature of New York to cover its lines in that State.

Mr. LISTER. You will ruin the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Not at all. To show that the Canadian Southern is really the same as the New York Central, on referring to Poor's Manual, page 920, I find that the president of the Canada Southern is Cornelius Vanderbilt, and among the directors of the Michigan Central are Cornelius Vanderbilt, chairman, Samuel F. Barger, W. K. Vanderbilt and Chauncey M. Depew. It will be also found that the headquarters of the Michigan Central are in the Grand Central depot, and its financial office, in the offices of the New York Central. Then the directors of the New York Central are Cornelius Vanderbilt, Chauncey M. Depew, William K. Vanderbilt, Samuel F. Barger and other members of the Vanderbilt family. It is not denied in any quarter that the Canada Southern is a Vanderbilt line.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does it carry passengers at 2 cents a mile?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). My amendment does not cover the Canada Southern although it should; and if I am here next session, I will introduce a Bill for that purpose. Now, if the Vanderbilts can give a 2 cent a mile rate in New York, and find it pay, as it has been found to pay, why can they not give the same rate in the province of Ontario? That is one reason why I propose to test the sense of the House on the question. I will give the House another reason, Mr. Chairman, why the Michigan Central should concede this 2 cent a mile rate. There is on the Canadian side of the Niagara River an electric service, which gives cheap accommodation to the people using the line, and the result is that the Vanderbilts have given less than a 2 cent rate on their railway line along the Niagara River, on the Canadian side, to meet that competition. If they can do it in that case they can do it in the case of this proposed line which is to run from Toronto to Buffalo, and which traverses the best paying railroad section in the whole of Canada. There is still another reason why the rate on this road should be reduced. It has got a very large bonus from the city of Hamilton, and it is getting an entrance into the city of Toronto for practically nothing. It will be built at a time when railroad construction is cheaper than it ever was before,

and under those circumstances they can well afford to give the people of the Niagara peninsula, from Hamilton to Buffalo a 2 cent a mile rate. The most profitable part of the Grand Trunk system is that portion running between Toronto and the Falls, and which portion of the road helps to make up the deficit caused by operating branches, and carrying foreign freight. Another reason, and a very strong reason, in favour of the lower rate is that there is so much traffic there that they can well afford to grant it. If we pass this 2 cent a mile resolution in regard to this railway, the other railways will have to meet the competition, and follow the example by reducing their rates. That was illustrated in the case of the New York Central. The New York Central came to be a 2 cent a mile railroad under circumstances similar to this present case. There was a Bill before the legislature at Albany to grant certain amendments to its charter, and enabling them to take over a small road that had a 2 cent a mile proviso in its charter. The legislature at Albany granted that, but they inserted this clause :

But nothing in this Act shall allow any rate of fare for way passengers greater than 2 cents a mile to be charged over the track or tracks of that railroad, now known as the New York Central Railway Company, and the rate of fare for way passengers over the track or tracks now operated by the New York Central Company, shall be 2 cents a mile and no more whatever.

They are now restricted to that rate of fare.

Mr. LISTER. What was the passenger rate before ?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). It was 3 and 4 cents, and all kinds of rates. That one amendment put in the New York Central Railway Bill compelled every other road in the state of New York to accept that rate.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend is mistaken. The New York Central is the only road in the state of New York that has a 2 cent a mile rate.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). They come close to it.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, they do not.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I beg your pardon. I have travelled over a good many of these roads and I know it. Their rate is practically 2 cents a mile in the state of New York, and it is all due to this clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Erie road and all the other roads are 3 cents a mile.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). They are based on the 2 cent rate of the New York Central. I say that in this rich peninsula of Niagara, where there is only one line of railway, the Grand Trunk, if we insert a 2 cent a mile clause in this Bill, we will have settled the question of railway rates in that district. This proviso will benefit the city of Toronto and the city of Hamilton, and the travelling public of all the counties, through which the road passes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would kill all the fairs, too.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). No, it won't.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, it will.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). How kill the fairs ?

Mr. McMULLEN. Because the railway companies will not reduce the rate for excursions to the fairs.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). It will be a good thing in the general interest of this country when the railways quit giving special rates, and give a uniform and low rate throughout the whole year. The public opinion of this country is in favour of a 2 cent a mile rate. We have had petitions in favour of the principle sent to this House from every municipal council in Ontario, from the Trades and Labour Councils, from the Farmers' Institutes, from the Grangers, and from the Patrons of Industry. That feeling is growing throughout Canada, and wherever a reduction in railway fares has taken place the result has been an increase in travel, an increase in the profits of the company and a greater convenience to the public. I challenge any gentleman in this House to disprove any one of these statements. These being the facts, that this House can secure for the people of this country so important a boon, it is, I say, the duty of hon. gentlemen to support my amendment and have it inserted in the Bill. I believe that if the promoters of this Bill would wire Cornelius Vanderbilt, that legislation could only be obtained by inserting a 2 cent a mile clause, Mr. Vanderbilt would gladly wire back : I will accept it. The New York Central Company have found that their profits have increased in consequence of the 2 cent a mile rate. They run through a very great and populous country, but they have great competition. They have four lines of their own paralleled by half a dozen other roads, yet what has been the result ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Name two or three of that half dozen ?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The Lehigh Valley, the West Shore, which they have taken over, the old Erie, the road by Rome and Watertown, and others. A report says :

The wisdom of the change is proved by the fact, that, although there are seven railroads competing, the New York Central carried nine million passengers in 1880.

That is the result of a 2 cent a mile rate on the best paying railroad in the United States. Its stock is the highest, its credit is the best, and it has proved that this passenger rate has been a benefit to the railway, a benefit to the public, and a rate that should be extended to all other roads on the continent, especi-

ally those which go through quite as good a railroad country as is the state of New York. Another reason why we should reduce railway fares in this country lies in this fact, that as the things which are most consumed by the people have been reduced in price the use of them has increased.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Reduce the tariff, and you have lower prices.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Take the subject of postage: every time postage has been reduced in this or any other country, the use of the mails has increased tenfold and the postal revenue has also increased.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Just in the same way.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). In what way?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Reduce the tariff, and you will have better times.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). That has nothing to do with it. Whenever telegraph rates or cable rates have been reduced, the people have used the lines more, and the companies have increased their profits, and afforded greater benefits to the public. There is only one thing of common consumption in this country that has not been reduced in price in the last thirty or forty years, and that is, railway passenger travel. Why should this House bar the way to the reduction of railway rates, when everything else has come down in price? Cotton goods, woollen goods, iron goods, sugar—everything the people use has come down in price, in many cases two or three hundred per cent; and yet passenger rates remain to-day where they were forty years ago. In every country in Europe where railway fares have been reduced, the result has been, as I showed the House two years ago, especially in the case of Hungary, that an immense increase in passenger travel and in railway receipts and profits has followed.

Mr. LISTER. How much did you say prices were reduced—two or three hundred per cent?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Yes, in some cases.

Mr. LISTER. Then you have nothing left.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Then, I will say that prices are one-third of what they were forty years ago.

Mr. LISTER. That is 66 per cent.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I will stand corrected if the hon. gentleman will vote for a two-cent passenger rate. If the hon. gentleman will tell us about the way in which steel rails have come down in price under a tariff law, they may throw some light on the subject. The country expects this House to grant some relief in regard to passenger rates. I make this proposition in the interests of the railways themselves. A railway company will receive a greater income, and earn greater profits if it gives the people cheaper travel The companies say they are the best judges of what the passenger rates should be. I dispute that. It is on record that in the fight for the reduction of railway rates in England, the objection to the cheap third-class fare came from the companies themselves. They opposed the reduction in every possible way. They gave the people poor accommodation, they ran the trains at night, and at inconvenient hours; and yet to-day the parliamentary fare of a penny a mile is the popular rate in England, and it is high time that we had a similar rate in this country. Hon. gentlemen will find, when they go back to their constituents, that the people are bent on having a lower passenger rate in this country. The electric roads which are extending in every direction, are carrying passengers at such low rates that they are taking the business away from the steam railways. One would think that the railway companies would, in their own interest, adopt a two-cent rate. They do not like to be told by Parliament what they should do; they say they are themselves the best judges. But they have refused so long to give the people what they want that it is time this House came forward and compelled the New York Central, or the Vanderbilt interest, when we are giving them the concession they are now asking for, to do as much for the people of Ontario as they now do for the people of New York state. I beg, therefore, to move that the following clause be inserted in the Bill:—

> But nothing in this Act contained, or in the Railway Act or amendments thereof, shall allow any rate of fare for way passengers greater than 2 cents a mile to be charged or taken over the track or tracks of said Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.

Mr. TISDALE. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to Rule 67 in relation to Private Bills:

> No important amendment may be proposed to any private Bill, in a Committee of the Whole House, or at the third reading of the Bill, unless one day's notice of the same shall have been given.

I raise the point of order, because I certainly do not agree with the hon. gentleman at all that this is a proper time to discuss a matter of such importance.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me rather unusual to raise a question of this kind in order to defeat this amendment. There is no doubt of the power of the House to introduce the amendment here. It is equally clear that if the hon. gentleman insists on the rule, he may delay the Bill a little longer, and he will be as likely to defeat the Bill as to defeat the amendment. I do not think it is fair to the House or to the

hon. member for East York for the hon. member for South Norfolk to take this means to kill the amendment. I have no doubt that he speaks in the interest of the railways. It is part of his life-work to be connected with railway corporations, and, perhaps he knows more about railways than many other members of this House; but the members of this House know what is the interest of the people as well as the hon. gentleman knows what is the interest of the railway corporations. If any Bill has been before this House for years, in which the principle of this amendment should be introduced, I think it is the Bill under consideration, because, as the hon. member for East York has said, this line will be part and parcel of the Vanderbilt system——

Mr. TISDALE. I beg to interrupt the hon. gentleman, and to appeal to you, Mr. Chairman. He is not discussing the point of order. That must be disposed of first. I wish to have it ruled upon now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no doubt, if the question of order is raised, that this amendment cannot be received without notice. Therefore, it is out of order to discuss this amendment now.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Two years ago, I brought up a similar motion in amendment to the Midland Railway Bill, and it was fully discussed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Two years ago the question of order was not raised, and that is why the amendment was received.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Then I have certain other questions to discuss in connection with this Bill which will compel me to talk until the hour is up, and in that way we will get a discussion of this question. I would advise hon. gentlemen not to raise the rule in this case, but to allow this question to be discussed here to-night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am obliged to follow the rule.

Mr. TISDALE. I am not in the habit of raising a question of order unless I feel it my duty to do so. The importance of this question is such that it should be discussed on a main motion, as it was when the hon. gentleman brought it up two years ago. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman, in the course of legislation on private Bills, should raise these points so as to prevent our getting through. He had plenty of time to raise these points by a motion. He could have brought them up in committee if he wished. I was careful not to object so as to give him every opportunity of placing his views on record, and I only rose to the point of order when he was through.

Mr. SPROULE. In answer to the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), I do not see anything extraordinary in introducing an amendment of this kind at this particular stage in a Bill. The hon. gentleman seems to think that is surprising.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have decided that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not attempting to discuss the amendment, but the right to bring in any amendment to a Bill.

Mr. FRASER. As that matter is disposed of, I have another amendment, to which the same objection cannot apply, because it does not affect the main part of the Bill. I have here a petition which I wish to read to the House; but before doing so, I wish to read the amendment which I intend proposing as clause 10 of the Bill. It is as follows:—

Before this Act shall become operative, the company shall pay all outstanding accounts for labour performed on the railway and other works of the company, and also for material supplied to or for the use of the said company, the amounts and the accounts for labour and material to be ascertained by the mayor of the city of Hamilton, and, when the said mayor shall certify to the Minister of Railways that all just claims as aforesaid shall have been paid, this Act shall become law.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I raise the same point of order with reference to that amendment. This Bill has been before the House for the last two months, and I have never heard anything about that until this moment. I do not think it is fair to spring these things on now.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman cannot raise his point of order until I have made my statement, and moved the amendment, which I have not done yet. I have here a petition from several parties, which reads as follows:—

To the Honourable the Minister of Railways and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council of the Dominion of Canada:

The petition of the undersigned humbly showeth:

1. That your petitioners were employed in the work of construction of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway beween Brantford and Hamilton;

2. That the construction of said portion of said railway was intrusted by the said railway company to a firm of the name of Bracey Brothers, the members of which firm were, as your petitioners believe, all residents in the United States or elsewhere out of Canada;

3. That, when the work on said railway, which had been intrusted to said Bracey Brothers was about completed, the said Bracey Brothers made an assignment, and, as your petitioners believe, the members of said firm of contractors left Canada, and are now in the United States;

4. That your petitioners are creditors of the said Bracey Brothers, or the said railway company, for work done in the construction of said railway to the amount set opposite their respective names, and that your petitioners are informed and believe, that the claims filed with the trustee of Bracey Brothers' estate by their creditors in respect of said work done and material supplied

in the construction of said railway amount to over $60,000, all of which claims have been due and owing since the month of February last, or before that date ;

5. That the said railway company were voted a large bonus by the city of Hamilton, and that one of the main inducements offered to the ratepayers to support the by-law for said bonus was, that the amount of the bonus, and a much larger sum, would be expended in paying for labour in the construction of said railway in and about the city of Hamilton ;

Your petitioners, therefore, pray, That your Committee impose upon the said railway company as a condition of any privileges or rights that may be granted by your committee to the said railway company, that due provision be made by the said railway company for the speedy payment of the debts now owing to your petitioners and others for labour done and materials supplied in the construction of said railway.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

A. Gorlin	$144 21
Wm. Gowland	40 00
S. R. Hammond (livery account)	89 05
Thos. Armstrong	500 00
Luke Gray, blacksmith	105 00
James Pattan	110 00
Jas. Anderson	5 00
D. B. Cambel	930 00
Jerry Flynn (St. Catharines), per P. D. Crerar, his solicitor, over	100 00
Wm. McNichol (St. Catharines), per P. D. Crerar, his solicitor, over	500 00

This is a very important matter. The people of Hamilton were induced to vote a bonus of $225,000 to this company on the understanding that they would get back their money through the employment of labour by the company in and round the city of Hamilton. It appears now, however, that not only will the people of Hamilton have to pay this $225,000, but will lose the wages as well. Consequently, I think a condition should be imposed upon this company by which they would be compelled to do something towards arranging all these bills. I understand that the parties to whom the $60,000 are due comprise quite a large number, only a few of whom, representing $2,500 to $3,000 have signed this petition ; but I maintain that when any railway company has received a bonus, this company ought to see that no men are employed doing any work in connection with it without getting paid their wages. The city would certainly never have given this bonus if they thought for one moment that the labour and material supplied the company would not be paid for. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) has a Bill which I will gladly support. We have been legislating in the interests of the speculators, and it is high time we should come down to the common sense principle, and legislate for the protection of labour. It may be said that the reputation of this firm of contractors was good ; but my contention is that when that bonus was voted, the railway company themselves should have employed the labour, or if they gave out contracts, they should have compelled the contractors to give security to meet the wages as they fell due.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was a subsidy granted to this road by this Parliament ?

Mr. FRASER. I am not sure about that. The city of Hamilton gave a subsidy of $255,000.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the amount owing for wages ?

Mr. FRASER. The amount is $60,000.

Mr. MULOCK. For the workingmen.

Mr. FRASER. Yes ; that amount has been owing ever since. And a large number of these men are feeling it very much. There are farmers and others who have worked upon that road and have not been paid a dollar since that time, and they feel the pinch. The company is given the benefit of their work. It will not do for them to say : We gave the contract to Bracey Bros., and if a man works for Bracey Bros., he knew what he was doing. You could get labourers every time and avoid paying them by throwing responsibilities from one to the other in that way. This company are bound to see that the men were paid, and if they made it possible for Bracey Bros. to leave the country without paying the men, then any further advantages granted to them by the legislature should be granted upon the conditions I shall name. My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) spoke about the two-cent rate, and I am in sympathy with him so far as that is concerned. One of the ways of providing that there shall not be a repetition of these large debts to workingmen is for this Parliament to step in and say : If there is a large amount due the labouring-men, you must pay it before you come to Parliament to ask for further franchises. If you are desirous of certain advantages by legislation, it must be a condition precedent that your hands shall be clean. Parliament will then be doing what is strictly just and of advantage to that which creates all wealth—the labour of the country. It is said that these men went into the employment of Bracey Bros. with their eyes open, and why did they not make inquiry before they took the risk ? Must a man who comes with his pick and shovel to get employment be a subscriber to Bradstreet or Dun, Wiman's, and get a report as to the financial standing of a man in such a case as this before he asks for employment ? The man who presents himself with his pick and shovel and his two hands willing for work ought to be able to feel that when he strikes an honest blow he shall get his pay for it. It will be seen that $60,000 is a very important matter to these men. It is not an important matter for this Parliament, for we are accustomed to deal in large sums, but to the men who depend upon this money for the support of wife and family, it is a most momentous

matter. In order that there may be no misunderstanding about it, I move that the committee do now rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Before this motion is carried, I wish to say a few words in regard to this matter. The railway spoken of runs through the constituency I represent, from the city of Hamilton to the city of Brantford. This company presented a by-law in the city of Hamilton three years ago and obtained a bonus, but they did not go on with their work, and the by-law expired. Next year they presented a by-law for a large amount of money. The by-law was carried, but they did not go on with their work, and that by-law also expired. Last fall they presented a by-law for $225,000, and it is said they spent a large amount of money in the city of Hamilton in order to carry that by-law. Afterwards the railway proceeded with the construction of the road from the city of Hamilton to the city of Brantford. They let the contract to a construction company which, I believe, is composed largely of Americans.

Mr. FRASER. Altogether.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Not altogether, I believe, but largely. Afterwards they let the contract to Bracey Bros., who were entirely American. These men came over with their foremen. They sub-let the construction of the railway, mile by mile, to sub-contractors, people resident in that section of the country, farmers and others. Bracey Bros. only completed one mile of the contract themselves, I believe. However that may be, these sub-contracts were let to parties living in the county, and these parties hired the labour in the neighbourhood, and for months they worked until they had completed the railway, and that in the winter when it cost double the money that it would have cost had it been built in a season when the frost was not severe. And after these men had worked for months completing the railway, Bracey Bros. made an assignment, and the result was that not only the sub-contractors, but the men who were working for the sub-contractors, lost every cent of the money they had been working hard for all winter. These men owed the farmers right through from the city of Hamilton to the city of Brantford, farmers who had boarded the men who worked in the construction of this railway; they owed the labourers who constructed the railway, and they owed the flour and feed stores that supplied the feed for the horses working on construction. The whole affair from beginning to end was a complete Yankee swindle. These Americans came over to swindle the people of this country, and they have succeeded in doing it. They got their railway built and they have not paid for it, and now they expect legislation from this House. I say it will be very unfair to pass this Bill unless provision is made that these labouring men shall be paid for their work. An assignment has been made, and it is reported in the Hamilton papers that there will not be 10 cents on the dollar. They owe individuals sums as high as $300, and even $500, and this to men in very ordinary circumstances. It is in the interest of justice and of the workingmen of this country that these people should be compelled to pay their honest debts, for they have had the benefit of the labour expended in constructing the road, and this Parliament ought to provide that the labourers shall be paid before they get benefits from this House to enable them to run their railway.

Mr. McKAY. I do not wish to obstruct the passage of this Bill, which is very satisfactory to all parties concerned. But I would like to say that I am heartily in accord with the amendment moved by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser). All he has said about the workingmen and others being deprived of their pay is true: the facts are well known to everybody in Hamilton who takes any interest in these matters. Not only the workingmen, but the farmers who boarded them and the people who have sold supplies have been kept out of their pay, and it is said that by the time things are settled with the assignee, it is not likely anything will be left for these men. They were employed in the winter time. It is well known that in any large city in the depth of winter, no matter how good times are, you will find a large number of people unemployed; and these parties took advantage of this, got the work done on the railway when they did, and the men worked week after week in the severest weather of the year and then found their money was not forthcoming. In many cases they had to sell their pay slips at 50 cents on the dollar to get money. They did that for the purpose of providing means for themselves and families. Some of them who were single men had to do it to pay for their board. I hope the amendment which has just been proposed, will carry. I am glad to know that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) has brought a Bill before this House dealing with this subject in a general manner, and I hope it will pass, because it is a step in the right direction. If a law of this kind had existed when this railway was being built, these men could have got their pay, and it would also be a lesson to promoters of enterprises of this character, warning them to be more careful to whom they give their sub-contracts. They would see it to be in their own interest to let out their sub-contracts to responsible men, men who are able to fulfil them and pay the labourers. I believe the amendment, if adopted, is calculated to do a great deal of good; and I also hope that the Bill of the hon. member for Glengarry will be accepted by the House.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). From my personal knowledge of the circumstances in the locality, I feel that the time has come when we should adopt some legislation to prevent the difficulties that we have locally experienced in this matter. I have a strong sympathy with the Bill that my hon. friend from Glengarry has before the House, with the object of putting into the general Railway Act a provision that will prevent this sort of thing in future. On this occasion, as my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. McKay) says, the special difficulties are just these: We all know that last winter when the circumstances of the workingmen were rather dark, this company, for the third time, succeeded in securing from the city of Hamilton a large bonus, chiefly by the votes of those men who were promised employment and a winter's work when the outlook was rather dreary. Now, while I have no wish to put the least obstacle in the way of carrying out this scheme, I think it is too bad that the money should be taken out of the locality, and that the benefit should be reaped by speculators who are largely outside of this country, and that they should quietly walk off and leave the burden to fall upon the workingmen in the neighbourhood. There was very little of that labour actually performed by the Bracey Bros. They stood around and frittered away the two best winter months we have had for a long time for accomplishing that kind of labour, and when we got past the middle of the winter, and into the severe period, then everybody was set to work, and the work was pushed on under unfavourable circumstances, and at a serious disadvantage. In my own town, and I happen to live in the centre of the district, the workingmen came in from round about with their bi-monthly pay-lists certified by the pay bosses, and no money being available from the contractors, they negotiated these as well as they could. The result has been that the local grocers in that town, and the small business men who have no margin to fall back on, took these pay-sheets in good faith, expecting to wait awhile for their pay, but expecting ultimately to receive their money. Many of the farmers along the way furnished labour, and, as my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) remarked, living far away in the country, they boarded the labourers, and boarded the teams, and nearly every farmer has some bill for the accommodation of these men. The contractors have succeeded in distributing the cost of the construction of this railway over almost everybody that dwells in the vicinity of the line within two or three miles of it. I say it is grossly unfair that that sort of thing should be allowed to go on any longer. We are not isolated in this matter. The same question came up this afternoon in regard to a railway in Nova Scotia, and I think it is time some action was taken to put a stop to it.

Mr. McKAY.

Mr. COATSWORTH. This Bill has been before the House for two months. Now, I do not want to say anything opposed to the interests of the workingmen, because I think I appreciate those as much as any member of this House. I think this Bill was on the Order paper in committee six or seven times and it is a very strange thing that, after it was fully discussed in the committee, we find this new-born zeal on the part of some hon. members to-night.

Mr. FRASER. I only got the papers Saturday morning, and I immediately went before the Railway Committee to ascertain if they would make some change; so that my new-born zeal is coteraporaneous with the reception of the papers.

Mr. COATSWORTH. What I say is that the matter has been before the Railway Committee, I think, on six occasions, and not a word has ever been said about this matter before. The Bill was very fully discussed last week. It took up nearly the whole of the time of one meeting of the committee, and this matter was not brought up at all. There has been no notice given of it, but it is sprung upon us when the Bill is in committee of the House. I think it is unfair to the company. We do not know anything about the names of these particular men who have signed the petition. As one hon. gentleman says, they may be persons who have been speculating in these pay orders; and while I am as fully prepared as any member of the House to support the interests of the workingmen, I question very much whether we ought to support the interests of those who have been speculating in these pay orders. I think it would be a very doubtful policy for us to adopt. With regard to the payment of the men, I understand that the question of the right of the company to hold that money for the purpose of paying those men, is now in litigation. As has been stated to the committee, the company do not employ the men. The company let their work to contractors, and the contractors employ these men. The company have retained from the contractors a certain sum of money for the purpose of paying these men, the contractors have sued them for the money, the matter is now pending in court, and until it is decided whether the company have a right to pay the workingmen out of this money due the contractors, I do not think this House ought to legislate against the company, and hamper their action with a provision of this kind, compelling them, in advance, to pay the contractors and pay the workingmen as well. I take that point in the interest of the company, and I think that hon. gentlemen ought not, at this stage, endeavour to block the Bill by such a motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am rather surprised at the line of argument adopted by

the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill, that because the parties have not been informed that such a Bill was before the House or the railway committee, and because they have not been able to make known their complaints, therefore, the House ought to take no cognizance of it.

Mr. COATSWORTH. That is not my argument at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I do not say it was a serious argument, but the hon. gentleman made those observations. He went further, and said that the promoters of this Bill ought not to be made liable for the debts of the sub-contractors. Well, Sir, we have in the province of Ontario a statute which gives builders a lien upon the property upon which their labour or their material have been expended. Now, it seems to me that that Bill is founded on equitable principles and equitable considerations, and I do not know why that rule should not apply to a railway corporation, if it is their bounden duty, as the promoter puts it, to see that those who expended their time and their labour on the work from which they are to derive advantage, should be paid by those to whom they have let the contract for the performance of this work. It is their bounden duty to see that those who spend their time and labour on the work from which advantage is derived by the company, are paid by those to whom the contract is let. If we undertake to put men of straw who do not reside in the country and have no property in the country forward as sub-contractors, it is their business as a matter of due diligence to see that those who have done the work have been paid for it, or if not paid, that the money is not handed over to the contractors. That seems to me to be a principle of simple justice, and before the company are allowed to avail themselves of the labour of those men who work upon the road they ought to be made to give compensation for it. It is better that they should pay twice than that the parties who expended their labour on the work, and who have nothing else to subsist upon, should remain unpaid.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) appears not to have remembered the measures that have been passed, or does not remember the legislation that has been enacted during recent years. Such an amendment as is now suggested was passed in regard to the Hereford Railway, I think. The Bill was not allowed to pass the House until a provision was adopted under which the new company was obliged to pay for the labour that went into the road.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In what year was that Bill passed?

Mr. SPROULE. I forget the year; I think it was about 1882.

Mr. MULOCK. There is also the case of the Baie de Chaleur Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. And there is the case of the North-west Central. In that case we made provision for the payment of $50,000. Parliament would not allow the new company's Bill to pass until a clause was introduced to ensure payments of labourers' claims for wages. On this occasion no new principle is being advanced and no new precedent established. It seems strange that men who put their labour into a road, especially when the road has been acquired by men who are rated at a hundred millions of dollars, should not be paid, and that this Parliament should stand in the way by members raising objections and points of order with respect to this Bill. I do not think this is a good or well-founded point to take against the proposition. I have had other claims handed to me which I would like to speak of did time permit. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) said it was strange that this matter did not come before the committee. As the hon. member for Guysboro' said, it was not brought to the notice of the members of the committee until after the Bill was passed. Serious objections were taken to the Bill, and as passed, exceptional powers were given as compared with the powers given to any other corporation during the seventeen years I have been a member of the House. Is it to be wondered that we should have a discussion on the merits of the Bill, so that the country would know in what direction legislation is tending? It does not become an hon. member to raise objection for the purpose of preventing free and full discussion of every clause before the committee. I hope other questions that will be raised will be discussed, no matter how many objections may be taken, in order that justice may be done to poor people who are unable to fight their own battles and enforce their own claims. It was well said by an eminent man that no satisfaction can be obtained from railway companies. Why? It is because they are great corporations having immense wealth at their back, and in this respect they exercise greater influence than private individuals. Railway corporations have no bodies to kick and no souls to save. The best course to adopt is to check them in Parliament, and impose on them the same restrictions imposed on other companies when they apply for charters or for amendments to charters, and compel them to pay what is justly due to the labouring men who have been employed on the work.

Committee rose and reported progress.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SALARY.

Mr. MULOCK moved second reading Bill (No. 4) to reduce the salary of the Governor General. He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill it is right I

should say at the very threshold that it is presented in no sense from a feeling of hostility to the Governor's General who have preceded the present incumbent, or His Excellency, or the office itself. Quite the contrary. It appears to me that all who favour maintaining this office, this connection between the mother country and ourselves, should at all times be astute to prevent abuses cropping up and attaching themselves to the office. If the office becomes too expensive, or for other reasons becomes unpopular, other reasons wholly foreign to the office itself, or which ought to be, in time that popularity will extend to the system. Therefore, I trust that whether my proposition may commend itself to the judgment of my fellow-members or not, they will at least at once recognize that this motion is in no sense intended to reflect on any incumbent of the office or to lower the position of the office in the public mind, but that it is purely and simply in the interest of economy, and I believe in the interest of the office itself. I should also say, Mr. Speaker, that I have not been prompted to bring this Bill in at this time because of any extraordinary expenditure in connection with that office of recent years. Year after year in passing the Estimates we have been compelled to vote large sums of money for His Excellency, the incumbent for the time being of this high office, that were in no sense part of the engagements of the country at the time of the appointment, but which by long practice have come to be regarded as part of the official salary. I introduced this subject some years ago when in Committee of Supply, on motions to grant special bonuses or sums for the maintenance of certain branches of expenditure in connection with the office of the Governor General, but which were in no sense binding on the country, forming no part of the compact between Canada and Great Britain, no part of the Confederation Act, but simply voted year by year as the perpetuation of abuses; and in 1893 the House caused a return to be laid on the Table showing how much had been expended on the office in certain ways since confederation. Those figures, which are official, are set forth in the preamble of the Bill. Hon. gentlemen will, therefore, distinguish between the fixed salary, which is referred to in the Confederation Act, and other expenditures which are wholly voluntary on the part of Parliament and are therefore in no sense part of the Act. But, first of all, what was the language of the Confederation Act which fixed any sum to represent the salary of the Governor General. Section 105 of that Act contains all there is upon the subject in any statute Imperial or Dominion. This section reads as follows:—

> Unless altered by the Parliament of Canada, the salary of the Governor General shall be £10,000 sterling, payable out of the Consolidated Fund of Canada.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that this amount was not placed in the Act of Confederation as an unalterable sum. It is not a figure that requires to be changed by appeal to the Imperial legislature, the foundation head of all our legislative powers. It was simply placed in the Confederation Act that we might start as a growing concern with a salary attached to the incumbent for the time being, but to be changed as the will of the people of Canada, from time to time, deemed wise. The very fact that the Act of Confederation contemplated a change, is an invitation to the representatives of the people to consider the situation, and if they deem it advisable to make a change. Therefore, Sir, I am strictly in harmony with this statutory invitation, in inviting the attention of Parliament to the salary attaching to this office, and in asking Parliament whether or not the time has arrived when we should exercise the power vested in us by this Act, and make the alteration which the Imperial Parliament said we might make. Now, Mr. Speaker, it would be worth while, just for one moment to look at the figures which have been laid upon the Table of the House, in response to an Order, showing the total expenditure for a quarter of a century, beginning with Confederation, and continuing down to the year 1892. I have not got the figures for the last few years. During the 25 years from Confederation down to 1892, we have paid for the salaries of the Governors General, $1,216,666.65, and for travelling expenses, $145,903.45. This last item is a pure voluntary gift by Parliament, not being part of any statutory sum payable to His Excellency. Then follow two other items, salaries of His Excellencies' secretaries, $270,350.14; contingencies of the Governors General's secretarys' office, $217,426.60. With regard to these two items of nearly half a million dollars, of course, it is debatable whether they should or should not properly be considered in this general question. I do not know, how far these salaries might be considered as of abnormal or unnecessary growth, not being behind the scenes myself; but for the purpose of argument, I group them as part of the general expenditure. Then there is an item for rental amounting to $7,854. That was for rental before we had equipped Rideau Hall. There was the purchase-money for Rideau Hall, amounting to $82,000. I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen to this interesting item, namely, that on a property which we bought at a total cost of $82,000 which was for whatever buildings there was upon it, and the land, there has been expended no less a sum than $547,143.45 for alterations, additions, repairs, and maintenance. The average expenditure under that one item for a period of twenty-five years, amounts to over $20,000 a year. We have further spent during that period, a sum of $108,853.01 upon furni-

ture for Rideau Hall. We have spent $94,349.86 for wages, and $151,371.10 for fuel and light. In all, we have spent the sum of $2,851,917.76, or an average yearly expenditure of $114,076.70, being an average yearly expenditure of $65,410.04 in excess of the annual salary of $48,866.66 mentioned in the Confederation Act. If we deduct from that excess of $65,000 odd, the total annual average expenditure for Governor General's secretaries, and contingencies connected with the office, we still leave that excess averaging about $45,000 a year. Now, taking the averages of these items for the twenty-five years, I find that whilst they varied in different years, the average is about as follows:—We have disbursed, during twenty-five years, for Governor General's travelling expenses, a yearly average of $5,836. We have disbursed annually during that twenty-five years, an average of no less than $21,785 a year for additions repairs, and maintenance of Rideau Hall. During that same period, we have paid out annually an average sum of $4,754 for furniture for Rideau Hall. During that same period, we have disbursed, annually, no less a sum, on an average, than $3,773 for wages on gardens and grounds, and during that same period of twenty-five years we have disbursed annually an average sum of $6,148 for fuel and light, sums voted to His Excellency. Now, Sir, these are sums very large in themselves, and I submit that they are quite beyond the resources of the people of Canada. On this point it might be instructive to make a comparison, and in seeking for comparisons, I think the paying capacity of the people will be a good criterion. Taking the population of Canada as a good test of its resources, and applying the same rule in regard to our neighbours to the south, I would ask the indulgence of the House for a moment while I compare, on the basis of population, the expenditure of the people of Canada, and the expenditure of the people of the United States for the maintenance of gubernatorial institutions. In Canada we disburse, annually, for salary to His Excellency, $48,666.66; in salaries to Lieutenant-Governors, $71,000; or a total of $119,666.66 for a population under five millions. In this sum of $119,000 I have included nothing whatever for expenses outside of the statutory salaries. I have omitted these because I am not furnished with accurate figures as to the corresponding expenses in the United States. Taking, therefore, only the statutory salaries for the corresponding offices in the United States, I find that the salary of the President is $50,000, that of the Vice-President $8,000, and the salaries of all the governors of all the states and territories together $201,600, or a total charge on the people of the United States of $259,600 for the salaries of the President, the Vice-President and all the governors in the union, as against $119,000 in Canada. In other words, assuming our population to be one-twelfth that of the United States—and in that I am afraid I am under the mark—the result is that if our population were equal to that of the United States, it would cost us, on the present scale of payment, $1,436,000 to pay the salaries of our Governor General and our Lieutenant-Governors, against $259,000 for the salaries of the corresponding officers in the United States. In other words, testing this expenditure on the basis of population, we are paying our Governor General and our Lieutenant-Governors six times as much as is paid in the United States. Now, take an individual case. The state of New York, with a population of six and a half millions, pays the governor a salary of $10,000, with a residence, whereas Canada, with our population of under five millions, pays nearly $50,000. Nor is that an isolated case. I have in my hand a schedule, which I have taken from the World's Almanac, of 1895, page 353—and I have no doubt the figures are accurate—showing that the state of Pennsylvania, with a population of 5,258,000, about half a million more than that of Canada, only pays $10,000 a year to its governor. It looks to me as if the whole scheme of Government in Canada, as represented by costly Governors General, Lieutenant-Governors and Cabinet Ministers, were founded upon too liberal a scale. For example, in the United States Government there are but eight heads of departments, each of whom is paid a salary of $8,000 a year, or a total of $64,000. In Canada, we have Ministers and departments galore—eleven Ministers drawing $8,000 a year each, one drawing $9,000, and three Controllers, together drawing $18,000; in other words, the executive heads of our Government cost us $115,000 a year, as against $64,000 a year, payable to the corresponding heads of departments in the United States. In other words, we are paying about 80 per cent more in the way of salaries to the members of our Government than are paid to the members of the United States Government. I mention that as a further illustration of the extravagant scale upon which our Government was formed. I shall be told, no doubt, that on a former occasion the Parliament of Canada passed a Bill reducing the salary of the Governor General to $35,000 a year, and that the Bill was disallowed by the Imperial authorities; and, I suppose, it will be argued that there is no reason to hope for better success should Parliament now repeat, in an aggravated form, as my opponent's might say, the proposition it made before. It is true that in 1868 the Imperial authorities did see fit to disallow that Bill; but what they did in 1868, when confederation had only been a year or so in existence, is no test of what they ought to do after confederation has been in existence for over a quarter of a century. They had a right to suppose in 1868 that this country would expand in wealth and population to such a degree as perhaps to enable us to pay these

expenses without feeling them. Therefore, I assume that the liberal scale of remuneration adopted at the commencement was adopted under a mistaken idea, and perhaps with a more hopeful expectation as to the growth of our country than has been realized. But whatever may have been the reason, the fact stares us in the face that this original salary of $48,000 is only about half of what the office costs us now. So that my proposition may be dealt with in two ways. Even if some hon. gentlemen insist on maintaining the salary at the figure fixed in the Confederation Act, they cannot justify the expenditures which have grown up and become attached to the office within the last twenty-five years. It is not intended by the Bill that the change shall take effect until a new Governor General is appointed. I began this movement during the regime of Lord Derby, but I was not able to press the measure to a successful issue during his regime. I introduced it again last year, and I have introduced it again this year in the hope that it will become law in time to apply to the successor of His Excellency. Now, it is argued that this high salary and these perquisites are necessary in order to secure to Canada the very best men the Empire can afford to send us. I admit that the salary in itself is some attraction; but I believe that the high position of Governor General of Canada is an attraction in itself, and the man who would only come for the salary would not be the kind of a man that Canada would be specially anxious to have. I think that the men who have filled this high office would feel that it was a reflection upon them to be told that this salary and these perquisites were the only things that had brought them here. They have come from a feeling of pride to be of service to the Empire; and I am sure Great Britain possesses no dearth of men able and willing to fill this high office without making it an unnecessary burden upon the people of the country. The expenses of our Government have grown beyond what is reasonable; and if we are going to apply the pruning-knife, we must begin at which at the top. The Government must set the example, every one who is in possession of power must set the example, that we may bring back the expenditure to reasonable and moderate limits. Who can justify the expenditure of our country to-day? It cannot be justified by the wealth of the country. There is nothing to warrant this enormous expenditure of nearly $38,000,000, except the fact that we are burdened down with debt and with office-holders great and small. In making that remark, I speak with all respect of His Excellency, who has endeared himself to the people of Canada. My remarks are wholly impersonal. They have no reference to him or to any of his predecessors; but inasmuch as I happen to be speaking during his regime, I would more particularly desire to be understood that nothing in his administration has given occasion for any movement in this direction. The reason for that exists independent of his administration. Nor would I be doing fairly by the subject if I were to suggest that the expenditure has grown to its present proportions under the present administration. Taking the returns that I have covering a quarter of a century, giving the figures during the Reform regime as well as the Conservatives regimes, there is nothing in the direction of economy particularly on this score particularly to the credit of the Reform administration of 1874 to 1878. So that my criticism is wholly also without reference to any particular Government. I am not blaming now any Government in connection with this matter. The fact is, this Government has so many sins to answer for, that I need not add this to the others, if it were one. I only hold them responsible as being to-day in command of the treasury, and I hold the whole House equally responsible unless the House insists upon reform in this matter. I will not trespass longer on the attention of the House, but will conclude by saying that I believe he will best serve the people of Canada and best promote the maintenance of the system to-day, who will aid at all times in lopping off abuses, including those I have particularly referred to and which are pointed out in the Bill. I therefore confidentially submit this measure to the House, hoping that even if my figures in the direction of economy are not such as to commend themselves to hon. member's, they will at least allow the Bill to go into Committee of the Whole, where we may be able to pass it in some modified form and legislate in the way of economy without at the same time in impairing the public service.

Mr. DALY. I admit that there is nothing in the hon. gentleman's remarks of a personal nature, nor do I suppose that this Bill is intended by him to reflect in any way upon the present incumbent of the high office of Governor General nor upon any of his predecessors. The hon gentleman said he was not speaking of any government. He said that the Reform Government which was in power from 1874 to 1878 was equally extravagant as the succeeding governments. But I must say that while I believe the hon. gentleman had no desire to say anything personal against the holder of the office or to blame any government, he is looking for some cheap popularity among a class of people known as the Patrons, or others, who are suffering at present from a fit of spasmodic economy. I do not think the hon. gentleman has the slightest expectation of carrying the Bill nor had he such expectation when he placed it on the paper. If we look to previous sessions, we cannot but conclude that when, at Confederation, the salary of the Governor General was fixed at $50,000 per annum, it was supposed at that time, and has since been acknowledged

by those who have looked into the matter, not to be anything beyond what would secure to us the services of a first class statesman in that position. In 1868 a motion was made in this House on the 4th May by Mr. Oliver, seconded by Mr. Bodnell:

That the House will, on Friday next, go into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to alter the provisions made in the 105th section of the British North America Act, 1867, and to fix the salary of the Governor General at $35,000 per annum.

An amendment was moved by Mr. Dufresne that it be passed at $32,000. That amendment was carried by a vote of 99 to 45; and in due course the Bill was reserved by the Governor General for the sanction of Her Majesty. Upon the Bill being sent home by Sir John Young, it was returned by the Secretary of State for the colonies in a message as follows:—

The Secretary of State for the Colonies to Viscount Monck.

Downing Street, 30th July, 1868.

(Copy—Canada,—No. 167.)

My Lord,—I have the honour to acknowledge your despatch No. 85, of the 23rd May, transmitting a Bill passed by the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, "to fix the salary of the Governor General," which Bill you have reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure.

I need scarcely say that it is with reluctance, and only on serious occasions that the Queen's Government can advise Her Majesty to withhold the Royal Sanction from a Bill which has passed two branches of the Canadian Parliament. The present, however, is a measure which has important bearings, far beyond its first aspect as a mere reduction of expenditure.

The annual salary of the Governor General was fixed at £10,000 so lately as last year by the Imperial Act of Union: within the first few months of the existence of the new Parliament of Canada, it is proposed to reduce that salary to £6,500.

I fear that the effect of such reduction, if assented to, must be prejudicial to the interests of Canada. The Governor's salary for the Colony of Victoria is £10,000 per annum; there are several colonies in which it is £7,000, in Canada the amount contemplated by the Bill under consideration is £6,500. Instead of being, as it ought to be, an object of the highest ambition, the office of the Governor General is by this proposal placed, as far as salary is a standard of recognition, in the third class among colonial governments. The effect would be not merely to restrict Her Majesty's Ministers in the choice of Governors General to those who may follow the career of colonial governors as a profession, but further to confine the choice even amongst those to gentlemen who are still rising and who would have to look to other places than Canada as offering the highest reward for approved abilities and success.

But the Governor General is the representative of the Queen and the highest authority in a Dominion vast in extent, occupied by several millions of people, comprising within itself various provinces recently brought together, which can only be knit into a mature and lasting whole by wise and conciliatory administration. Nor is the position insulated. The Governor General is continually called upon to act on questions affecting international relations with the United States. The person who discharges such exalted functions ought to possess not only sound judgment and wide experience, but also an established public reputation. He should be qualified both to exercise a moderating influence among the different provinces composing the union, and also to bear weight in his relations with the British Minister at Washington, and with the authorities of the great neighbouring republic.

I am sure that the Queen's advisers in this country would at all times wish to obtain for Canada a Governor General so qualified, but they could not invite his services if the income of his office is insufficient to meet the demands on his resources, and to uphold in a becoming manner the dignity of the Queen's Representative in Canada.

For these reasons Her Majesty's Government have felt it their duty to advise Her Majesty not to pass into law, by giving the Royal Assent, the Bill reserved for Her Majesty's pleasure for the reduction of the Governor General's salary.

I have, &c.,

(Signed,) BUCKINGHAM & CHANDOS.

&c., &c.

Governor the Right Honourable
Viscount Monck, &c., &c.

Now, Sir, from that it would appear that the Governor General, in sending that Bill home, acted upon the advice of Earl Grey to a previous Governor General of old Canada; and the Bill was considered as it was in this instance by Her Majesty's Government and the assent was withheld. And I have no doubt that if this House should pass legislation to-day similar to that that was passed in 1868 it would meet with the same fate. The hon. gentleman gave as one reason why his Bill should become law and the salary of the Governor General should be reduced that at the time this Act of union was passed and the salary of the Governor General was fixed, it was supposed that Canada would develop in a large ratio and that the gentleman holding the high office of Governor General would be entitled to the salary fixed. I think I can easily meet that argument by saying that this country has largely and materially increased since 1868. Not only has it increased in the development of its resources and in its wealth, but its boundaries have been extended. At the time the salary was fixed, we had not taken into Confederation Prince Edward Island or British Columbia, nor had we acquired Manitoba and the North-west Territories. When the sum of $50,000 was fixed as the salary of the Governor General it was considered only a fair salary for a man who was to be Governor General of a country including the old provinces of Canada and the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, surely it cannot now be considered more than a fair salary for the man who has to govern a Dominion stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I agree with the hon. gentleman in saying that it is not supposed that the salary attracts the gentleman who is appointed here, but it is only right that he should have a salary in accordance with the responsibilities and ex-

penses attendant upon his office. In the preamble of the hon. gentleman's Bill, he goes into the expenditure that has been made upon the Governor General's position. He first gives the salary, and then the travelling expenses and contingencies and the rentals and the cost of Rideau Hall and all that sort of thing from Confederation up to the present time. That has nothing whatever to do with the salary of the Governor General. That salary was fixed by section 105 of the British North America Act, and the fact that Canada paid $82,000 for Rideau Hall, and, in addition, $547.143 for repairs and so on, is no argument why we should reduce the salary of His Excellency the Governor General. It may be well, in view of the fact that the home Government took the action they did in 1868 to refer to what was the opinion of the then leader of the Government, Sir John Macdonald. I find in Mr. Pope's life of Sir John Macdonald, Vol. II., page 15, the following :—

Sir John subsequently expressed himself on the subject thus : "The only matter that went wrong during the whole session was a measure to reduce the salary of the Governor General from £10,000 sterling to $32,000. The Government opposed this with all their might, but there was a regular stampede of friends and foes in favour of the reduction, and no arguments could avail. It unluckily so happened that the Governor's salary was the only point in the Union Act that could well be objected to. Most of the young members had pledged themselves to vote for a reduction and they carried out their pledges. There is a great cry for retrenchment just now, which originated principally in the maritime provinces. They were unaccustomed to our scale of salaries, and Canadian extravagance has been made a matter of daily discussion in the newspapers."

Speaking of Lord Monck, he goes on to say :

With all this, I regret much that Lord Monck is going away. He has managed the relations between Canada and the United States ever since he has been Governor, and during all the American war with infinite discretion. The slightest mistake on our frontier might have created a war, in the excited state of feelings that existed in the United States. I think that Lord Monck feels the passage of the Bill a good deal, not that it is of any pecuniary consequence to him, but because the House refused to postpone the reduction during his incumbency, and made it commence from the 1st of July. The Bill has, of course, been reserved for the royal assent. Lord Monck has no option, inasmuch as Lord Elgin, in 1851, received positive instructions from Earl Grey, when Colonial Minister, to reserve any Bill affecting the Governor's salary, and those instructions have never been revoked.

Now, to show the importance and the necessity of having a first class man here as Governor General, it is well to bear in mind what Sir John Macdonald says in the words I have quoted, about the way Lord Monck managed the relations between Canada and the United States in those trying times. That is an argument in favour of our having in Canada at all times a first class man, a man of reputation, a man of education, and a man of weight and of large experience in matters of statesmanship. And then, further, it may be remembered that at the time of the reduction of this salary in 1868 it was contemplated that Lord Mayo should become Governor General of this country ; but upon it being made known to His Lordship that the House of Commons had passed this resolution reducing the salary, he declined to become Governor General of Canada, and subsequently became Viceroy of India ; and it put the then Government of England to a considerable amount of trouble to get a man who would accept the place in view of the action that Parliament had taken. But fortunately, Sir John Young, afterwards Lord Lisgar, was at that time in England, and he was prevailed upon to accept the position, and, as we know, filled it very acceptably afterwards. Now, further in reference to what were the views of Sir John Macdonald upon the office of the Governor General, as affecting the relationship between Great Britain and this country, I quote the following from Mr. Pope's work, Vol. II., page 242 :—

The office of Governor General—the outward and visible sign of British connection—was, in Sir John Macdonald's opinion, an institution of the highest importance, and one that could not be safeguarded with too great care. When, in 1888, the action of the Queensland Government, in attempting to obtain from the Imperial authorities a promise that the men of the proposed new Government or Governor of that colony should be submitted to them before the selection was definitely decided upon, raised the question of the appointment of colonial Governors, Sir John, being invited to express his opinion caused Her Majesty's Government to be informed by telegraph that the "Canadian Government consider the present system of appointing the Governor General perfectly satisfactory, and would greatly regret any change. Reference to Government here for nomination or approval would introduce a disturbing element, and might eventually lead to the election of a Governor, a change to be deplored."

Further Mr. Pope says :

The present manner of appointment, directly by the Crown, gives to the colonies an executive head entirely unconnected with local parties, and for that reason qualified to hold the balance between them. If the Governor General does anything unconstitutional, an appeal always lies from him to Her Majesty's Government, whose servant he is. The cost to Canada of the maintenance of the office Sir John considered as money well spent, and he deprecated the attempts made in Parliament from time to time to investigate too closely the expenditure under that head. I recollect, when some voluntary economy on the part of a former occupant of Rideau Hall was announced, Sir John's remark that "though well meant, it was a mistake, for," said he, "the people of Canada like to see the dignity of the office fully maintained."

That being the view of Canada's foremost statesman, I am sure it will be re-echoed by

all those in this House who have given consideration to the matter, and that it will receive the approval of the people of Canada from one end of the Dominion to the other.

The hon. gentleman tried to show, that we were paying too large salaries here not only to the Governor General but to our judges, and other functionaries in comparison with the sums paid to similar officers in the United States. I hardly think, Mr. Speaker, that the comparisons are fair, because if we want to make comparisons, we should compare gentlemen in other colonies of Great Britain similarly situated to His Excellency the Governor General. We do not require to go to the United States for those comparisons, but we can go to other colonies of Great Britain and ascertain how they treat their Governors General, and how liberal they are towards them as compared with what we pay in Canada. On this point let me read to the House this table:

SALARIES OF COLONIAL GOVERNORS.

	Population.	Revenue.		Salary.	
Canada	4,833,239	(1893)	$38,168,609	$50,000	
Victoria	1,140,405	(1894)	£6,719,623	£10,000	
Cape of Good Hope	1,527,224	(1893)	£6,446,149	£8,000	
Ceylon	3,008,466	(1893)	*Rs. 18,051,950	*Rs. 80,000	£8,000
New South Wales	1,132,234	(1893)	£9,706,734	£7,000	
Malta	168,105	(1893)	£291,158	£5,000	
Queensland	393,718	(1893-4)	£3,343,069	£5,000	
South Australia	320,431	(1894)	£2,526,705	£5,000	
New Zealand	626,658	(1893)	£4,407,963	£5,000	
Hong Kong	221,441	(1893)	$1,940,260	$32,000 (6s.	£4,800
Natal	543,913	(1893)	£1,069,678	£4,000	
Western Australia	49,782	(1893)	£570,651	£4,000	
Gold Coast	1,473,882	(1893)	£201,783	£4,000	
Tasmania	146,667	(1893)	£706,972	£3,500	

* Reals.

Now, Sir, according to that table, showing the population, the revenue and the salary, in thirteen other British colonies, we find that the colony of Victoria, with nearly 3,000,000 people less than Canada, pays her Governor General the same salary that we do; and we find that in none of the colonies I have quoted is the salary less than $17,500, and in one of them, Tasmania, there is a population of only 146,667. I think that indicates a feeling upon the part of our fellow-colonists in the colonies I have named, that there is an absolute necessity, in order to acquire the services of a first-class man, that a first-class salary should be attached to the office. When we come to consider the responsibility that rests upon the shoulders of the Governor General in a colony such as this, the foremost colony in Great Britain, a colony extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, lying alongside a foreign country, a colony that requires at its head a man of such experience and such weight as shall be able to properly consider our relations with that great nation to the south of us, I say that the people of Canada will insist, and I have no doubt Great Britain will also insist, upon our having a first-class man to fill that position. I think that from the experience that Great Britain has had in her colonies and from the views that are expressed in the despatch I read to the House a short time ago, it is a principle underlying the appointment of her Governors General that the colonies to whom they are appointed must pay those gentlemen a salary commensurate with the obligations and the duties that are imposed upon them. I think that when we go back and look over the list of the Governors General we have had since confederation, commencing with Lord Monck, Lord Lisgar, Lord Dufferin, the Marquis of Lorne, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Derby and our present Governor General, His Excellency the Earl of Aberdeen, we will see that Great Britain has done well by us; and I think it is only right that as she has sent us such able men, men who have governed us so well, we should not object to pay them salaries commensurate with their services. These gentlemen have left our shores leaving behind them brilliant reputations, in consequence of which Great Britain has seen fit to advance them in her diplomatic service, as she did in the case of Lord Dufferin who, immediately he ceased to be Governor General of Canada, was promoted to the highest Imperial position, namely, that of Viceroy to India, and Lord Lansdowne who was also appointed subsequently to the same position. These facts prove that Great Britain has given to us as Governors General men of the highest rank as statesmen, men whom we trust will be succeeded in the future by others of equal ability and statesmanship. Now, according to the proposition laid down by the hon. gentleman

in the argument he used, one would suppose that the position of Governor General was an empty one, that it had no duties attached to it, that it had no responsibilities attached to it, that required the people over whom His Excellency ruled to provide him with proper accommodation. I say that it having been established by our Act of union that we should have a Governor General appointed from Great Britain from amongst her foremost statesmen, it is the duty of this country to supply that Governor General with a proper residence, and to surround him with all the comforts that we can give him in this country. Because it must be remembered that these men leave comforts at home, the most of them are men of independent means, and you cannot expect them to come out here and forego all the comforts and all the luxuries they have enjoyed in the homes they have left, without some adequate compensation; and if we provide them with a proper residence, and surround them with proper comforts, and pay them a salary commensurate with their position, we are doing nothing more than it is our duty to do. It seems to me that when we look at what Great Britain does for us, when she chooses her first-class statesmen to represent our Sovereign in this country, when she maintains her navy, as she does at Halifax, and at the Atlantic stations, and at Esquimalt in the west, and when she guards our shores at either end, the least we can do in Canada in recognition of that protection, is not to quarrel and quibble in the House of Commons over the salary that we vote to Her Majesty's representative in this country. By way of emphasizing the duties and the responsibilities attaching to the office of Governor General, I may quote, I think, very acceptably from Todd upon this point. At page 32 of Todd's Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies, you will find the following:—

> There is, no doubt, a general impression abroad, amongst persons who have not bestowed much thought upon the matter, that the governor of a British colony or province is little less than an ornamental appendage to our political system; necessary to fulfil certain ceremonial duties, useful to represent the community at large upon public occasions, or as the mouth-piece of public sentiment; and of unquestionable service to society in the discharge of a dignified and liberal hospitality, to be freely extended to whoever may be a suitable recipient of vice-regal favour, without distinction of creed or party.
>
> But if this were all that we had a right to expect from a governor, it would be quite insufficient to justify the pre-eminence which is attached to his office as a representative of the Crown. Without underrating for a moment the incalculable advantages which society and the state derive from the fulfilment of the duties above enumerated, by men in exalted positions—assisted by the ladies of their household—such ceremonial observances and festivities might, without much loss of dignity or efficiency, be assigned to cabinet ministers and other prominent officers of government of adequate rank and fortune.
>
> The governor of a British dependency, however, within the limits prescribed by his commission, is essentially a political officer; and the necessity for his office must be estimated as to the gravity and importance of the duties allotted to him in the body politic. If his duties in that relation are mainly formal, and his political functions of a small account, the continuance of the office will be apt to be regarded as an expensive luxury, which cannot be justified by an economical people, or endured in an age which is intolerant of shams.
>
> But if, on the other hand, a constitutional governor is actually invested with an authority which is eminently capable of being employed for the public good, and if he fills a place of trust wherein he is competent, upon fitting occasions, to interpose to guard and protect the political liberties of those over whom he presides—then, it becomes the interest, as well as the duty, of all good citizens to respect his office and to strengthen and uphold him in the exercise of his lawful prerogatives.

I hold that no person can dispute the position taken by Mr. Todd, that to uphold the dignity of the Governor General's office and surround it with all the safeguards that are necessary, it is our duty, as those over whom he governs, to assist him in every way at our command. The hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill has stated that his remarks were entirely of an impersonal nature, and he very properly referred to the fact that the present incumbent of the high office of Governor General is giving the greatest possible satisfaction to the people. I am satisfied, although I do not speak with any authority, that coming down to the question of salary, so far as the present incumbent is concerned, His Excellency himself has spent twice the amount of his salary every year he has presided over the destinies of this country. When Great Britain sends us men of such eminence as Lord Aberdeen, who with his consort, grace and dignify the position they hold, as they do, are so lavish in their expenditures in all parts of Canada as they have been in the different visits made throughout the country, instead of asking this House to pass a Bill to reduce the salary of His Excellency, we should not only refrain from taking any such step but feel that we owe it as a duty to the Crown and to the incumbent of the office that the salary should remain at the figure at which it was placed in 1867 by the fathers of confederation, more particularly in view of the fact that as this country has increased and its bounds been extended the responsibilities attaching to the office have increased, the different questions involved in the Government of this country, owing to the diverse nature of the Dominion and the contending influences which prevail, entailing greater responsibilities to-day than they did formerly, and the House will agree with me that the hon. member for North York cannot expect to proceed further with his present Bill. I move that this Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. McMULLEN. In entering on a discussion of this very important question, which is undoubtedly important owing to the fact that very large sums of money are spent under the head of Governor General and staff and the residence he occupies, I think the hon. Minister might have prefaced his address in reply to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) without charging the hon. member with aiming at cheap popularity. I do not think the Minister was justified in imputing to the hon. member who introduced the Bill a motive of that kind. It is well known that the question with regard to the expenses connected with the Governor General's salary and residence have forced the subject for discussion in this House for several years. The hon. Minister made some remarks as to the salaries paid in other British colonies; but if he will refer to the colonies he will find that those colonies have reduced themselves by extravagance almost to a state of bankruptcy. He referred to the Australian colonies. What has been their condition during the past few years? We know that owing to extravagance of those Governments, they have been in a deplorable condition and one very trying to the people. At the time the Governor General's salary was fixed, as was pointed out by the hon. member for North York, it was fixed at that sum until such time as the Parliament of Canada should change it either to a lesser or greater amount. The Parliament of Canada did within a few months express its view, and reduce it to $32,000 per annum. The hon. Minister read the reply of the Home Government with respect to that action. I should like to emphasize one or two points in that regard. In the first place it says:

> I need scarcely say that it is with reluctance, and only on serious occasions, that the Queen's Government can advise Her Majesty to withhold the Royal Sanction from a Bill which has passed two branches of the Canadian Parliament. The present, however, is a measure which has important bearings, far beyond its first aspect as a mere reduction of expenditure.
>
> The annual salary of the Governor General was fixed at £10,000 so lately as last year by the Imperial Act of Union: within the first few months of the existence of the new Parliament of Canada it is proposed to reduce that salary to £6,500.

The reason is there given why the royal assent was withheld from the Bill; it was simply because only a short time had elapsed since the salary had been fixed at £10,000 and the reduction to £6,500 might have been made without due consideration. No doubt it was thought that the people of Canada had not had a full opportunity of considering the measure, that there had not been sufficient experience, and time had not been allowed to see the development of the country. The Minister said there had been great development in Canada. I contend that the fathers of confederation when they cast the political machinery for the Dominion anticipated that Canada to-day would contain at least double the population it possesses. They cast that machinery on altogether too ponderous and expensive a scale. We are beginning to realize that now. The general feeling throughout this country is that the expenses of Government are altogether too high. There is not an elector in this Dominion, with some few exceptions, who does not appreciate the presence of the representative of Her Majesty here. But, under our financial embarrassments, with a deficit of $1,200,000 this year, and prospective deficit of four and a half millions next year, I do not think that Her Majesty, or her Government, would find fault at Canada making general reductions in our expenditures. Everything the Governor General needs for himself and his household he is permitted to bring in duty free, so that he does not contribute a dollar to our revenue. Had Rideau Hall been properly managed from the beginning, I doubt very much if there would be this general feeling of complaint with regard to our extravagance in this matter. Notwithstanding the glowing statements made by the Minister (Mr. Daly) with regard to the dignity of the position, and the desirability of having men of great ability to fill it, the people undoubtedly believe that reductions must be made in this department. I admit that it is very important to have a man of ability to discharge the duties of Governor General, and if ever there was a period in the history of our confederation when it was necessary to have a man of great ability at the head of affairs, that time is the present. The more incapable a Government is, the greater the necessity for having a man of great ability as Governor General. I appreciate the ability of Lord Aberdeen, and I have no doubt that it will take all the ability he possesses to so direct the affairs of the country now as to cause them to tend towards the interests of the people of the country. Notwithstanding all this, I believe that I express the opinion of the people when I say that we should be less extravagant in this expenditure. The intention of my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) is to reduce the salary of the Governor General to $35,000 a year, or $3,000 more than was provided for in the Bill which was disallowed in 1868. Thirty-five thousand dollars to-day will secure more of the ordinary wants of life than £10,000 would twenty years ago. Even from that standpoint, we are justified in asking for a reduction. I have myself a Bill on the Order paper to reduce the salaries of Lieutenant-Governors, and if it should be reached, I intend to give figures to show that Canada is paying more, per capita, for Governors and Lieutenant-Governors than any other portion of Her Majesty's dominion, or than any other country blest with responsible government. The enormous amount spent on repairs and

furniture and other items in connection with Rideau Hall proves that there must be something wrong. It is absurd to have spent $547,143 for the last twenty-five years in alterations and improvements on a property that cost $82,000 for land and all. That shows that gross extravagance has characterized the administration of Rideau Hall affairs. It has become nothing short of a political sink hole on which a whole lot of money has been squandered in one way and another. Then look at the amount of money that has been paid for wages to vegetable gardeners and botanic gardeners, and others who have been employed around there. It is no wonder that the people of Canada are getting sick and tired of the continuance of that condition of things. If Rideau Hall is to continue to exist, then, in my opinion, it would be a thousand times better to erect substantial buildings for the accommodation of His Excellency, than to spend thousands and thousands of dollars in maintaining the present tumble-down concern. I am in favour of the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock), and I am quite confident that if Her Majesty's Government are cognizant of the stringent financial condition of Canada they will not refuse to reduce the Governor's salary to $35,000. My hon. friend (Mr. Daly) has mentioned some of the very excellent men we have had here in that position. Well, Sir, I have had it on fairly good authority, authority that leads me to place implicit confidence in the statement made to me, that one Governor General who spent five years here, after paying all the ordinary expenses out of the money he got for fire and light, and otherwise, actually brought home with him a saving of $200,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. Gentlemen opposite may cavil at that, but you must remember that the Governor General gets $13,000 a year for fire and light, and gets nearly all the attendance inside and outside of his office and residence free, it is paid for by Canada. It is a very decided advantage to him that he is allowed to import everything he wants free of duty. Well, Sir, after all that, I have good reason to believe that that Governor General took home $200,000 to reduce the mortgage on his estate over there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. In the face of that, I do contend that this House would be justified in making a reduction in the salary of the Governor General.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend allow me. If he is going to found an argument on that statement, for abolishing or lowering the salary of the Governor General, he should be able to state it as a fact, and not give it as hearsay. I do not understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) to state that as a fact.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not prepared to verify the statement, I must admit, but I have been so informed by a person who was in a position to know.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me for one moment.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman cannot interrupt me.

Mr. McNEILL. Certainly not if you do not wish it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Now, Sir, I am satisfied that the expenses connected with Rideau Hall have tended to stir up a feeling of dissatisfaction amongst the people of this country. The hon. Minister of the Interior appears to suppose that my hon. friend from North York wants to cultivate popularity with a certain class of people. Well, I can tell my hon. friend that the views he has just expressed are not confined either to the Patrons of Industry, the Grits or the Tories. There is a very large class of people throughout this Dominion who are strongly in favour of a reduction in the Governor General's salary and in the expenses of Rideau Hall; and if the hon. Minister will go to some meeting in the country and try to impress upon his audience the advisability of continuing the extravagant expenditures connected with that office and its surroundings, he will get very few to cheer him. Why, in the item of fire and light alone since the beginning of the establishment, $151,370 has been spent, and on travel no less than $147,103. The whole cost of government in this country is altogether too much. We have thirteen Ministers, each drawing a salary of $7,000 and a sessional allowance of $1,000; and I must say that if $7,000 was considered an ample allowance twenty years ago, $4,000 should be considered an ample allowance now. $4,000 would procure to-day more of the necessaries of life, or the ordinary supplies required by a member of the Cabinet, than $7,000 would twenty years ago. Wheat, flour and other supplies are not over half the price they were. We pay the thirteen Cabinet Ministers $92,000 in salaries and $13,000 in sessional allowances; we provide them with private secretaries costing $9,000; we pay a deputy speaker, $2,000; we pay two Controllers, $13,200. That makes $129,200 for our Cabinet Ministers and our two Controllers; and we have also a Solicitor General who costs us $6,000 a year. That is only part of the expense. Adding the provincial assemblies, we have in this country 715 law makers for 4,800,000 people, or one for every 1,400 families. Of these about fifty are Ministers of the Crown. Now, I believe we are beginning in the right way to reduce this burdensome expense, and I would like to see the Bill now before the House passed into law. I believe the Ministers of the Crown, could well afford to submit to a reduction,

so as to meet the demand of the people of this country for a general reduction all around. I have no doubt that Sir John Macdonald was quite sincere at the time he expressed the opinion in favour of continuing the Governor General's salary at £10,000. That was many years ago, when no doubt he anticipated a very great increase in our population. Everybody then believed that when we got our North-west opened up and the construction or the Canadian Pacific Railway completed our population would increase from three or four millions to eight or nine millions; and had it done so there would not have been so much complaint about the cost of Government. But when you consider the whole condition of things in this Dominion and the experience of other colonies that have been extravagant in this regard, you must see that it is time for us to call a halt and make a decided effort to bring the annual expenditure of the country down to a figure which our people can bear without feeling the burden so seriously as they do to-day. I believe we could reduce the expenditure of this country by five or six millions if the Government were only ready and willing to consent to it. I believe we could reduce the expenses of the Civil Service by from $500,000 to $750,000, if the Government would put fewer of their friends in office, and only employed men to fill the offices because they were capable and because they were needed. We have too many men, both in the inside and the outside service, who are drawing salaries for doing little or nothing; and we want a general trimming in all directions, beginning with the Governor General and going down to the lowest civil servant. In this way and in this way only shall we meet public sentiment in favour of diminishing the burdens of the people.

Sir JAMES GRANT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 25th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LAKE MANITOBA RAILWAY AND CANAL COMPANY.

Mr. TAYLOR moved:

That so much of the Eighth Report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines as relates to Bill (No. 75) to revive and amend the Act respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company, be referred back to the said Committee for further consideration.

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the hon. gentleman to let that motion stand until to-morrow.

Motion allowed to stand.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 132) to revive and amend the Acts to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. Martin.)

CRIMINAL CODE, 1892.

Mr. LAVERGNE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 133) to again amend the Criminal Code, 1892. He said: The object of the Bill is to allow a magistrate in preliminary investigation or summary conviction to extend the time for adjournment to sixteen days instead of eight days as now provided. We are met with great inconvenience in some districts of our province when the magistrate has to administer some three or four districts. As the limit of the adjournment is only eight days, sometimes the magistrate will come for the purpose of adjourning the case, and will come a week after that to deal with it seriously. I think there should be no objection to this measure especially when the defendants are under recognizances. It simply changes a word in two sections of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 125) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th day of June, 1895, and for other purposes relating to the public service.—(Mr. Foster.)

CRIMINAL CODE—JOINT COMMITTEE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved:

That the quorum of the select joint committee appointed by this House and the Senate to consider Bill (No. 51) be reduced to nine members, and the committee have leave to report from time to time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman mean nine from our side?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Nine altogetner.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It may be composed of members of the Senate entirely.

Mr. DALY. There are about seven, I think, from the Senate. Nine is a large quorum.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If they take up substantive changes and put them in their code, it might be a little awkward, because they might have five of a quorum who might report on some radical changes, several of which I have heard talked of, and the effect of the report might be greater than it would be if the report was made by a majority.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We were forced to this step by the extreme difficulty experienced in getting so large a committee together, and nine was the full number attending on the last occasion.

Motion agreed to.

GENERAL REVENUE FUND—NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Resolution (p. 2573) reported from Committee (p. 3209) respecting certain fines, penalties and forfeitures in the North-west Territories, was read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. DALY then moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 134) to legalize payments heretofore made to the General Revenue Fund of the North-west Territories of certain fines, penalties and forfeitures.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUBLIC WORKS ACT.

Bill (No. 123) further to amend the Public Works Act, was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the Minister what is the precise meaning of this last proviso: "Provided always that such public works shall, whenever practicable, be sold or leased by tender or at a public auction."

Mr. OUIMET. This means that in all cases the sale of public works shall take place by public tender or by public auction, except when it is impossible to do so. Here is a case in point: Finding that we had an old property in Hamilton which was of no more use to the department, the old custom-house, I directed that the property should be valued and advertised for sale at an upset price. Well, the upset price was not reached, but an offer was made to the department a little under that price by a public body who intended to use it for the purpose of a public institution. In a case like that, I think that, on application to Council, an Order in Council should authorize the department to accept a lower price than the price set up in the advertisement for public sale.

Mr. LAURIER. The reasoning of the hon. member is convincing, but I do not think the object will be carried out by that proposal at all, because you provide that such public works shall be sold or leased by general or public auction whenever practicable. The Government is to determine when it is practicable, but the rule the hon. gentleman lays down is that the sale shall take place by public auction. I do not think that the section is framed so as to meet the hon. gentleman's object, and it requires amendment.

Mr. OUIMET. We might amend the clause by saying, "Provided always that such public work shall be sold by tender or auction after public advertisement, unless otherwise authorized by the Governor General in Council."

Mr. LAURIER. What is the reason?

Mr. OUIMET. It is not necessary to state the reason. Of course, the public advantage would be a sufficient reason, but I do not see that it is necessary to state the reason in this Act; that shall be done in the Order in Council.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is an empowering clause. The hon. gentleman proposes to pass it with limitations, and the clause stands with the words "whenever practicable." Those words are sometimes used where property has been sold by a party who is entitled to receive it back again in case the Government no longer require it. In that case, it would no longer be practicable to sell it at public auction, as there is only one person having legal right to purchase. It seems to me that what the hon. gentleman wants with a provision is to declare that where it has been found impossible to obtain a purchaser at public auction, then the Government may undertake to sell.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman will notice that it not only concerns the sale of property, but also the leasing of property, and I think it is a sufficient security for the public that no sale of that kind should take place under the authority of the Minister alone, but that the sale should be made a matter of public notoriety, as Orders in Council are published every year, and they are always the property of the public after a certain time. This should be a sufficient guarantee. But as it concerns leases as well as sales, it would be very awkward, I should think, in case of a lease, to be obliged every time to resort to public advertisement, and to public tender. Therefore, I would propose to add the words, "Unless otherwise authorized by the Governor General in Council."

Mr. MULOCK. Under what circumstances would it happen that the Government could not first endeavour to sell the property by public auction after the sale had been publicly advertised? There are serious objections to selling by tender, as compared with selling

by public auction. A sale by public auction is open to all the world, there are no tenders to be trifled with. the property after being duly advertised is open to competition and altogether such a system would prove more satisfactory to the Government and to the public. I think the rule should be to try and sell or lease property by public auction first, and to dispose of it by tender only as the last resort. Perhaps the Minister can suggest some cases in which this plan would not work.

Mr. OUIMET. Different ideas prevail as to which of public tender or public auction is the best mode of disposing of public property. In both cases, however, sale could not take place unless the property had been advertised. I think the experience of every one who has had to transact business of this kind is that sale by public tender is preferable. At public auctions it may happen that very few persons are present, it may even occur that there is collusion between the bidders so that a lower price is obtained than was expected. In case of a sale advertised for public tender it is not necessary to accept any tender made, any more than it is necessary to accept the last bid at a public auction. When sale is by public tender and is publicly advertised, that is all that can be done, leaving upon the Minister and the Governor in Council the responsibility of taking all proper precautions to guard the public interest.

Mr. MULOCK. We have had numerous cases of property being disposed of by tender. For example, a few years ago large sections of timber land in the so-called disputed territory were disposed of by tender. When the returns were laid before the House, it appeared that those tenders consisted of two communications to a couple of persons asking them to tender.

Mr. OUIMET. That was not a public tender.

Mr. MULOCK. Valuable leaseholds in the North-west Territories were disposed of by tender. Does the hon. Minister maintain that that is the best way of obtaining full value for the property? And yet this was selling or leasing by tender within the provision of the present clause. If we are called upon to dispose of the public domain, the best course to pursue, taking it all in all, is to test public opinion through the medium of an auction sale, for a sale by public tender is wholly insufficient to make known to the public that certain property is to be sold or leased. I quite agree that the Government are not bound to accept the highest bid at an auction sale, yet it would be more satisfactory to the Minister and afford a stronger guarantee to the public if the mode of selling by public auction were adopted, and the average result would be better prices. I am not at all favourable to resorting to sale by tender, if it is possible to sell by public auction. Does the Government propose to dispense with public advertising?

Mr. CURRAN. No.

Mr. MULOCK. Under the proposed provision, it would be possible to get an Order in Council passed dispensing with public advertising.

Bill reported.

SECOND READINGS—IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 123) further to amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. Ouimet.)

Bill (No. 113) to amend Chapter 10 of the Statutes of 1892, respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers.—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 124) further to amend the Act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.—(Mr. Ouimet.)

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 116) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Daly.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This Bill is somewhat unusual in its character, because it proposes to exempt persons from the operations of a law already in existence. There has been no doubt a great deal of difficulty to prevent persons taking possession of school lands as trespassers, but the hon. Minister has not, as far as I know, stated how these persons came in possession, or how it was, if they were wrongfully in possession, that the Government took no steps to protect the lands against improper occupation. The intention in reserving lands of suitable quality as school lands, was that they might increase in value, and that their sale would form a substantial fund for school purposes. If persons go into possession contrary to law, and are allowed to remain in possession, as the hon. gentleman by this Bill states that they have been for fifteen years, I do not know how he is going to protect any school lands at all. If he adopts this rule, the result will be that every man will know that if he goes upon a lot reserved for school purposes, and manages to remain in possession a certain length of time, the Government will ultimately ratify his occupation and give him possession of the property, just as if it had been properly opened for occupation and settlement. I think the principle of the Bill is a very important one in its practical consequences, and I have not heard from the Minister any reason for it.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman has no doubt forgotten that in 1893 similar legislation was introduced and passed in this

House, and that at that time I explained that the reason for it was that in the years 1874 and 1875 a number of people squatted on these lands in the townships mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before they were surveyed ?

Mr. DALY. Some had been surveyed and others not. It appears that at that time there were not other lands available for homestead entry in that neighbourhood ; and these people went there, some in ignorance that they were squatting on school lands owing to the absence of a survey, and others taking them up because, as it is alleged, no other lands were opened for settlement. Upon looking at the Bill the hon. gentleman will see that the lands are all confined to three townships in one locality.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In the old railway belt ?

Mr. DALY. Yes. The Bill applies only to people who performed their homestead duties prior to the 1st January, 1880. We are not departing from any principle of the land laws. The Bill is introduced by arrangement with the local government and with their consent, in order to settle a long-standing grievance. We thought in 1893 that we had included all the parties who had squatted in these particular townships ; but it appears that we had not, and we caused advertisements to be published last year, the result of which was that we received applications from these people. Each case was separately investigated, and the departmental officers saw that only the persons who came within the category I have mentioned, and who were not included in the former Act, should be included now. We are simply meting out to the people an act of justice which should have been accorded to them years ago, and in accordance with the desire of the local government.

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

SUPPLY—THE PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

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

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to submit to the consideration of the House an amendment to the motion of the hon. leader of the House. I propose, Sir,

That all the words after " that " in the original motion be left out, and the following be substituted :—This House declares that since 1880 the public expenditure has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.

I think, Sir, that if we examine the expenditures of this country since 1880, we shall discover that this motion is not an untimely one, or submitted at an inopportune period, nor will its adoption be of no practical consequence. During the past fifteen years we have had a public expenditure which, in my opinion, has been far out of proportion to the wealth, the resources and the population of this country. Our expenditure, when you count what has been made on capital account as well as what has been taken from ordinary revenue, will certainly average $40,000,000 a year. Now, $40,000,000 a year capitalized would mean $1,000,000,000 ; and so it is clear that of the private property of the people of this country there is pledged for the purposes of this Government alone $1,000,000,000 to pay this annual charge of $40,000,000. The adoption, some years ago, of the principle of charging a certain portion of the expenditures of the country to capital account had the effect of concealing from the public view to no small extent the actual amount of our expenditures. We have had charges made to capital account for public works, for railways and canals, for railway subsidies and for Dominion lands. Every year for the last ten or twelve years you have had a certain sum charged to capital account in connection with the Dominion lands, in this way concealing the fact that our expenditure for the survey and settlement of these lands has often exceeded the amount of revenue derived from them. To show how large our expenditure has been on capital account, in addition to the very heavy rate of taxation which has been charged, I need only point to the growth of the gross debt of this country. The public debt of Canada in 1867 was $93,046,000 ; in 1875 it was $130,778,000 ; in 1878 it was $174,957,000 ; in 1888 it amounted to $284,500,000 ; and in 1895 the gross debt of this country has reached $308,348,000. Now, in addition to the very high rate of taxation which has been imposed upon the people, this indicates a very rapid growth of public liabilities. If you add to this the provincial indebtedness, the municipal indebtedness, the railway indebtedness of the country—I count the railway indebtedness because it is very obvious that if these railways are to do more than pay running expenses, the burden must fall upon the people, and that is a legitimate charge to take into account when considering the liabilities of a people —and if you include the private indebtedness of the population : if you count all these sources of liabilities, it will be seen that we are practically in a condition of villeinage ; and although the ordinary yeoman may hold his estate free from any charge which he has incurred himself, there have been incurred on his behalf and in spite of any objection on his part the very serious liabilities I have mentioned. These are a burden upon him as certainly as if he had incurred them himself. Sir, when you look at the various charges for public purposes which have been incurred from year to year, it will be seen that the growth

of our taxation has been far more rapid than the growth of this country in either wealth or population. In 1873-74, the cost of the Civil Service in this country was $883,685; in 1878 it was $823,369. During the five years of the Liberal Administration of Mr. Mackenzie, the cost of civil government had actually diminished by $60,000. Now, there has been since then a constant growth, and it is impossible to refer to any succeeding year without finding that the cost of civil government in that year was greater than the cost in the year that preceded. In 1878, the cost of civil government was $823,369; in 1883, $1,084,417; and in 1893 it was $1,402,279, so that from 1878 until the present, the cost of civil government has increased 70 per cent. There has been no such increase in population, and there has been no corresponding increase in wealth. Then, if you take the ordinary expenses of government, what may be regarded as the controllable expenditure of the country, in 1873-74 it was $8,324,076, and in 1878 it was $6,542,510, or nearly two million dollars less; in 1883 it was $9,419,482; in 1893 it was $11,867,042; and in 1894 it was, in round numbers, $13,000,000, so that there has been an increase in those controllable charges of 100 per cent since 1887-88. Now, if we look at every department of the Government we will find there has been corresponding increase. It is perfectly obvious, when you examine the various departments, that there has been nothing like a systematic conduct of public business. There has been an overcrowding of every department from political consideration. Members have importuned Ministers to find a place for A, B or C, because of his eminent services to the party or the valuable services of some of his friends; and the result has been that a large number of persons have been placed in the public departments for whom there is nothing to do. In 1877 there was in the Department of Agriculture, including the emigration branch, 26 persons employed, messengers and clerks, the salaries of whom amounted to $32,304. If you add to this the cost of contingencies, you will have something over $40,000. In 1893, we find the number had increased from 26 in 1877 to 104 clerks and messengers in 1893. The expenditure had risen for salaries from $32,000 to $75,988, and the contingencies had risen to $8,507, making an increase of 88 per cent in the cost of that department. Then, in the Department of Finance I find that in 1877 there were 38 persons employed at $53,412, and others as extra clerks whose salaries amounted to about $7,000. Now the number of clerks is equal to what it was before, and the expenses are $58,224 for salaries—or about $5,000 for extra and permanent clerks in the service more than in 1877-78. Then in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, there was, in 1877, 22 clerks at salaries amounting to $32,000, whereas in 1893 there was in that department 52 clerks at a total salary of $54,112, being an increase of 50 per cent. If we look at the Militia Department, we will find there is an equally rapid growth in the cost of management of that department. In 1877 there were 29 clerks, whose salaries amounted to $42,192. In 1893-94, there were 52 clerks, whose salaries amounted to $51,332, and the contingencies amounted to $18,747; or there was an expenditure of $70,000 in 1893 as against $42,000 in 1877. Then, in the Department of Justice, I find that in 1877 there were 14 persons employed, whose salaries amounted to $18,724, and in 1893 there were 15 employed with salaries of $24,455. And in the penitentiary branch of that department there were three clerks, the expenditure in connection with whom amounted to $2,877. In 1893 there was the same number, whose salaries and expenses amounted to $6,525, or an increase of over 100 per cent. Then in the Department of the Privy Council there has been a very extraordinary increase. The leader of the House last year informed us that this was in part due to the fact that the Ministers had adopted the practice of bringing to Council a great many matters which were formerly disposed of by the Minister as head of his department—that many matters which are properly matters of administration by the Ministry have been made matters of decision by Order in Council. This, I pointed out last year, was a very inconvenient practice; it was not consistent with the patent of office which the Minister held and must necessarily lead to delay in the conduct of the public business and very considerable increase in expense. Now, I find that in 1877 there were 13 clerks employed in the Privy Council office, whose salaries amounted to $21,415, and the whole contingencies of the department—there were no extra clerks—to $2,996, or in all, $24,441. In 1894 the number of clerks had risen from 13 to 49, and the expenses from $21,000 to $34,925. The contingencies in all were $19,072, or contingencies for extra clerks, allowing $8,492, making an aggregate of $52,489 as the aggregate expenditure of that department of the civil service, against $24,441 in 1877. Then the organization of the Trade and Commerce Department renders it necessary, in order to trace the increased expenditure, to see what the charges were for the Department of Inland Revenue and the Department of Customs when each had to support a Minister at its head. In 1877 the Department of Customs had 23 permanent clerks, whose salaries amounted to $34,321, and the contingencies for extra clerks and writers to $4,000, making $38,321 in all. The Department of Inland Revenue had at that time 23 clerks at salaries aggregating $30,777 and contingencies amounting to about $4,000, making $34,777 for the department, or $73,098 for these two departments combined in 1877. Now, in 1893-94 we have, under a Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Department of Customs and the Depart-

ment of Inland Revenue, and some special provision which concerns the business of the Minister himself. We see that there were 46 clerks employed in these two departments in 1877. To-day there are in the Customs branch 46, and in the Inland Revenue branch 54, and in the Trade and Commerce branch, as near as I can ascertain, permanent and extra clerks, 12. The charges at the present time for the Department of Customs is $37,721; for Inland Revenue, $60,474, and the Trade and Commerce Department, including the salary of the Minister, $12,998, or a total of $111,193, as against $73,098 in 1877. Then in the Post Office Department there is perhaps more marked progress in the growth of expenditure than in almost any other department of the Government. In 1877 there were 97 clerks employed in that department, their salaries aggregating $88,239. And for contingencies, in payment of extra clerks, the expenditure was about $5,500; or in all, $93,739. In 1893 you have 321 clerks at salaries aggregating $232,169, contingencies $3,612, a total of $235,781, as against $93,739 in 1877. Then in the Department of Secretary of State in 1877 there were 28 clerks, who were paid $38,336. These 28 clerks included those in the Stationery branch and in the Police branch, a total of 11 clerks who received $9,607; so that reduces the expenses in 1877 for purposes of comparison to $28,729 for 19 clerks. The charge for contingencies was $4,132; or a total of $32,862 for the Secretary of State's Department in 1877. In 1893-94, there are 40 clerks whose salaries amount to $50,137, and the contingencies amount to $3,000, making a total of $53,127, or an increase of upwards of 60 per cent in the cost of that department. They have taken away the North-west Mounted Police from the Secretary of State's Department. In 1877 there were two persons only employed as clerks in that branch, and their salaries amounted to $2,164. To-day the charges are $9,742 for salaries, and $5,694 for contingencies, a total expense of $15,436, against about $4,000 in 1877. Then, Sir, let us take the Public Works Department. It must be borne in mind that the Public Works Department in 1877 embraced both what is now the Department of Public Works and the Department of Railways. In 1877 there were 32 clerks in the department and their salaries, with the salary of the Minister—which I have included in each of these cases—amounted to $55,150, and the contingencies of every kind to $8,914, a total of $64,064 as the cost of the department in 1877. Now, in 1893-94, the Railways and Canals Department is separate, and to compare the cost of to-day with the cost of 1877 we are obliged to examine the number of persons employed in each of these departments and the amount of salaries paid for permanent and extra clerks. Now, in 1893-94, the Department of Public Works as it is now constituted has 32 clerks and one Minister at salaries amounting to $51,100. The chief engineer's branch has 28 clerks whose salaries amount to $23,617. The architect's branch has 30 clerks whose salaries amount to $27,658. The telegraph branch has two clerks with aggregate salaries of $2,230. The miscellaneous charges for clerks, 15 of whom are employed under this head, amount to $7,436. And there were 31 temporary clerks, evidently for a very short time, the payments to whom aggregate $1,853. The whole charges amount to $146,539, or leaving out the Department of Public Works specially so called, we have a total of $95,439. Now Railways and Canals to-day employ 32 clerks, whose salaries amount to $52,648, and the special officers of that department, including engineers and others, receive salaries amounting to $20,263. I am including contingencies, $6,397. Some of the charges incident to that department it will be seen are very considerable. Thus, on the Cornwall Canal, there has been an expenditure of $342,019 on the contract; the expenses of oversight and management of which amount to over 10 per cent, or $33,620. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House to the Department of Indian Affairs, the Interior, and Immigration. In 1877 the Indian branch, although a distinct organization, was not a separate department but was a part of the Department of the Interior. In that branch, in 1877, there were eight clerks, and I think there were two extra clerks, their salaries amounting to $9,176. To-day there are 54 clerks whose salaries amount to $51,014, and the contingencies, $5,967; or $56,981 were expended in 1893-94 as against less than $12,000 expended in 1877, or an increase of more than fourfold. Then in the Department of the Interior proper, in 1877, there were 28 clerks employed, at salaries amounting to $38,010, and the extra clerks employed in that branch were paid $1,123, or $39,133 for the year. In 1893-94 there were 93 clerks employed as against 28 in 1877, and their salaries amounted to $101,794 as against $38,010. Then, besides this sum, into the details of which I need not enter, there is a considerable sum due to the fact that a large portion of what would, under ordinary circumstances, and the ordinary way of making up the cost of the department, be charged against the inside service, is charged in the hon. gentleman's account and estimates against the outside service. This, I think, amounts to about $62,500, making in all $164,294. Then the hon. gentleman has a very large expenditure for immigration. The general expenditures amount to over $16,859. Now, there are emigrant agents employed in Canada in connection with this department, to whom $71,390 were paid in 1893-94. There are employed in the United States a number to whom are paid the sum of $61,890. In Europe, are persons whose salaries aggregate $150,154, and in Newfoundland, a most hopeful field for immigration, I suppose my

hon. friend thinks, there have been paid for this service $2,873. Now, when we look at the Geological branch, we find there have been paid to 32 persons, in 1893-94, $51,925. Let me invite the attention of the House, not to the whole Indian expense, but to the Indian expenditure in Manitoba, and the North-west Territories and British Columbia. Those are places at the greatest distance from the office, and they are the places which, in proportion as the distance increases, seem to increase the public burden. The Regina office, for which I think there is really no practical use, or it ought to be a very subordinate office indeed, there are 25 persons employed, to whom $31,212 are paid. There are 148 agents in the North-west Territories, to whom $103,604 are paid, part as travelling expenses and part as salaries. There are in the Territories 14,273 Indians, so that it costs to look after those Indians, $7.33 a head. By the treaties which we have made with the Indians, we are required to pay them $5 each, and in order that we may fulfil our obligations, we have to pay to an officer $7.33 to each Indian, or $2.33 more than the sum that the officer is required to pay over. In the case of the Manitoba superintendency, the expenses of the head office, with six officials amount to $6,070. There are 11 clerks as against 140 in the North-west Territories, whose salaries amount to $9,300; travelling expenses, $3,294, or $18,764 in all. So that the 9,436 Indians in the Manitoba superintendency cost us for official management, $2 per head as against $7.33 a head in the Territories. When we take into consideration the number of these agents, when we take into consideration the number of farm employees, when we consider the number of persons that are employed to distribute and oversee the payments of the money that is granted for various local purposes throughout the North-west Territories, we see what a very large army of persons are in the Government employ. I pass by the North-west Mounted Police, and I pass by the appropriations for public schools, for the teachers who are employed, and all the business that is being conducted under this central organization, and we find it is a species of political octopus whose tentacles are extended all over the North-west Territories. The Government form, in fact, an organized political force, through the Indian office, the Land office, the Mounted Police force, and the appropriations to establish territorial government in that country, as numerous as the American army was in former periods before the civil war.

Mr. DALY. That is right, I wonder you hesitate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, it is somewhat indefinite, but I think I will be able to show that so far as the expenditure is concerned in Canada up to the present time, and so far as the number of employees is concerned, there is not much indefiniteness about them, and we have a very clear and distinct statement of the amount of expenditure in the Estimates that are yearly submitted to us. You have a very large expenditure in the North-west Territories. In British Columbia the expenditure has grown even more rapidly than it has in the North-west itself. The House will remember that in the case of British Columbia we have no Indian annuities. The Government of British Columbia, prior to the union, recognized no sort of title on the part of the Indians to the possession of any portion of the territory. They provided in the articles of admission that we should deal with the Indians at least as liberally as they had done. But, except in the case of Governor Douglas, who conducted the affairs of the country under the Hudson Bay Company, prior to its organization as a province, I do not think any payment was ever made to any Indian band or tribe for surrender of territory in the province of British Columbia. So that as far as this Government was concerned, we had nothing like the condition that existed in the other provinces of Canada. Under the condition of things that existed in Canada prior to the union, where the title of the occupiers had been recognized in the Indians, where that title was extinguished when the territory was taken possession of with the consent of the tribes who were engaged in hunting or fishing over it, there was gradually formed for the use of the Indians, a fund, out of which they have since received annuities, and, except in this way, the Indian population, prior to the union, were not a charge upon the public revenues of the country. Since then, some expenditure has taken place. This expenditure was in part due to the control exercised over the Indians in the province of Nova Scotia, and in New Brunswick, where there were Indian reservations of limited extent, but where there were no Indian funds. The amount expended there has never been very large, and I am not accusing the Minister of being extravagant in his expenditures in those provinces. But I maintain that in Manitoba, and in the North-west and in British Columbia, a very different state of things existed, and I will undertake to point out to the House that there has been an amount of money expended in British Columbia, from which neither Indians nor the public have derived any corresponding advantage. When British Columbia came into the union, an Indian agency was established in the province, in order that the Government might exercise some supervision over them, to protect them against wrong, and see that those duties which were assigned to the Government of Canada by the British North America Act were properly discharged. Of course, the Government of Canada did not undertake specially to provide for the Indians; they had no duty of that sort de-

volving on them. The Indians west of the Rocky Mountains were rather an energetic race, and, in most cases, have proved capable to taking care of themselves. In a few cases there was sickness and destitution, for which relief was provided, but, beyond furnishing a small quantity of medicine, and paying certain medical charges, there was no charge made upon the public revenue, with this exception, that when reserves came to be established for those Indians, the Government of British Columbia appointed one commissioner, and the Government of Canada another, and those two commissioners agreed upon a third, and they were to constitute a Reserve Commission Board for the purpose of settling all reserves, and this work, it was supposed, would take five or six years. That board was found to be too expensive, and it was abolished, and by agreement with British Columbia, one commissioner instead of three, was appointed. I wish to call the attention of the House to the gradual progress in increased expenditure connected with the management of Indian affairs in that province, for which I venture to say there is no warrant whatever, either in the condition of the tribes of Indians or in the results which have been accomplished. In 1877 we voted a lump sum of $25,000, and, after paying over $6,000 for the maintenance of officials and officers in that province, the balance went towards the relief of the Indians. In 1880 the central office expenses were $8,248, this amount including salaries and rent. The reserve commission cost $14,425, and surveys, $11,594, or for these three items, out of a parliamentary appropriation of $48,531, $35,267 went to the payment of the officers, and $13,264 in various ways towards the Indians. In 1881 there was paid $7,781 for salaries, $12,771 for the reserve commission, and $11,008 for the surveys, or $31,561 as official expenses, out of a total appropriation of $41,401, or a sum of $9,840 was left for the aid of the Indians. Then in 1882 the salaries of officials amounted to $13,569. There had been a change made. There were districts established in which there were local agents, and so the amount for salaries was largely increased. There was paid for the reserve commission, $10,671; for surveys, $9,658; or $33,858 on those three items, out of a sum of $42,317 which was voted, leaving the sum of $8,459 to the Indians, as the balance having gone to maintain the official establishment. In 1883 there was paid for salaries, $18,985; for the reserve commission, $10,145; for surveys, $15,105; or a total of $44,236, out of less than $50,000 appropriated, leaving a balance of about $6,000 to the Indians. In 1884, the salaries of officials in that province were $21,493; the reserve commission, $7,506; surveys, $8,631; or a total of $37,631 out of an appropriation of $43,731, leaving $6,100 for the Indians. In 1885, the salaries paid were $22,181; for the reserve commission, $11,836; for surveys, $8,700, making a total of $40,717 as expense of Indian management, the whole of this being incurred for the purpose of paying to the Indians for medicine and various other purposes, $8,583. In 1886, the cost of salaries was $25,799; reserve commission, $10,075; surveys, $6,250; or a total of $42,125 out of an appropriation of $48,283, leaving to the Indians, $6,158. In 1887, the salaries were $30,061; reserve commission, $9,235; surveys, $16,951; or a total of $56,248 for the officials, and $5,096 for the Indians. The year 1888 was about the same as the year 1887. In 1889, the salaries were $47,704; reserve commission, $10,811; and the surveys, $12,407, or $70,922, leaving $12,091 for the Indians. In 1890, the salaries were $31,510; the reserve commission, $9,541; and the surveys, $9,341, making $50,392 for salaries, for watching and taking care of the Indians of British Columbia. In this year the Government established schools, and I have this to complain of, both in regard to British Columbia and Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Before the Government entered upon a policy of establishing a system of expensive industrial schools calculated to make a large permanent charge upon the revenues of this country, they ought to have submitted a scheme to the House, and asked a solemn expression of opinion from this House upon a policy which was not only to make a serious charge for the particular year when the system was initiated, but to make a large charge, perhaps, for many years to come. In British Columbia there were about $35,000 appropriated to schools in 1890, and $4,600 was paid out for medicines for the Indians of British Columbia who are many of them as competent to work as any other class, who are industrious, who are engaged in the lumber mills, and who are employed on the railways. They are, I say, as industrious a class as you will find among the labouring population anywhere, and why they should have been singled out, and an attempt made to pauperize them by adopting a policy such as here indicated, I do not very well see. There is this, Mr. Speaker, apart from the appropriation to schools—how much of that they got I will not venture to say, because I have not had time to analyse these accounts—but so far as the $102,000 are concerned, 50 per cent went towards the payment of the officials to take charge of this Indian population, every man of whom, I believe, is capable of taking care of himself. In 1891, the salaries were $27,821, the reserve commission $6,326, the surveys $8,900, and for medicines $3,500, making for salaries and surveys $43,057 on a total appropriation for that year of $85,000. In 1892, the salaries were $30,642, the reserve commission $8,444, the surveys $9,473, making $48,560 out of an appropriation of $90,021. Besides, $5,500 of this sum was

paid for medicines. Then, in 1893, the salaries were $31,833, the reserve commission $8,243, and the surveys $9,646, or $49,723, and besides, $4,500 for medicines out of an appropriation of $106,838. Then, in 1894, we find that there are $30,500 for salaries, $8,000 for the reserve commission, $9,672 for surveys, or $48,212 for these purposes. There were $53,200 for schools and $6,000 for medicine, making in all $107,412, of of which $5,000 was paid to relieve distressed Indians, and $1,700 to furnish them with grain. That is the total appropriation that went directly to them out of this sum. Now, Mr. Speaker, looking at these fifteen years to which I have referred, I find that during that period, there was paid for salaries and travelling expenses, under pretense of providing for the Indians of British Columbia, $387,000 for salaries, $143,000 as salaries to that reserve commission, and $165,880 for Indian surveys, or a total of $695,993. I ask the attention of the House to this fact: I ask hon. gentlemen to look at the report of that Indian Reserve Commission and see what they do. I ask them to look at the surveyors' report and see what the surveyors do for this money. Why, Mr. Speaker, $165,880 would survey five times over all the lands that the Indians in British Columbia require. There is no indication of this coming to an end. The expectation was, when the reserve commission was established, that it would complete its work in five or six years. It has been in existence sixteen or eighteen years, and it is going on, like the brook described by Tennyson, for ever. There is no termination to the expenses. They are continued for the purpose of the payment of the reserve commission, consisting of the Hon. Mr. O'Reilly, the two surveyors that are employed, and what else it is very difficult to say. It is rather an extraordinary proceeding that the Government should organize a very elaborate and expensive series of Indian offices scattered over the province of British Columbia, and that they should undertake to make an appropriation for Indian purposes, almost every dollar of which is consumed in the payment of the organization. That is the condition of things that exists, and that is one of the things that warrants what I have said: That the public expenses of this country have increased, are increasing, and ought to be diminished. Let us look at some of the charges in connection with these offices. In British Columbia, out of the $1,029,000 that have been appropriated under pretense of helping the Indians, there has been expended on officials $695,993, leaving $333,611, a considerable portion of which goes towards the maintenance of the industrial schools that are being built or that are being maintained. You have Indian salaries, $265,770 for the year; you have had for travelling expenses, $24,938; you have had for the Interior land office, $46,300; you have for other clerks, $43,726; you have for travelling expenses connected with the department, $40,180, and you have for other expenses $6,932, or you have $137,138 in Manitoba and the North-west Territories in addition to the $100,000 charged to capital account. Now, your expenditure on Government House in the Territories is $10,255 a year; registration office, $17,697; legislative assembly, $33,000; schools, $109,000; and aid to the public works in various districts, $61,000; and to Indians, $750,000. For the Government of the North-west Territories, you have $200,000, for immigration agents within the Territories you have $8,000, and for police you have $622,959.

Mr. DALY. Where does the hon. gentlemen get that $8,000?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have taken the salaries charged to persons resident in the Territories in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. DALY. Dominion lands agents as well, I suppose?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think so.

Mr. DALY. Of course, we are not responsible for what appears in the Auditor General's Report. Things are very badly mixed there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly not. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has a very large staff of persons employed in the North-west Territories to teach the Indians how to farm. They have been engaged there for the last fifteen years, and it is very interesting to notice what they have accomplished. According to the hon. gentleman's report for last year, there was harvested by the Indians of Manitoba and the North-west Territories 39,000 bushels of wheat, 16,500 bushels of oats, 58 bushels of peas, 13,000 bushels of barley and 3,216 bushels of other grains—71,774 bushels of various sorts of grains produced by 23,000 Indians under the fostering care of the numerous officers of the Government. If you take into account the value of the services of the Indians, you will find that to produce $1.20 worth of grain and roots it costs the Government 80 cents. You have very little more money resulting from the industry of all these farm labourers and all the Indians they can persuade to work than would be produced if the Government were to pay the money to the Indians and let them remain unemployed. The average earnings of the Indians amount to about 30 cents a month, or $3.60 a year. Now, it is reported that the Indians made last year by fishing and the chase, $248,000. So that, with a shotgun and a few pounds of powder and shot, an Indian makes about $6 a month, whereas if you put him to work and employ a large number of farmers to aid him, and pay them handsome salaries for doing so, his earnings

and theirs are less than 30 cents. You have $6 in the one case against 30 cents in the other. And yet the hon. gentleman has told the House that he is satisfied with the progress that these Indians are making. Now, Sir, I have shown that in almost every department of the Government the expenditures of the country are out of all proportion, beyond the requirements of the public service; and I think the House will agree with me that the present state of things, which I have not shown in detail, but of which I have given the barest outline, because the facts are open to every member to investigate for himself, warrants my proposing the resolution which I have read, and which I now place in your hands.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, although the hon. gentleman's motion charges the Government with general extravagance, he has devoted most of his time to a criticism of the departments over which I have the honour to preside, especially the Department of Indian Affairs. I can only liken the hon. gentleman to Rip Van Winkle. Because the hon. gentleman some sixteen or seventeen years ago had the honour for a few years of occupying the position I do now, he considers that the condition of the administration of Indian affairs and Dominion lands have remained exactly what they were then. In short, from what the hon. gentleman has said, one would conclude that Canada had not moved from that day to this, that our population had not increased, that the business of the Department of the Interior has not grown, but that everything had stood still from the time the hon. gentleman presided over the Department of the Interior. The hon. gentleman has been most unfair in his criticism of the expenditure on Indian affairs. He has given the House and the country to understand that it is the sole duty of the officers of the Indian Department to pay treaty money to Indians—that when we entered into treaty obligations with the Indians, all we had to do was to pay them so much per head per annum, and that the moment that was done, we had nothing whatever more to do with them. They could roam over that vast country as they pleased, with no restrictions whatever, and it was not the duty of the Government of Canada to try to raise them to the position of their white neighbours; but on the contrary, we should allow them to remain in the condition they were in at the time we made the treaties with them. The statements and arguments made by the hon. gentleman here to-day contradict the policy of the Government of which he was a member and the policy of the department over which he presided. I will show shortly that the policy this Government has pursued towards the Indians is exactly on the lines of the policy laid down by the hon. gentleman and the Government of which he was a member from 1874 to 1878. Now, Sir, what are the facts? At the time the hon. gentleman presided over the Department of Indian Affairs, taking the figures by provinces, the Indian population which we had to deal with in Ontario numbered 15,711; to-day it numbers 17,330. At that time there were five superintendents, one at a salary of $1,400; one at $1,600; one at $1,200; one at $1,300; and one at $900. To-day, we have three superintendents, whose salaries are respectively $800, $900, and $1,200. Then they had agencies, one each at Toronto, Brantford, and Parry Sound, and two at Manitowaning. To-day we have one agent at Brantford, Parry Sound, and Manitowaning respectively. They had twelve Indian agents then and three agency clerks; now we have only fourteen, and two clerks, although the Indian population has increased 2,000. After the 30th June, 1878, three more agents added to the staff of outside officials, making in all, fifteen agents at that time. In Ontario and Quebec, together, the expenditure at that time was $28,071; to-day it is $55,412. The cost per head then was $1.63; to-day the cost is $2.24. This increase is due entirely in Ontario to the schools and salaries paid to the inspectors, and the increased cost entailed by the payment of treaty moneys under the Robinson treaty. In the province of Quebec, the Indian population dealt with in 1878 was 4,852; in 1874 it was 7,320. At that time, ten agents were employed, and the same number is still employed; and of the agents we have now, one is paid by commissions on land sales. What was the condition of these Indians in 1878 and 1874 in Ontario. In 1878 they had 46,063 acres under cultivation. To-day they have 78,382 acres under cultivation. Then they had 4,221 buildings; to-day they have 6,115. They had stock then to the amount of 13,108 head; to-day their stock amounts to 15,552 head. Their implements then numbered 6,953; to-day they have 11,018. They harvested, in grains and roots, in 1878, 305,427 bushels; and in 1894, 363,578 bushels. They raised, in 1878, 4,904 tons of hay, and in 1894, 11,501. The value of their fish, furs, and other industries, in 1878, amounted to $80,524; to-day they amount to $165,172. In Quebec, during the same period, taking the same items, the total value was $21,566, in 1878; and to-day the total is $109,837, showing the way in which the Indians have progressed during that time, and showing that the policy of the Government has had a good effect. In 1878, the Indians had fifty-three schools in Ontario, with a school-roll of 1,824 pupils. In 1894, they had eighty-three schools, with a school-roll of 2,341. In Quebec, there were ten Indian schools in 1878, with a roll of 320 children; in 1894, there were twenty, with a roll of 634. In Nova Scotia, the Indian population, in 1878, was 2,116; and in 1874 it was 2,141. There were thirteen agents then; now there are sixteen. The expenditure

then was $5,324.46, or $2.52 per head; the expenditure now is $6,413, or $2.99 per head; and taking the acreage under cultivation, the buildings, stocks, implements, grains and roots, using the same table that I referred to in relation to Ontario, we find the total value, in 1878, was $11,581; and in 1894, $21,313. There were three schools in Nova Scotia in 1878, with ninety-nine children on the roll, and there are seven now, with 119 on the roll. In New Brunswick, the Indian population, in 1878, was 1,449; in 1894 it was 1,618. There were two superintendents then, and there is the same number now. There were then four missionaries, and now there are seven. There was then one medical officer; now there are five. The highest salary we pay to medical officers is $100, and the lowest, $20. The expenditure in New Brunswick amounted, in 1878, to $5,272.44; and in 1894 to $6,283.24. The cost per head in 1878 was $3.64; and in 1894, $3.88. Taking the same table as I gave for the other provinces, acreage under cultivation, buildings, stock, implements, grain and roots, hay, fish, fur and other products, the total value, in 1878, was $2,488 as against $35,850 in 1894. There were no Indian schools in New Brunswick in 1878; now there are five, with 102 children on the roll. In Prince Edward Island, the population, in 1878, was 306, and in 1894 it was 285. There was one superintendent then, and there is one now. The expenditure in 1878 was $1,829.23; and in 1894, it was $1,771.58. The cost, per capita, then was $5.97; and now it is $6.20. Taking the same table as in the case of the other provinces, the total value of the products in 1878 was $1,595, which has decreased to $200 now. There was one school in 1878, with twenty-two children on the roll. There is now one school, with thirty-three children on the roll. Now we come to British Columbia, to which the hon. gentleman referred at considerable length, in the latter portion of his address. The Indian population that was dealt with by the Mackenzie Government in 1878 was 5,427; the Indian population dealt with at present is 23,307. In 1878, when the hon. gentleman would lead the House to suppose there was no expenditure on Indian affairs in that province, we find there was one superintendent at Victoria, whose salary was $2,000; another at New Westminster, with a salary of $2,400; a medical officer, with a salary of $400; and a clerk at $1,500; making an aggregate of salaries, in 1878, of $6,900, as against the aggregate salaries there to-day of $5,500. There were three reserve commissioners then, and there is one now. There were three surveyors then, and there are three now. And, in addition to the agents which we had then, we have nine agents in British Columbia. These nine agents in British Columbia are scattered all over the province. As hon. gentlemen can understand, the Indian reserves are very numerous in British Columbia, and scattered over a large area of territory; and although there are nine Indian agencies there, in each agency is included a large number of reserves in the districts over which they preside. The number of agencies, I will give you later. The expenditure that was made by the Mackenzie Government in 1878 was $47,476, or $8.74 per head. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact. He has criticised the expenditure of this Government upon Indians in British Columbia, and I want to call his attention to the fact that the expenditure of the Mackenzie Government was $8.74 in 1878 as against $4.60 per head in 1894, the expenditure now being $107,081.65, as against $47,000 in 1878. I would also call his attention to the fact that the total assets which the Indians of British Columbia had in 1878 amounted to 2,528 head of stock, thirty-five implements, and fish and furs and other products, valued at $28,757. To-day they have 11,259 acres under cultivation, 6,547 buildings, 19,963 head of stock, 8,985 implements; they have harvested 144,766 bushels of grain and roots, and have raised 4,025 tons of hay. The value of their fish, furs, and other products, is $765,065. In 1878 there were nine schools in British Columbia, with 648 pupils; to-day there are thirty-one schools there and 843 pupils. Now, coming to Manitoba and the North-west Territories, to which the hon. gentleman referred at considerable length, we find that the population settled on the reserves and dealt with by the Indian Department in 1878 numbered 6,087. To-day it numbers 23,709. In 1878 there was one superintendent in Manitoba, one inspector, one surveyor, three clerks, and seven Indian agents. Now there is one inspector, three clerks, eight agents, and three medical officers. And in the North-west there were one superintendent, one clerk, three medical officers; and in the following year, on the recommendation of the superintendent, the staff was increased by four agents, one medical officer, one inspector and 19 instructors. In the North-west, in 1894, we had one assistant commissioner, three inspectors, one surveyor, one storekeeper, 16 clerks, 19 Indian agents, 14 agency clerks, 16 farm instructors, 16 interpreters and three medical officers. The expenditure in 1878 was as follows:—

Annuity money for 10,159 Indians in Manitoba	$ 54,558
Annuity money for 10,892 Indians in North-west Territories	95,424
Provisions, implements and general expenses in Manitoba	52,635
Provisions, implements and general expenses for North-west Territories	79,305
Surveys in Manitoba and North-west Territories	21,938
Cost of making treaties	73,000
	$376,858

Against an expenditure of $776,400 in 1894.

We thus see that after deducting the annuity money paid the Indians, and the cost of cattle and implements distributed among them, and the cost of surveys, the Government of the day spent nearly $50,000 in provisions, and $150,000 in doing the work; and we find from a return made to the department in 1878 that only 6,687 Indians all told in that country were settled on reserves. In 1894 the expenditure had increased by nearly $400,000. From 1874 to 1878—when the Mackenzie Government were dealing with the Indians, numbers of them had not come into treaty. And at that time the buffalo was roaming the plains and the Indian, from the buffalo, furnished himself with meat, he made clothing for himself and family, he furnished his tepees, and, with the robes he sold, he purchased all the tea and tobacco and the other little luxuries that he required. But with the advent of settlement the whole situation was changed. The buffalo disappeared. Then it became necessary, not only in the interest of the Indians, but in the interest of peace and settlement, that the Indians should be placed upon the reserves. And when they were placed upon the reserves the Government had to feed them, clothe them and look after them. It would be folly simply to set aside a certain number of acres of land as a reserve, and furnish buildings, and then for keep the Indians upon the reserves, because if they were not content to stay upon the reserves, they would be roaming at will killing cattle, stealing horses and otherwise interfering with the settlers. And it has been, and is now the policy of the Government, to use its best endeavours to educate the Indians to earn their own livelihood and to make themselves, as far as possible, independent of the Government. And the effect is shown in the reduction, year after year, in the amount appropriated for food for the destitute. Later on, I shall be able to show by the figures I shall give that every year since 1878 the vote for supplies for the destitute has gradually decreased; and, instead of the policy being an expensive one, as the hon. gentleman would give the House to understand, the money used to pay agents and other officers has resulted in the Indians being encouraged to go into farming and cattle raising, building schools and compelling the children to attend these schools, to teach them trades, blacksmiths and farmers and all the other trades that make up the usual callings of life. So the expenditure in that line has saved the country thousands upon thousands of dollars. Instead of spending an insignificant sum for destitute Indians, had we not entered upon this expenditure for special services of our agents and farm instructors, we should be obliged to spend $500,000 or $600,000 a year in feeding the Indians. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to read the report of the Department of Indian Affairs, he will see in the report for every agency a tabulated statement of the earnings of the Indians, the trades they follow, and the improvements they have made. And no person but one utterly ignorant of the question, one who had given neither care nor time to the consideration of it would make the statement the hon. gentleman has made or attempted to give the people to understand that the whole duty of the Government towards these Indians is to see that they get their treaty money. Why, Sir, the least thing we have to do is to pay treaty to these people; the easiest thing we have to do, the least expensive part of our work of administration is to pay this money. Is it to be supposed, Sir, that the policy of this Government was such that the Indians were to be left in the state of ignorance in which we took them into treaty? On the contrary the policy that we are carrying out to-day is the policy that was inaugurated by the hon. gentlemen in 1878. What did Hon. David Laird say upon this question in 1878? He was then superintendent. He says:

> I am unable to furnish any satisfactory information respecting the number of Indians in this superintendency who have accepted treaty allowances. * * * However desirable it may be to report on the operations during the past season, it is impossible in this country, where communication is so infrequent and irregular, to give a general report for the superintendency up to a later date than the 30th of June.
>
> I deeply regret that in this comparatively unorganized superintendency I have, as yet, been unable to obtain sufficient information to warrant me in attempting to give any statistics respecting the property of the Indians. Besides paying the annuities, the great work at present in this superintendency is distributing the agricultural implements, cattle and seed promised in the several treaties, and attending to those Indians who call to represent real or imaginary grievances, and to seek relief in their destitution.

I call the special attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Laird says that the great work at present is "distributing the agricultural implements, cattle and seed promised under the several treaties." And yet, according to the hon. gentleman we have no right to show these people how to use these implements, we must simply carry out our bald treaty obligations, hand over to them the implements and the oxen, but never teach them how to plough or to put in their seed. Then Mr. Laird says:

> Were it possible to employ a few good, practical men to aid and instruct the Indians at seed time, I am of opinion that most of the bands on the Saskatchewan would soon be able to raise sufficient crops to meet their most pressing wants.

Carrying out what was in the mind of Mr. Laird, we find that to-day upon many of the reserves the Indians are raising sufficient feed for themselves. And not only are they raising sufficient to support themselves, but, as I stated, they are grinding their own flour. I

would like the hon. gentleman to explain how that state of things could have been brought about if we had pursued the policy he speaks of to-day, simply handing over the implements and oxen without teaching the Indians to put in the seed. The Government did not pursue that policy, but a better and more sagacious policy, and we are reaping the fruits of that better policy to-day. In thousands of cases the Indians are raising their own grain and grinding it into flour, raising their own cattle and, from their own earnings, erecting their houses and furnishing them so that they live in comparative comfort. In this we have a condition of things that could not have existed had the policy enunciated by the hon. gentleman been carried out. I cannot conceive of any person who has had the slightest knowledge of the question coming to any other conclusion than that the Government would have been derelict in its duty if it had pursued any other policy toward these Indians than that it has pursued. What does Superintendent McColl, an appointee of Mr. Mackenzie, and still an officer of the Government, say in 1878, reporting on the Manitoba superintendency ? He says :

During the last summer I visited nearly all the Indian bands in the Manitoba superintendency. * * * * I am strongly of the opinion, from the opportunities of Indians throughout this superintendency, for cattle, seed grain, farming implements and schools, as well as from their urgent solicitations for farmers to teach them how to cultivate the soil, that, under judicious supervision and instruction, they would soon develop into successful agriculturists and skilful tradesmen.

Again we have an officer of the Mackenzie Government saying that we should supply them with cattle, seed grain, farm implements and schools ; and that at the urgent solicitation of the Indians, we should supply them with farmers to teach them how to cutivate the soil. And yet because we carried out the very suggestions made by Mr. Mackenzie's officer, and have provided them with farms, and with farm instructors to teach them how to cultivate the soil, the hon. gentleman takes exception to our policy and ridicules the idea. I would like to know how he can reconcile his statement to-day with the report he laid upon the Table of this House in 1878. Because, if it was a wise policy in 1878, when we had but 6,000 Indians under charge of the department in the North-west, to furnish them with farmers, how much greater is the necessity to-day when we have some 23,000 or 24,000 ? Now, in connection with the question of schools which the hon. gentleman criticises, let us see what Mr. McColl says :

The establishment of an industrial school in some central place, where the Indian youth of both sexes could be taught the various industries, so as to enable them to impart their knowledge thus acquired to their less-favoured kindred, would, in my judgment, be the most efficient and practical system to adopt for the amelioration of the present dependent condition of the red man, and for enabling him to become self-sustaining and independent.

And what has the Government done but carry out exactly what was recommended by Superintendent McColl in 1878, and what the hon. gentleman took the responsibility of recommending to the House by adopting the Indian report he laid upon the Table of the House in 1878 ? So that for this very expenditure that the hon. gentleman criticises, he and his Government must be held responsible in a great measure because they adopted the report that was made in 1878, and that would have been the policy of their Government had they remained in office. I say this to the hon. gentleman, that I defy him or any other person to administer this department upon the lines upon which it is administered to-day, and carrying out the policy which was enunciated in 1878 by the officers and has been carried out since, with less expense and with fewer officers than we are doing at the present time. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. He is talking of something he knows nothing about, and I am talking of something of which I have had three years experience. Again, the hon. gentleman spoke of matters to-day as if they were in the same state as in 1878.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, I did not.

Mr. DALY. Yes, he did. He talked of matters to-day as if they had only slightly changed since 1878 ; and I have quoted figures showing indubitably that the expense per head of managing Indian affairs, not only in Ontario, Quebec and the other provinces, but in British Columbia and North-west Territories, is less per capita to-day than it was in 1878. Of course I cannot convince the hon. gentleman, he still shakes his head ; but the figures are there, and they speak for themselves. Although the hon. gentleman may not accept my facts or my figures, I am sure the country will be convinced.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? How is it that, according to his own report, the value of the Indian products is to the amount of salaries, as 120 is to 80.

Mr. DALY. What on earth has that got to do with the question ? Are we supposed to furnish agents who will give a quid pro quo for their salary ? Does the hon. gentleman not know that these agents and these farm instructors are necessary to keep the Indians at work ? Was it contemplated by Mr. McColl, or by the Hon. David Laird, that we were to appoint agents and farm instructors to make money out of the Indians ? Was it not with the expectation that they would help these men to become self-supporting ? I would ask the hon. gentleman to read the report of last year and of the year before, and he will see that from

almost every Indian agency in the North-west and Manitoba, there are examples given where the Indians are improving, and in other cases where they have become self-supporting. It was never supposed by any person that the Indian himself was going to return to this Government cent for cent the amount of money expended upon him. On the contrary, all we can expect to-day is to keep the Indians at work. Now, from what the hon. gentleman has said, if the Reform party came into power we may conclude that he would wipe out all the agents, all the farm instructors, so that the Indian would go back to the state in which we found him in 1878. The result would be exactly what we have found from experience. For instance at the Onion Lake reserves, a few years ago we removed a farm instructor. When that man was removed, the Indians had gardens, they had a great number of acres under cultivation, they had their lands fenced and were making progress; and by way of showing the effect of a policy carried out upon the lines laid down by the hon. gentleman, I may tell the House that the next year the Indians had nothing planted, the fences had fallen down, and the whole work that that Indian farm instructor had done for the three or four years previously, was left undone for one or two seasons, and that would be the result to-day, if the hon. gentleman's ideas were adopted. But the Indian farm instructor was sent back, and matters began to improve. We keep these Indian farm instructors to-day, and although the hon. gentleman wants to know the result of that work in dollars and cents, I take it that no person dealing with Indians looks for a dollar and cent return for the expenditure that is made upon them. But the hon. gentleman will see that they have made wonderful progress, and I say that the Indians of the North-west Territories to-day, so far as their population is concerned, have made a greater progress than the Indians of the United States have made. But going back to Mr. McColl's report in 1878, he says again:

> Chiefs and councillors express the desire that their children might be educated, and request me to ask the Government not only to send them teachers, but also to build them school-houses. * * * Their appreciation of the necessity of depending more upon the product of the soil, and less upon those of the chase, is evinced by the eagerness with which they turn the agricultural implements they possess to good account.

Now, that is a little different from the views enunciated by the hon. gentleman this afternoon, with glee, and his remarks were received with applause by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman showed how much the Indian made by the chase. He says that with his shotgun he can earn $6, and as a farmer he can only earn 30 cents. Now, that may be very clever, and calculated to catch the ear of such an audience as the hon. gentleman might be addressing in a country school-house. But no person would look upon that as an argument to convince any reasonable thinking man that the people of this country would rather have the Indians go back to the use of their shotguns whereby they could earn $6 instead of having them live peaceably upon farms and learning how to cultivate the soil, even if they could only earn 30 cents. Why, Sir, applying the hon. gentleman's argument to the Indians of the North-west, I would like to know what he could earn with his shotgun in view of the fact that buffalo disappeared years ago, and now there is nothing for the Indians to shoot but gophers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not propose that the Indian should return to the use of his gun, but I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that the Indian who does use his gun when he has an opportunity, is making more than he can when he undertakes to use agricultural implements, and is only earning 30 cents during the time that he can earn $6 with his gun.

Mr. DALY. It is a most extraordinary thing that the men who earn $6 with their gun, are the very men for whom we have got to provide the most food. The hon. gentleman shakes his head again. I cannot convince him, of course. If I were to lay down the book, or to read from the figures, it would not convince him. I say that the Indians who have depended upon their guns are the very men that it costs the most money to feed, and we have to feed them. It is the man who earns 30 cents that is earning sufficient to feed himself.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I controvert that statement, and I say the hon. gentleman's report proves the contrary.

Mr. DALY. All right, I will show you later on. I am going into this question thoroughly, and I think I will be able to explode the bomb-shell the hon. gentleman supposed he had thrown into the department by his attack upon its administration. Now, coming back to his inspector, what did Mr. McColl say in 1878:

> Numerous instances can be cited where the members of bands with ploughs and harrows, but without cattle or horses, have actually harnessed themselves and ploughed and harrowed their fields.

Now, should we allow that state of things to continue? Are we to allow these Indians to hitch themselves to their ploughs and harrows and to cultivate their fields in this way? That was the state of things when the hon. gentleman administered this department, but is not the condition of things now. It is a most harrowing tale, of course. Mr. McColl goes on to say:

> These brief references will serve to indicate that the Indians of the North-west appreciate to

a gratifying extent the advantages of looking to the soil for subsistence in the future. * * * I have been careful to impress upon the agents the necessity of using their best efforts to stimulate the Indians to greater perseverance in the direction of agriculture, and I am sanguine as to the future advantages to them and to the Government, if reasonable and proper encouragement be afforded them to cultivate their land.

And by way of illustrating what the Government have done in that direction, I find that in carrying out the policy that was projected by Mr. McColl at that time, there was a tremendous increase of acreage brought under cultivation in Manitoba and in the North-west Territories, the figures of which I have not at hand, but I will give them later on. Another subject that has caused the expenditure of a considerable amount of money has been surveys on the different reserves. In 1878, Mr. McColl reported :

I would suggest the expediency of surveying, at as early a date as practicable, the locations they had pointed out as reserved.

From this and other sources of information, doubtless, the Deputy Superintendent General, Mr. Vankoughnet, gathered particulars for his report of 1878. As to the North-west, he says :

In the newer provinces and more remote territories of the Dominion, Indians have not yet learned the value of agriculture. As, however, the game and fish on which they now rely for subsistence, notably the buffalo in the North-west, and salmon in British Columbia, become scarce, they must turn their attention to tilling the soil or raising stock to enable them to live.

Again, he says, and this is the report of the hon. gentleman himself :

Instructions in farming or herding and raising cattle, as the character of the country inhabited by the different tribes may indicate to be best, should be furnished to the Indians, and in such manner as will effectually accomplish within the shortest period the object sought for, namely, to make them self-supporting. The Indians should be encouraged by precept, and, when necessary, by pecuniary aid, to erect houses and barns.

He says further :

Their reserves should be subdivided into lots. * * * A school should be established on each of the reserves. * * * There is nothing to prevent operations towards this much-to-be-desired end being initiated and vigorously prosecuted in the North-west Territories and in the province of Manitoba, under the supervision of competent and reliable men, who, in turn, should have over them an inspecting officer.

A thorough policy for the management, control, and education of the Indians had to be inaugurated, and the Government undertook the task with the advice and assistance of men who were familiar with the country and character of the Indians, and with what success it may be left to the public of Canada to say. Up to 1880, although the Indians of the North-west and Manitoba were gradually being induced to settle on their reserves, and begin work in a small way, and acquire property, little progress may be said to have been made prior to this year ; but it will be seen by comparing the statistics of 1878 with 1894 that great development has taken place :

Year.	Acres under Cultivation.	Buildings.	Stock.	Implements.	Grain and Roots raised.	Hay raised.	Fish, Furs and other Industries.
	No.	No.	No.	No.	Bush.	Tons.	Value.
1878.....	1,933	1,151	1,129	724	16,118	2,007	$ 53,799 00
1894.....	16,595	8,401	22,553	22,874	126,277	30,392	247,964 00

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

After Recess.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was dealing with the Manitoba and the North-west Indians. I may say by way of preface that the treaty made between the Indians of Manitoba and the North-west involved eight different obligations which the Government of Canada undertook to fulfil : 1. Payment of annuities. 2. To provide implements and tools. 3. To furnish seed grain. 4. To furnish cattle. 5. To provide treaty clothing. 6. To furnish education, that is schools. 7. To survey the Indian reserves ; and 8. To give the Indians education in agriculture. In looking at the figures which showed the expenditure made by the department during the last 15 years, it will be found that a number of these items are included under the head of general expenses and others under the head of destitute Indians. As I have already stated, in 1878 when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was dealing with the Indians of Manitoba and the North-west the total Indian population dealt with numbered 6,687, and the total Indian population we have to deal with now numbers 23,709. In 1878 the following sums were voted by this House and expended on behalf of the North-west and Manitoba Indians :—

1878. Population dealt with, 6,687.			1894. Population dealt with, 23,709.		
1. Annuities		$149,710	1. Annuities		$122,190
2. Implements and tools			2. Implements and tools	$12,231	
3. Seed grain			3. Seed grain	1,695	
4. Cattle		31,266	4. Cattle	12,803	29,486
5. Treaty clothing			5. Treaty clothing	2,759	
6. Education (schools)			6. Education (schools)		231,750
7. Survey of reserves		21,939	7. Survey of reserves		4,430
8. Education in agriculture		None.	8. Education in agriculture; farm wages and maintenance		35,618
9. General expenses	$51,695		9. General expenses		126,973
Making new treaties	72,917				
		124,612			
10. Buildings		No expen.	10. Buildings		11,385
11. Destitute Indians		48,979	11. Destitute Indians		206,107
			Sioux Indians		5,309
			Saw and grist mills		3,152
		376,500			776,400
			The difference being:		
			School vote		$231,750
			Farm maintenance and wages		35,600
			Buildings		11,400
			Increase in general expenses		2,000
			do destitute Indians		166,000
		$56.30 per head.			$32.75 per head.

At that time the Mackenzie Government were dealing only with 6,687 Indians, most of whom were in the province of Manitoba; there were scarcely any in the North-west with which they had to deal, beyond giving them their annual annuities, clothing and implements, as Superintendent Laird stated. At that time buffalo were roaming over the prairies and the Indians were gaining their livelihood out of them, and no responsibility regarding those Indians was attached to the department. Besides we must remember that at that time it was only necessary to have 300 mounted police to look after those Indians. The difference between the expenditure of $376,500 in 1878 and $776,400 in 1894, is made up of the school vote, the farm maintenance wages, the buildings and the general expense charges. The general expenses amount to $2,000, payments to destitute Indians $166,000, less a saving now of $27,500 for destitute Indians; $1,780 for implements, and $17,500 for surveys, making an exact total increase between the years 1878 and 1894 of $400,000. I wish to emphasize the point, that whereas it only costs $32.75 per head of the Indian population in the North-west and the Territories in 1894, in 1878 it cost the country $56.30 per head. We now spend $231,750 for schools, an expenditure which is responsible for a large part of the increase. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) gave the House to understand that he was not in favour of the policy of the Government in spending so much for Indian schools. Well, we are carrying out exactly the policy which was outlined in the report of Mr. McColl, and in the report of the Deputy Superintendent General laid upon the Table of the House by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) himself in 1878. From year to year, as circumstances required and as the increased number of Indians necessitated it, we have enlarged our schools, and to-day, instead of having the ordinary day schools upon the reserves we have boarding schools and industrial schools as well. Every person, both in the United States and Canada, who has considered the question of elevating the Indians, have come to the conclusion that it is the duty of the Government to bring them up, as far as possible, to the standard of their white neighbours. It is a wise policy also, because by doing so, we are providing in the future for lessening the cost of feeding and looking after those Indians. It can be shown that whereas we are spending $231,750 for Indian schools, our payment for destitute Indians has decreased materially year after year. We are paying now some $35,000 for farm wages and maintenance of the farm instructors, as against almost nothing in 1878, but while we are doing that, we are supplying the Indians with less beef and less flour and less bacon, and the cost of the maintenance of these Indians has decreased as the cost of the farm instructors and the cost of the schools has increased. I do not think that the hon. gentleman wishes it to be understood that the policy of his party if they came into power would be to abolish boarding and industrial schools, and thus retrograde in the handling of the Indians. Sir, it is a source of satisfaction to the officers of the department and myself, who has charge of the administration of its affairs, that from all

parts of the world, from Great Britain, from the United States, and from friends in Canada, who interest themselves in the matter, we have received the highest encomiums for the mode in which we are conducting Indian affairs in the North-west and Manitoba and British Columbia. Is it the policy of the hon. gentleman that we should confine ourselves strictly to the letter of the treaty, that we should furnish the Indians with implements and with oxen without instructors to show them how to utilize them, and that we should do nothing further than to erect school-houses on the reserves and place teachers in them? If that is to be the policy of the Reform party when they come into power, I wish to call the attention of the people of British Columbia and the North-west to it. I want the people of the western country to know of the small and picayune policy we are to expect from hon. gentlemen opposite should such a calamity strike the country as that they would govern its affairs. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills), when he spoke this afternoon, must have forgotten the policy of the Government of which he was a member in 1878, because I have shown conclusively that we have followed the lines laid down by the superintendent in the North-west and the superintendent in Manitoba and the deputy superintendent here, as shown in the reports laid upon the Table in 1878. We are pursuing an enlightened policy towards the Indians, we are dealing with an increased number of them, and because our expenditure is greater now than then, are we to be charged by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) with an improper administration of our trust? One would suppose from what the hon. gentleman says, that he and his party expected that for every dollar we expended on the Indians we would receive a dollar back. Nothing could be more absurd. Is it to be expected that we can take the untutored savage, the man who has roamed the plains without a thought of providing for the morrow, and that we can expect him to live upon the treaty money? Is it to be expected, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) would have it, that the Indian can now rise in the morning, take his gun and go out shooting for a living? However desirous the hon. gentleman may be to inaugurate a policy of that kind, I do not think he can ever succeed, because I hope and expect that the better sense of his party would be against it. The hon. gentleman looks upon the expenditure on Indian affairs in Manitoba and the North-west Territories as being extravagant, but I can tell him that the inhabitants of that country express the opinion freely that the expenditure is rather niggardly. I state here upon the responsibility of my office, that I do not believe, considering the safety and welfare of the population of the Territories, that Indian affairs can be conducted there for a dollar less than is expended to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And the Regina organization is a necessity?

Mr. DALY. It is a necessity, as the hon. gentleman will find out if he ever has anything to do with it. It is a necessity because in looking after these Indians we require to have men in authority on the spot who can easily go to the reserves any day when called upon. Does the hon. gentleman imagine that because everything is smooth upon the surface, and that we do not hear any reports of Indian uprisings, that there is not a serious responsibility resting upon the officers who are charged with the administration of the Indian Department? I want the hon. gentleman and the House and the country to understand that if any different policy is adopted towards the Indians by this or any other Government, that Government may wake up some fine morning and discover that they will have to pay a bill amounting to two or three million dollars. Hon. gentlemen opposite have criticised our expenditure on the Mounted Police. Well, Sir, I have entered my protest against a further reduction in the number of the Mounted Police, and I reiterate that protest here. I say a serious responsibility rests upon the shoulders of any government, or upon the shoulders of any man who recommends a further reduction of that force. If that force is reduced further, the people of Canada will have a bill to pay in that country that will far exceed the expenditure for Indian Affairs during the last five or six years. Although the hon. gentleman has given figures to illustrate that the Indians are earning only 30 cents a head for the instructions we are giving them in farming, I want to state that if the Government had not pursued this policy and kept the Indians on their reserves, and instructed them in the arts of peace, this country, instead of cutting down the mounted police force, would have had to increase it by 500 or 1,000 men; and by spending $231,000 in the instruction of Indian children, to fit them when they grow up to follow some useful trade or industry, we are saving at least $500,000 a year to the country which we would otherwise have to spend in maintaining police to look after them. The policy the hon. gentleman advocated this afternoon would mean that the Indians would have to roam the prairies instead of remaining on their reserves. Then, instead of seeing four or five of them at Medicine Hat or Maple Creek, or some of the other stations along the line of the railway selling buffalo horns to eke out an existence, or a few Indians at Brandon or other towns with their heads in the swill barrels of the hotels, or going about the slaughter houses trying to pick up a living—instead of seeing a few hundreds doing that sort of thing, there would be thousands. You would have Indians invading the privacy of every farm house in the North-west. Hon. gentlemen take exception from time to time to

the small increase of the population in that country; but I want to tell the hon. gentleman that if he wants to damn immigration altogether, if he wants to stop the inflow of people whether from Ontario or anywhere else, all he needs to do is to put that gunshot policy of his into operation. The policy the Government is pursuing is a wise policy, based upon many years' experience, and I will illustrate to the House the success of that policy in the past. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that it costs $7 to spend $5.33 for the Indians; but I will show the hon. gentleman, by practical illustration, the benefit that results from the policy he criticises. For instance, take the Crooked Lake agency. The total cost, as shown in the Auditor General's Report for 1893-94 is $12,697.24. This is made up as follows:—

Annuities (treaty obligation)	$ 3,245
Implements do	287
Seed do	26
Cattle do	150
Education (policy and treaty)	633
Buildings (capital)	63
Destitute Indians	2,689
Management and supervision	5,605
	$12,698

Now, the population on this reserve, according to the census, as shown in the last Indian report, is 574; consequently, the cost of management and supervision was $9.75 per capita. To that add what we paid to destitute Indians, $4.69 per capita, and it makes a total of $14.44. Of course, we must understand that annuities, ammunition, and twine, and a certain proportion of implements, seed and cattle we have to supply every year under treaty obligations, whether we choose to do so or not. With proper management and a close supervision of the Indians, we brought the cost of food supplies down to a minimum, as the above statement shows. Owing to that close supervision, a large amount of Indian supplies are raised during good seasons by the Indians themselves; and, being near to the railway, and in a comparatively settled part of the country, they are enabled to sell their produce and to obtain employment. Now, on the reserve in question, the following grains and roots were raised during the past season, though it was a very dry one:—

	Bushels.	Value.
Wheat	1,848	$ 924 00
Oats	180	54 00
Barley	15	15 00
Potatoes	786	235 80
		$1,228 80

And the individual earnings of Indians on the same reserve were as follows:—

Sale of cattle and pigs	$ 974 50
do grain and roots	1,606 37
do wood and hay	1,470 70
do lime, bones, &c	60 00
Sale of seneca root	$2,176 00
Labour, freighting, &c	80 00
Hunting, furs, &c	327 50
Miscellaneous	15 85
	$6,711 18

That money was expended by the Indians in the purchase of young stock, wagons, mowers, binders, twine, provisions, and clothing, and if they had not been kept on the reserves and taught to earn money to the amount of $6,711, we would have had to furnish them out of the revenue of the country, with the articles I have enumerated. Now, it has to be borne in mind that the individual Indians who sell grain of their own are rationed proportionately less by the department, and the sales are entirely from the surplus produce that is raised. The cost I have given of $4.69 per capita for the support of destitute Indians is simply an average, as many receive nothing at all from the Government, and it is the old and destitute Indians who are in receipt of sufficient food, from time to time, to support them. It will be seen from the foregoing statements, that the Government pay to manage and supervise these Indians, $5,605, or $9.75 per capita. Owing to the supervision of the Indians we got $1,228 worth of produce from them, and the money they earned through the guidance and management of the agents and farm instructors, was $6,711. It is to be observed that for an expenditure of $5,605 we get a revenue of $7,940 in food and labour alone, from the Indians on this reserve. If that were the only benefit the Government derived from this expenditure for management, it might be considered a good investment; but, in addition to that, the Government discharged treaty obligations through its agents, and made good progress in civilizing the Indians, and creating individuality among them. Take another agency, that of Muscowpetung's, which is north of Regina, and which has, I think, a better market for the produce of the Indians than the Crooked Lake agency. But there was a failure of the crops there last year, so that this statement is not as good as it would otherwise be. The expenditure on destitute Indians there was only $3.08 per capita, as against $4.66 per capita at the Crooked Lake reserve. At that agency last year there were 708 Indians to manage, and the expenditure was $12,134.77, and $235.55 for the Sioux band. This expenditure was made up as follows:—

Annuities (under treaty)	$ 2,780 00
Implements do	239 00
Seed grain do	49 00
Cattle do	272 00
Education (policy and treaty)	121 00
Buildings (capital)	462 00
Management and supervision	6,275 00
Destitute Indians (Sioux)	2,172 00
Total	$12,370 00

The Indians on this reserve only raised, last year, wheat and oats, potatoes and corn, to the value of $123.40, owing to the unfortunate drought; but the surplus stock and grain which they were able to sell from their individual holdings was as follows:—

Sale of live stock	$ 57 40
do grain and roots	82 73
Hunting, sale of furs, &c.	12 00
Sale of wood and hay	4,523 37
Labour and freighting	706 43
Miscellaneous and manufactures	4,411 82
Sale of seneca root	82 25
Total	$9,876 00

This was expended by the Indians on provisions, implements, clothing, building material and stock. The cost of supplies to destitute Indians was brought down to $2,172, or an average of $3.08 per capita. As I have shown, the individual earnings of the Indians was $9,876. Now, we will take an agency in the north, the agency of Edmonton, as a third example. The total cost, as shown by the Auditor General's Report, is $25,197.60. This is composed of the following items:—

Annuities (treaty obligations)	$ 3,955
Implements do	519
Cattle do	145
Seed	44
Education (policy and treaty)	5,137
Buildings (capital)	2,679
Destitute Indians	8,043
Management and supervision	4,676
Total	$25,198

The population on this reserve, according to the last report, is 718. Consequently the per capita cost of management and supervision was $6.50; and we paid for destitute Indians $11.20 per head, making a total of $17.70 per capita. During the past season, they raised the following quantities of grain and roots:—

	Bushels.	Value.
Wheat	1,875	$ 750 00
Oats	1,860	465 00
Barley	2,510	1,265 00
Potatoes	3,529	882 25
Garden produce	1,941	750 00
Turnips	270	75 00
Total		$4,187 25

And the individual earnings of Indians on the same reserves were as follows:—

Live stock	$ 60 00
Sale of hay and wood	155 00
do furs	6,207 00
Labour, freighting, &c.	666 50
Miscellaneous and manufactures	53 00
Grain and roots	40 00
Limestone, charcoal, &c.	15 00
	$7,196 50

And the money was expended, as in the other cases, in the purchase of implements, clothing, building material, provisions, wagons and necessaries of life. It will be seen from this statement that the supervision and management of the Indians of the Edmonton agency was $4,676, or $6.50 per head, and owing to the supervision exercised over them, they raised produce to the value of $4,187, and their earnings by individual effort aggregated $7,196.50, or a total of $11,383.75. The three cases I have given will illustrate to the House more clearly the policy of the department in connection with the North-west Indians than the bald statement of the hon. gentleman that it cost $7 to expend $5.33 per head.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, $7.30.

Mr. DALY. I do not take it that the hon. gentleman understands that under our treaty obligations with those Indians we are simply to see that the annuities are paid to them and provide them with implements and not take any measures to instruct and improve them. The Government would not be carrying out its treaty obligations, if it were simply to provide them with implements and not instruct them in the use of those implements. Again, before I leave the North-west Indians, it might be well to show the progress these Indians have made during the past year, and I will quote shortly from the report of the department. For instance, we find in the report of the deputy-superintendent the following on page xix:—

The agent at Assiniboine reserve writes:

"It gives me much pleasure to be able to report that these Indians have worked very hard during the past month. They have done a large amount of fall ploughing, built some new houses and repaired old ones, plastered all their stables, repaired doors, &c., to make them comfortable for the stock in winter. They have also hauled and stacked a large quantity of hay, handy to their stables, and have put up stanchions for holding cattle. These Indians are making fair progress in what may be called 'mixed farming.' They are raising wheat, oats, barley, potatoes, turnips, carrots and onions, cattle for beef, sheep, pigs and poultry, and a few make butter.

"I may also state that the Indian women of this agency are becoming more industrious every year; they knit socks, mitts, gloves and mufflers for their families; they also tan hides for robes for white settlers. The young women make moccasins, while the old women prepare the leather. The health of the Indians has been good. Cattle, sheep and horses are in good condition and being well attended to."

Birtle Agency.—"The Indians have cultivated more potatoes this year than formerly. The yield has been good, and it is to be hoped that another year a larger area will be put in. The general health of the Indians has been good. A number in the bands make butter for their own use; in fact, have at different times offered it for sale."

Touchwood Hills Agency.—"The Indians have been employed in preparing their houses and stables for winter, and in addition Muscowequan's Band, in the latter part of October, were working repairing the boarding-school, making willow-laths, some nailing on the laths, others plastering outside. The work on the school has all been done by Indians. The live stock on the different

reserves are in good condition, and the health of the Indians is also good."

Onion Lake Agency.—"The threshing has been completed. Considerable fall ploughing has been done. The Indians have 'mudded' and whitewashed their dwellings and stables, making them comfortable for the winter.

"The Indian women can handle and milk their cows fairly well. A number make butter for their own use. The milk and butter, with the help of the Government rations, assist them in living.

"The cattle are all in good condition, and the young animals thriving well. The general health of the Indians is good."

Saddle Lake Agency.—"Seventy acres were fall-ploughed on Saddle Lake reserve, and 80 on that of Blue Quill. The dwelling-houses and the stables of these Indians are about all 'mudded' and made comfortable for the winter, and at present the corrals are being repaired and strengthened. The cattle are in good condition. Some families are making butter."

Edmonton Agency.—"The Indians are in good health, and during the month have been busy ploughing, building and 'mudding' stables and whitewashing their houses. The cattle are in good condition.

"On Michel's reserve the women nearly all make butter and keep a few hens.

"During September we had a number of visitors at the agency, amongst others being Mr. Ham, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Colmer and Mr. Charbonneau, of the Montreal press. These gentlemen expressed themselves as being highly pleased with everything they saw, and were particularly struck with the successful growing of tobacco, the crop being quite as good as any they had ever seen in any part of this continent. I am trying to cure these plants. I distributed some plants to about 25 different Indians this spring, and they all grew them successfully."

Blackfoot Reserve.—"The Indians have been engaged in fall-ploughing, working at irrigation ditch, mining and hauling coal, repairing and whitewashing their houses. There has been a large amount of work done on the irrigation ditch. The general health of the Indians is good. Horses and cattle are in good condition. Indians that have heifers have retained enough hay to supply them, and others have had permission to sell hay. Indians at Lower Reserve have stored considerable potato seed. The conduct of the Indians has been good."

With regard to the Blackfoot reserve, this is the more wonderful when we consider that the Blackfeet were the last Indians who came under the treaty :

Coutcheeching Agency.—"All the Indians here had good crops, with one exception, and there was no sickness on the reserve. On the 24th we reached Manitou Rapids. The Indians on this reserve were improving their dwelling-houses. Whilst I was on the reserve, three Indians cut 900 feet of lumber from the mill for this purpose, and intend paying for it out of the money that they will get for their hay. Before leaving the reserve I went to see a new house built by Kay-bay-ga-bo. It is 20 x 26, with 13-feet walls, magnificent logs, splendidly hewn and dove-tailed, plastered with lime, and whitewashed on the inside. He intends putting on a drop-siding as soon as he can afford it ; has a cellar 12 x 10 feet, lined with cedar logs.

"I found everything proceeding satisfactorily on all the reserves."

Piegan Reserve.—"The Indians were at work during the early part of the month, taking up and housing their potatoes. The yield and quality were good. Having finished their crops, the Indians then began to thoroughly clean and whitewash their houses, both inside and out. A good amount of hauling has been done throughout the month by the Indians, including coal for house, blacksmith shop, agency buildings and all Indian requirements. They have been hauling building logs and corral poles from the timber limit. The health of the Indians has been very good throughout the month."

Sarcee Reserve.—"The Indians were chiefly employed in hauling hay to Calgary, erecting and repairing buildings, road-making, cutting wood, ploughing, &c. Thirty-seven acres of fall-ploughing has been done. Five houses have been built, three of good hewn logs, and two of round timber ; four are completed, and one has to be roofed. Most of the houses have been whitewashed and made comfortable for the winter, and others will be attended to after payments. The Indians have worked well, and are in good health. They were eager to obtain work from the settlers, and accepted every chance offered them. This year they will appreciate the benefits of their labour at haying more than heretofore, as they have not incurred any debts. All the men in the band are good haymakers, and are eager to be allowed to work during haying.

This may not seem very interesting to hon. gentlemen, but my hon friend the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and the other hon. members who know the North-west must simply be amazed when they hear these reports from such reserves as the Blackfeet reserve, the Piegan, the Sarcee reserve. They must be astonished to learn that these Indians have done what the agents report, when they look back but a few years and remember them as wandering, lazy Indians, without any object in life except to get a meal as easily as they possibly could, and ready to do anything in the world but work. But, Sir, the policy pursued by the Government has enabled us to get these Indians, in the first place, to be content to stay upon the reserves, and, while they stay there, to be willing to get between the handles of the plough and plough the ground, put in the seed, and harvest the grain. And not only that, but it has enabled us to lead them to build comfortable houses for themselves and their children, to earn money by hauling coal as they do on the Blackfeet and Blood reserve, or by hauling hay and wood as they do upon the Sarcee reserve. Speaking from my experience, I can understand what hard work and indomitable energy it must have cost these agents to bring these Indians to this condition in life ; and I can fairly claim that if the Government had done nothing else by this large expenditure, they have done well to hold the Indians in treaty No. 7 to the work they are doing ; for there are some four or five thousand of the worst class of Indians known upon the reserves. Take the Bloods and the Blackfeet, and any man who spent any time among them ten years ago and will go there and see the progress

they have made, and the work they are doing, will be simply amazed. And if any such a man were told of this work without seeing it, he would scarcely believe it. Here is the best justification we can have for the policy this Government has pursued, because, as I said a short time ago, if the Government had not pursued this policy of employing farm instructors, and providing seed grain and everything necessary to bring about this condition of things, we should now be spending money to surround these reserves with mounted police, and also spending large sums for feeding the Indians. Without wishing to weary the House, I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman and the House to the Blood agency report, which will be found at page 87 of the Report of the Department of Indian Affairs. This report is dated 1st August, 1894 :

An experiment in a small way has been made in irrigation at the agency garden which is a success, and I hope to see a number of such wheels in different parts of the reserve soon. An ordinary water-wheel with buckets for lifting is placed in the river, and this can be made to lift the water almost any height. This method of irrigating will suit our village system very well, and it has one great recommendation, viz., that it can be done at little cost.

That indicates that the Blood people are taking up the question of irrigation. The report goes on :

The Indian " Black Horses " was engaged during the summer and fall in opening up the coal mine and mining coal. He got out 200 tons of coal—130 for use of agency, farms and hospital, 50 tons for boarding-school, and over 20 tons for white settlers in Macleod and district ; all of which was hauled by the Indians. They also filled the coal contract for the North-west Mounted Police at the detachments. One hundred tons of the Galt Company's coal was freighted from Lethbridge mines, and delivered to the Stand Off and Kipp detachments in a very satisfactory way. Besides the foregoing, the Indians freighted to Macleod about 50 tons of coal from the Hawk's mine, on the St. Mary's River, and made good wages at this work.

Now fancy, Mr. Speaker, any person who knows these Indians being able to say that one of them had mined 200 tons of coal, and had been engaged in delivering coal at different parts. The agent further reports :

All the freighting of flour and other supplies was done by the Indians, and this work kept a large number employed. In order to show the amount of work done by these Indians, I would point out that the total sum of money earned by individual Indians amounted to $5,772 during the twelve months.

Fancy this sum being earned in twelve months by Blood Indians. To understand the full effect of this, to appreciate what it means, one should have had acquaintance with the Blood Indians as they were some years ago. The report says further :

The houses belonging to the Indians are much better built than they formerly were, and it is no uncommon thing to find good stables and corrals at the different places. " Red Crow "——

That is the chief in Farmer McNeil's district.

—has a good house, stable, hay corral and horse corral ; while his mower, hay-rake, wagon and other implements are well taken care of.

" Running Crane " (in Farmer Clarke's district) has a good house, horse corral, stable with hay shed opening from it, implement shed in which can be found his mower, hay-rake, wagon, &c., neatly stored away ; while he has under course of erection a large cattle shed and corral. This place is the nearest approach to a white man's farm on the reserve.

" Mike " and ' Heavy Old Man " (in Farmer Jones' district) have each good houses, stables, corrals, &c. All these men named have mowers, rakes and other implements securely stored and well taken care of during winter.

The number of wagons, mowers, &c., the private property of Indians, has vastly increased, and they are taking more care of them than they used to do. A number of Indians are taking up locations and fencing them in part.

The wagons, harness and other implements supplied by the department, have also given a great impetus, and made them more anxious to follow the advice of those in charge ; the sight of so much money made by the best working Indians by feighting, &c., stimulates others, and thus I am able to get all the workers I require.

During early spring the saw-mill machinery arrived, and the Indians shortly after went to the timber limit and cut logs for foundations of mill and frame of same. They also cut a large number of saw-logs.

Immediately after spring work, a party went to the mountains and ran these logs down the river to the mill.

The Indians worked well on the saw-mill ditch, and had it all taken out before high water. The river rose this season to an abnormal height, and it has not yet been possible to get the whole of the foundations dug out, but these will be got at later on ; all this work on the saw-mill ditch, and getting logs for it, being done without payment of any kind.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to weary the House with quotations, but no one who is acquainted with the condition of these Blood Indians in past years can listen to such reports as I have just read without coming to the conclusion that the policy of the Government has not been a failure, for in dealing with these Indians, we are dealing with the worst class of Indians in the North-west. Then the agent among the Blackfeet, treaty No. 7, reports as follows. I quote from page 89 of the report :

The Indians have been working the coal mine by themselves, and have supplied the agency, farms, schools, police, and some of the residents of Gleichen and vicinity ; also some to the Sarcee Reserve, and two car-loads in part payment for two stallions to improve their stock. The money received was used to purchase blankets, saddles and make payments on their wagons and mowers. They have exchanged 20 ponies for heifers, and will take more the first opportunity. They have lost no horses of any account since the Canadian Pacific Railway Company built fences along the line. Their conduct has been very good, no serious breaches of the law having occurred.

I could go on ad libitum, quoting from the reports of these agents to show that a similar condition of improvement exists in the different reserves. But I have particularly selected these reports from the Indians in treaty No. 7, because those Indians, as I remarked before, are possibly the worst Indians we have had to deal with in the North-west. These reports show that although it costs Canada a great deal of money to look after and administer the affairs of the Indians, that money is being well spent, and that where we are educating these men to support themselves, and to be good citizens, we are saving money to the country. Now, I come to British Columbia. The hon. gentleman made a very special attack upon the expenditure of money in British Columbia, overlooking, no doubt, the fact that the department under his care, and that of his predecessors during Mr. Mackenzie's regime expended just as much money in proportion, as we are doing. The hon. gentleman shakes his head again. I shall have to give him up, for I am afraid I shall never be able to convince him even with all the facts and figures I can give. But there are some points I would like to bring before the hon. gentleman and the House. In British Columbia, in addition to the superintendent and his two assistants, we have the following agents :—

Agent.	Agency.	No. of Reserves.	No. Bands.	Population.
W. H. Lomas	Cowichan	65	14	2 072
H. Guillod	West Coast	150	14	2,833
R. H. Pidcock	Kwawkewlth	92	14	1,618
F. Devlin	Fraser River	192	30	4,275
W. F. Wood	Kamloops and Okanagan	190	28	3,408
R. L. T. Galbraith	Kootenay	8	3	586
C. Todd	North-west Coast	137	13	4,000
Ewan Bell	Williams' Lake	78	19	1,860
R. E. Loring	Babine and Upper Skeena	33	7	2,653
Indians in the interior and northern portion of British Columbia who have not come under any particular agent as yet				2,500
Totals				25,807

Now, I suppose I could not convince the hon. gentleman that it costs more to maintain destitute Indians and to provide clothing and supplies for 25,807 Indians than it did to maintain the 5,000 or 6,000 Indians dealt with by the hon. gentleman, and the expenditure the hon. gentleman had reference to is in that particular. For instance, we have nine agents, with 945 reserves, and we are dealing with 25,807 Indians, scattered over the whole territory of British Columbia. Now, taking that into consideration, and the long distances that the Indians have to travel to their reserves, I can show the hon. gentleman, the average salary of these men being $1,200, that there are no men in the service of the Government to-day who are earning their money harder than are the agents on the reserves in British Columbia, and I venture to say that the representatives of British Columbia will bear me out in that fact. If the amount is large that we are expending there year after year in clothing, food to destitute Indians, and particularly in medical expenses, and I admit that it is, we are only carrying out what the hon. gentleman undertook to do, and did do, while he was presiding over the Department of Indian Affairs. I think, speaking from memory, that our expenditure amounts to $12,000 this year ; I think that is the vote in the Estimates for medicines in British Columbia. I have here statement, showing amounts expended by the Government of the Dominion on the Indians of British Columbia for medical attendance and medicines, &c. :

Year.	Medical Attendance and Medicine.
	$ cts.
1873-74	907 46
1874-75	1,288 80
1875-76	4,386 90
1876-77	6,722 53
1877-78	2,999 84
1878-79	2,645 56
1879-80	2,753 16
1880-81	2,488 25
1881-82	2,198 19
1882-83	3,262 24
1883-84	1,893 19
1884-85	3,059 02
1885-86	2,365 63
1886-87	3,029 54
1887-88	2,703 01
1888-89	7,856 56
1889-90	6,797 88
1890-91	7,791 77
1891-92	6,790 56
1892-93	11,044 79
Total for twenty years	82,984 88

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Indians got the money.

Mr. DALY. The Indians get the money this year. The hon. gentleman would like to mislead the House, the hon. gentleman would like to mislead any person reading this discussion. Why, Sir, the figures I have given are the figures of the money that reached the Indians, and the figures that I am giving to-day represent the money that reaches the Indians. If the cost of administration is greater to-day than it was in 1878, it is by reason of the fact that the population we are dealing with is two-thirds greater than it was at that time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The same population.

Mr. DALY. I beg your pardon, we have not the same population. I gave the figures to the House a moment ago, and showed conclusively that we have not the same population. But the hon. gentleman shakes his head, as he does to everything else I say. I say to the hon. gentleman that his own report, which I have under my hand, made in 1878, shows that the Indian population of British Columbia was not then two-thirds of what it is new. The figures I have given are taken from the Public Accounts, and I ask the hon. gentleman to compare them with the figures of to-day, compare the population he dealt with, and the population we have to deal with now. I have shown conclusively that the cost per capita of dealing with these Indians in British Columbia is far less now than it was at that time. Now, the hon. gentleman, in dealing with British Columbia, dwelt at some length on the cost of the reserve commission. Who was responsible for this reserve commission? Was it the Macdonald Government that was in power before 1874, or was it the Macdonald Government that came into power after 1878? No, Sir, it was the Government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and the hon. gentleman himself was responsible for the commission that has cost this country so much money, and I will prove it in a short time. Now, I may say for the information of the hon. gentleman that all the negotiations that took place between the Government of Canada and the Government of British Columbia, in reference to Indian matters, took place during the Mackenzie regime; and they are in so unsatisfactory a state that we are about to state a case as between British Columbia and this Government concerning the reserves. Now, the hon. gentleman said that we were under no obligation—he made that broad statement, that we were under no obligations to provide medicine and clothing to these Indians in British Columbia, whereas, I have quoted from the Public Accounts that in one year the hon. gentleman, when at the head of the department, spent over $6,000 upon medicines alone in that country. What is the obligation of Canada towards those Indians? Article 13 of the terms of union, as set forth in the schedule to the British Order in Council of 16th May, 1871, which admitted British Columbia into the Dominion of Canada, reads as follows:—

> The charge of the Indians and the trusteeship and management of the lands reserved for their use and benefit, shall be assumed by the Dominion Government, and a policy as liberal as that hitherto pursued by the British Columbia Government, shall be continued by the Dominion Government after the union. To carry out such policy, tracts of land of such extent as it has hitherto been the practice of the British Columbia Government to appropriate for that purpose, shall from time to time be conveyed by the local government to the Dominion Government, in trust for the use and benefit of the Indians, and, on application of the Dominion Government in case of a disagreement between the two governments respecting the quantity of such tracts of land to be so granted, the matter shall be referred for the decision of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Matters then appeared to be going very unsatisfactorily between British Columbia and the Dominion, in more ways than one. In 1874, Mr. Laird, the then Minister of the Interior, in his report to Council, dated 2nd October, 1874, referred to this matter, and stated that, prior to the admission of British Columbia to the union, the entire annual expenditure of the Colonial Government did not exceed, at times, a few hundred dollars, and he quoted Commissioner Powell as saying that money payments had been restricted to the expenditure incurred by outrages, that no effort had been made to civilize the Indians, and to leave them alone was regarded as the best way of treating them. Mr. Walkem, then Attorney General, took exception to that, and in a long report submitted to this Government, he laid down what he considered was the policy that ought to be pursued by the Government of Canada towards the Indians of British Columbia. Matters between the Government of Canada and that of British Columbia became very strained, and, on the 2nd November, 1874, in the report already referred to, Mr. Laird recommended that an earnest appeal should be made to the Government of British Columbia to reconsider in a spirit of wisdom and patriotism the grievances of these Indians. Then it was necessary that the intervention of the Secretary of State for the colonies should be called in, which was done by Lord Dufferin, who forwarded his despatch home on 4th December, 1874, as referred to in the Order in Council based on Mr. Laird's report. Then we came to an arrangement that was effected in 1875 between the Dominion Government, through Hon. R. W. Scott, at that time acting Minister of Interior, and the British Columbia Government, and that was after the Secretary of State for the colonies had intervened. Mr. Walkem's suggestion made at that time was as follows:—

1st. That no basis of acreage for Indian reserves be fixed for the province as a whole, but that each nation (and not tribe) of Indians of the same language be dealt with separately.

2nd. That for the proper adjustment of Indian claims the Dominion Government do appoint an agent to reside "with each nation."

3rd. That reserves of land be set aside for each nationality of Indians, such reserves to contain, in addition to agricultural land, a large proportion of wild and forest land. Every application for a reserve shall be accompanied by a report from the agent having charge of the nation for whom the reserve is intended; and such report shall contain a census and give a description of the habits and pursuits and of the nature and quantity of land required for the use of such nation.

4th. That each reserve shall be held in trust for the use and benefit of the nation of Indians to which it has been allotted; and, in the event of any material increase or decrease hereafter of the members of a nation occupying a reserve, such reserve shall be enlarged or diminished, as the case may be, so that it shall bear a fair proportion to the members of the nation occupying it. The extra land required for any reserve shall be allotted from vacant Crown lands, and any land taken off a reserve shall revert to the province.

5th. That the present local reserves be surrendered by the Dominion to the province as soon as may be convenient, the province agreeing to give fair compensation for any improvements or clearings made upon any reserve which may be surrendered by the Dominion and accepted by the province.

Mr. Walkem's recommendations were communicated to the Federal Government, and not approved by the Government, as the report of Hon. R. W. Scott, dated 4th November, 1875, shows. Mr. Scott took some exceptions to them, and they were not entertained at the time. Mr. Scott said that Mr. Duncan's suggestions did not correspond precisely with those made by Mr. Walkem. In lieu of the proposition of Mr. Walkem, Mr. Scott suggested in his report of 10th November, 1875, as follows:—

1. That, with the view to the speedy and final adjustment of the Indian reserve question in British Columbia on a satisfactory basis, the whole matter be referred to three commissioners, one to be appointed by the Government of the Dominion, one by the Government of British Columbia, and the third to be named by the Dominion and local governments jointly.

2. That the said commissioners shall, as soon as practicable after their appointment, meet at Victoria and make arrangements to visit, with all convenient speed, in such order as may be found desirable, each Indian nation (meaning by nation all Indian tribes speaking the same language) in British Columbia, and, after full inquiry on the spot into all matters affecting the question, to fix and determine for each nation separately the number, extent and locality of the reserve or reserves to be allowed to it.

3. That, in determining the extent of the reserves to be granted to the Indians of British Columbia, no basis of acreage be fixed for the Indians of that province as a whole, but that each nation of Indians of the same language be dealt with separately.

4. That the commissioners shall be guided generally by the spirit of the terms of union between the Dominion and the local governments, which contemplate a "liberal policy" being pursued towards the Indians, and, in the case of each particular nation, regard shall be had to the habits, wants and pursuits of such nation, to the amount of territory available in the region occupied by them, and to the claims of the white settlers.

5. That each reserve shall be held in trust for the use and benefit of the nation of Indians to which it has been allotted, and in the event of any material increase or decrease hereafter of the numbers of a nation occupying a reserve, such reserve shall be enlarged or diminished, as the case may be, so that it shall bear a fair proportion to the members of the nation occupying it. The extra land required for any reserve shall be allotted from Crown lands, and any land taken off a reserve shall revert to the province.

6. That so soon as the reserve or reserves for any Indian nation shall have been fixed and determined by the commissioners as aforesaid, the existing reserves belonging to such nation, so far as they are not in whole or in part included in such new reserve or reserves so determined by the commissioners, shall be surrendered by the Dominion to the local government so soon as may be convenient, on the latter paying the former, for the benefit of the Indians, such compensation for any clearings or improvements made on any reserve so surrendered by the Dominion and accepted by the province, as may be thought reasonable by the commissioners aforesaid.

The British Columbia Government, by Order in Council of the 6th January, 1876, accepted the proposals embodied in the Dominion Order in Council of the 10th November. Three commissioners were accordingly appointed, and began their labours in 1876: but in January, 1877, the British Columbia Government suggested that, with a view to diminishing the heavy cost thereof, the joint commission should be reconstructed on a more economical basis; and on the 23rd February, 1877, a Dominion Order in Council was passed providing that the commission should restrict its labours to places where whites and natives were living in close proximity. It was hoped that under that arrangement the commisison would finish its work in a year, and that then the Indian superintendents or agents could lay out, subject to the approval of the chief commissoner of lands and works of British Columbia, the reserves in their different localities as occasion demanded. Early in 1878 the British Columbia Government pressed for the carrying out of the proposed arrangement; but the then Minister of the Interior, the Hon. David Mills, felt constrained, from the knowledge which had come to him of the critical condition of affairs among the tribes of the interior of British Columbia, and of the many difficulties which beset the assigning of the reserves, to believe that it would be highly impolitic and inexpedient to bring into effect the arrangement contemplated by the Order in Council of the 23rd February, 1877. He feared that grave national complications might result if the arrangements were carried out; and he recommended that, in-

stead of the allotting of reserves being left to the local superintendent, Mr. Sproat be appointed sole commissioner to do that work, subject to the approval of the British Columbia Commissioner of Lands and Works, a reference to be made to a judge of the Supreme Court in the event of a disagreement. Mr. Sproat was accordingly appointed as Indian reserve commissioner by Order in Council of the 8th March, 1878, and since that date the Dominion Government has borne the whole cost of allotting reserves. What that means can be gathered from the fact that over 900 reserves have been allotted, and that last year the cost of the work was upwards of $8,000, Mr. O'Reilly now occupying the position held by Mr. Sproat. If the expense of that work has been great, and it has been great, year by year since it was entered upon, the Government has simply been carrying what the Dominion Government obligated themselves to the people of British Columbia, and carrying out in full terms the Order in Council to which I have referred. I have illustrated from the figures I have given as to the expenditure made in British Columbia in 1874-75-76-77-78, that in accordance with the population the expenditure for medical attendance and for medicines, supplies of implements, tools, seeds, &c., was as great formerly as it is at the present moment, and in saying so I do not for a moment mean to state that the hon. member for Bothwell was doing wrong, for he was only carrying out that Liberal policy which is embodied in the Order in Council passed on the report of Hon. R. W. Scott in 1877, and we have only been carrying out the same policy inaugurated in those years only with a larger population, and as the population has increased the expenditure has advanced. I have also shown that although large expenditure has taken place in connection with the reserve commission, we are simply carrying out the obligation entered into by the Mackenzie Government in 1878 with the British Columbia Government. So it does not lie with the hon. member for Bothwell to criticise the expenditure we have made under the reserve commission. The hon. gentleman by looking at the Estimates for the present year will see that the expenses of this commission have been considerably reduced, and I hope very shortly they will be still further reduced. Another item which the hon. gentleman criticised very exhaustively was the expenditure on schools. The following statement shows the greater number of schools and the larger attendance of pupils in 1894, as compared with 1878:

THE following statement shows the greater number of schools and the larger attendance of pupils in 1894 as compared with 1878.

1878.	Schools.	Children.	1894.	Schools.	Children.
Ontario	53	1,824	Ontario	83	2,341
Quebec	10	320	Quebec	20	634
Nova Scotia	3	99	Nova Scotia	7	119
Prince Edward Island	1	27	New Brunswick	5	102
Manitoba	11	327	Prince Edward Island	1	33
North-west Territories	5	174	British Columbia	31	843
British Columbia	9	648	Manitoba	55	1,454
			North-west Territories	82	2,322
			Outside	11	288
Total, 1878	82	3,419	Total, 1894	295	8,136

We are bound under treaty to provide schools in Manitoba and the North-west. It is true we are not bound to provide boarding or industrial schools, but in establishing them we are only carrying out what experience teaches us is the only way to educate the Indians. We have to remove the children from the influence which surrounds them on the reserves, and give them that benefit which they will derive not merely from learning to read and write, but also from acquiring a knowledge of the various trades. For instance, the following table will show how the children are taught industries at the different schools:—

STATEMENT showing number of Pupils at present acquiring Trades at Industrial Schools in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, 31st March, 1895.

No. on Roll.	Boys.	Girls.	Schools.	Trades.	No.
119	74	45	Battleford	Carpenter	7
				Farmer	20
				Blacksmith	4
				Printer	3
				Shoemaker	8
				Painter	1
				Total	43

Statement showing number of Pupils at present acquiring Trades at Industrial Schools in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, 31st March, 1895.

No. on Roll.	Boys.	Girls.	Schools.	Trades.	No.
221	100	121	Qu'Appelle	Carpenter	10
				Farmer	8
				Blacksmith	8
				Shoemaker	7
				Baker	6
				Total	38
47	29	18	Red Deer	Carpenter	5
				Farmer	7
				Total	12
135	84	51	Regina	Carpenter	16
				Farmer	9
				Shoemaker	14
				Baker	3
				Blacksmith	2
				Total	44
122	90	32	St. Joseph's	Carpenter	5
				Farmer	9
				Shoemaker	9
				Total	23

Statement showing number of Pupils at present acquiring Trades at Industrial Schools in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, 31st March, 1895.

No. on Roll.	Boys.	Girls.	Schools.	Trades.	No.
97	71	26	Elkhorn	Carpenter	13
				Blacksmith	4
				Shoemaker	12
				Painter	7
				Tailor	5
				Tinsmith	2
				Total	43
78	45	36	Rupert's Land	Carpenter	7
				Farmer	13
				Blacksmith	5
				Printer	4
				Total	29
101	49	52	St. Boniface	Carpenter	5
				Blacksmith	3
				Shoemaker	7
				Total	15

All the girls are taught sewing, knitting, cooking and general housework.

The Indians are not only educated, but the different religious denominations which control these schools and to which we give a per capita grant, clothe and feed the children, and manage the schools out of that per capita grant. Here is an estimate of the total cost per capita in each of the schools for the year ending 1894, and the various details in connection with each school :

STATEMENT showing expenditure, under various headings, for Industrial Schools in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, to 30th June, 1894, number of pupils on roll, average attendance, cost per capita, cost for maintenance, and total cost per capita.

School.	Salaries.	Food.	Clothing.	Management.	Total for Maintenance.	Average No. on Roll.	Average Attendance.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.		
Battleford	6,332 26	4,826 81	1,589 44	4,633 66	17,382 17	113	86
Brandon	1,049 70	5 00	.....	212 27	1,266 97	.....	.....
Elkhorn	8,647 71	.....	.....	944 29	9,593 00	89	84
High River	11,930 67	319 20	1 41	516 75	12,768 03	94	85
Qu'Appelle	22,660 25	422 46	7 90	1,216 91	24,307 52	224	193
Red Deer	2,700 84	2,767 26	612 30	867 10	6,947 50	49	35
Regina	12,932 16	.....	.....	901 26	13,833 42	118	106
St. Boniface	8,130 50	.....	.....	71 60	8,202 10	99	88
St. Paul's	4,693 59	2,152 93	1,396 31	2,767 57	11,010 39	70	67

School.	Cost, per capita, on Average Attendance.	Cost, per capita, of Average on Roll.	Furnishing.	Buildings.	Miscellaneous.	Grand Total.	Total cost per capita.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Battleford	201 53	153 38	1,133 90	2,545 80		21,011 87	185 94
Brandon			968 55	17,855 69		20,091 21	
Elkhorn	114 20	107 67	1,489 47	3,817 35		14,899 82	167 41
High River	150 21	135 83	315 49	2,389 01		15,472 53	164 60
Qu'Appelle	124 65	108 52	818 19	9,593 92	605 30	35,324 93	157 70
Red Deer	210 53	141 78	1,284 74	3,138 68		11,370 92	232 06
Regina	130 50	117 23	583 90	1,863 39		16,280 71	137 97
St. Boniface	93 20	92 15	979 28	5,594 33		14,375 71	161 52
St. Paul's	164 33	157 29	532 43	1,146 52	3,525 70	16,214 91	231 49

The average cost per capita is calculated on the average number of pupils on the roll, and not on the average yearly attendance, as all the pupils are furnished with tuition, clothing, transport, etc., the only difference being for food. In reference to this per capita cost, I find from figures given by Mr. James L. Hughes, public school inspector, that the Mimico industrial school, conducted by the Mowat Government, had 197 pupils in residence last year, and the cost per capita for the maintenance of these pupils was $165. At the Alexandria industrial school, with 32 pupils, the cost of maintenance is exactly the same, $165. As against $165 to maintain each of the 197 pupils at the Mimico industrial school, conducted under the auspices of the Ontario Government, we have at High River, a place south of Calgary, a cost per capita of $164.60. Taking into consideration the cost of living, the wages, the salaries, and the long distance of this latter school from civilization, the per capita cost of the pupils contrasts more than favourably with the cost of the Mimico and Alexandria schools in Ontario. The object of these Indian schools is, as I have stated, to educate these children, to remove them from the bad influence of the reserves, and to minimize crime as much as possible. If hon. gentlemen will look at the criminal statistics for Manitoba and the North-west Territories for the last fifteen years, and take the proportion of the Indian population to the white population, they will find that the proportion of those arrested or convicted for crime amongst the Indian population is in a very small ratio indeed. Had we not educated these children as we have done, and had they not been instructed by not only the clergy on the reserves, but by the teachers in these schools, there is no doubt that we would have the same sad conditions amongst our Indians in the North-west that they have in Montana, Idaho, and other western states. Mr. Ross, the Minister of Education for Ontario, estimates that it costs $8.54 a year to educate a child, $91.28 to keep a prisoner in jail, and $187 to keep a prisoner in the Central Prison. It is evident from the statement of Mr. Ross, that the larger number of children sent to school, and the longer they are kept there, the better it is for the children and the country generally. If this statement be correct, and I have no doubt it is, then for one prisoner kept in the Central Prison for a year twenty-one children can receive a year's education. We know that ignorance is the parent of crime, and if that applies to white children, ten times more would it apply to Indian children brought up with all the evil surroundings of the reserve, and coming in contact with the worst class of white men at the different points along the line of railway. If we had not adopted this industrial school policy, instead of paying so much per capita for maintaining the children in industrial schools, we would be paying a good deal more per capita for maintaining the Indians in our jails and penitentiaries. Every dollar expended by this Government in the education of our Indian children, is two dollars saved to the country, and more than that, we are educating these young Indians to trades so as to qualify them to become useful citizens. The best indication that our policy was a success is the character of the reports of the different agents, contained in the annual report, showing that year by year the comfort of the Indians is greater, that their houses are better built and are furnished with more modern improvements, that they are learning to dress better, that they are acquiring higher ideas of comfort, and that they are learning to work for their livelihood. All the influences begotten by the education of the young children in the schools are thus having their effect upon the parents and others on the reserves. As I said in speaking on this subject in the House last session, religion and education must go hand in hand; and if the hon. gentleman who criticises the policy of the Government in reference to these Indian schools would consult the authorities of those churches which are interested in the maintenance of these schools, he would find that the opinion of those gentlemen is at variance with the policy he would inaugurate

if in power. I think it would be satisfactory if, before I conclude this branch of my case, I showed the relative cost of conducting our Indian affairs as compared with the cost of conducting Indian affairs in the United States. In 1894, the United States appropriated for the Indian service $7,954,962.99, the greater part of which was expended as follows:—

Current and contingent expenses of the Indian service	$ 195,800 00
Fulfilling treaty obligations	2,849,406 44
General and miscellaneous expenses of the Indian service	1,864,204 19
Miscellaneous support	690,671 08
Support of schools	2,243,497 38
Total	$7,843,579 09

The Indian population of the United States being placed at 248,000, this represents an estimated cost per capita of about $31.60. Our expenditure, in 1894, amounted to $968,563.17, and our population being 100,227, we have a cost per capita of $9.60, as against $31.60 in the United States. The United States appropriation was not an extraordinary one, as a comparison with the preceding four years will show:

1890	$6,504,759
1891	7,480,954
1892	8,036,944
1893	8,342,094

The United States appropriation for schools for 1893 was $2,315,612, and there were enrolled 21,117 children, so that the provision made amounted to $109 per capita. In the same year our expenditure on schools did not exceed $300,000, and we had enrolled 7,700 children, making the average cost per capita in Canada $39, as against $109 in the United States. These two items in the United States appropriation:

Fulfilling treaty obligations	$2,849,406
Miscellaneous support	690,671
Total	$3,540,077

are for the same purposes as our annuities, clothing, destitute Indians, implements, cattle and seed grain, for which our expenditure does not exceed $500,000, or $3,000,000 less than that of the United States; and that country has not quite one and a half times more Indians than we have. The two items which might be compared with our general expense and cost of management are:

Current and contingent expenses of the Indian service	$ 195,800
General and miscellaneous expenses of the Indian service	1,864,204
Total	$2,060,004

Our general expense and cost of management, on the same lines, do not exceed $200,000, against $2,060,000 in the United States; and in connection with their appropriation, it is interesting to note that under other sub-heads, they pay as follows:—

Pay of interpreters	$ 25,000
Travelling of agents	40,000
Incidentals	129,000
Pay of farmers	50,000
Pay of Indian police	160,000
Transportation of supplies	300,000

Now, I think these figures will illustrate to the House and to the people of this country who are interested in this question, that the expense of conducting our Indian affairs does not begin to compare with the similar expense on the other side of the line. In order to substantiate some statements which I made a short time ago as to the decrease in expenditure, I may say that in 1878 we paid for destitute Indians in Manitoba and the North-west, when there was a population there of 6,500, $48,588, which gradually increased until it reached a maximum of $614,515 in 1882, and that expenditure has been gradually decreased from year to year until 1894, when we only spent $206,107 on destitute Indians as compared with $614,515 in 1882, $570,458 in 1886, and $508,809 in 1887. And whereas the hon. gentleman did not expend anything on schools specifically in 1878, the expenditure for that service has gradually gone up from $2,280 in 1879 until it reached $231,750 last year; and I have a table here which shows that while the cost of maintaining our schools has increased year by year, the expenditure for destitute Indians has decreased year by year. Now, Mr. Speaker, that finishes my remarks upon the question raised by the hon. gentleman in reference to the expenditure incurred by the Government in connection with Indian affairs. I have many more documents and many facts and figures I could give, showing the necessity for the service we have here at Ottawa; but I have already delayed the House longer than I expected to do. I could not, however, conveniently cut my story shorter and do justice to the case. And what have I proved? I have proved that the cost per capita of managing our Indians in British Columbia is less to-day than it was in 1878; I have shown that the cost of managing our Indians in Manitoba and the North-west, notwithstanding the $231,000 which we expended for schools, for which not a dollar was expended in 1878, is less per capita to-day than it was then; I have shown conclusively that we have carried out and more than carried out, our treaty obligations to those Indians by furnishing implements, tools, oxen and farm instructors. In doing this, we are but continuing the policy enunciated by the hon. gentleman and his officers in 1878, in making this large expenditure for the maintenance of Indian schools we are but carrying out the suggestions made by Mr. Vankoughnet in 1878, and laid on the Table of the House by the hon. member for Bothwell; and in expending the money we do in British Columbia in furnishing medicines and supplies to destitute Indians, we are but carrying our the policy inaugurated then. With reference

to the reserve commission, the cost of the commission shows that we are carrying out the obligation entered into by the Mackenzie Government with the Government of British Columbia in 1878. So that I have established conclusively that, so far as the policy we are pursuing at present is concerned, we are simply pursuing the policy which was inaugurated by the Mackenzie Government. More than that, I say that this Government is only carrying out the policy that any Government, Reform or Conservative, will be bound to carry out towards the Indians. It should be remembered that we have taken over the lands of those people in the North-west and Manitoba, it must not be forgotten that we have had the benefit of the thousands of acres of prairie land which was theirs; and surely we can give in return to them the few thousand dollars that we are paying them every year in the shape of blankets and clothing and school for their children. There is a still greater obligation on the Government with regard to those Indians, and that is the obligation to preserve peace and insure protection to settlers. If we were not educating those young Indians to cultivate the lands, if we were not educating the older Indians to remain on their reserves, we would have to spend thousands upon thousands of dollars on mounted police in order to keep them in order. If we did not keep those Indians engaged on the reserve, they would become scattered over the whole of the North-west and Manitoba, they would enter the houses of innocent and inoffensive settlers, frighten the women and children, and when the news of their doings got abroad, it would effectually stop all immigration. It is the bounden duty of this Government and any succeeding Government to continue the policy that we are carrying out. Any one who has heard the statement I have made and who fairly considers the matter, must believe that every dollar spent on the Indians is money well spent. We are not only carrying out our treaty obligations, but a policy which has commanded admiration throughout the world. Go to any part of the world, and you will find that all those who take any interest in the Indian question admit that if there is one thing which stands out boldly as regards the fulfilment by Canada of its treaty obligations it is our treatment of our Indians. The best evidence of that treatment is this: that in the Riel Rebellion of 1885, although our Indian population numbered 25,000, not more than 600 were engaged in that rising. That speaks louder than words in favour of their treatment under the policy pursued by this Government. The hon. gentleman criticised three other departments over which I have control, and I would like to answer him more particularly with reference to the Department of the Interior. I shall not take up the time of the House much longer, but I must finish my task. I want to compare the condition of things to-day with that which existed in 1878, because the hon. gentleman seems to look through the same spectacles now as he did then. I wish to convey to him the fact that the business of the department has slightly grown since then; and if it costs more money to conduct the department now, that is necessitated by the increase of business.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). An unnecessary increase which has nothing to do with the actual business done.

Mr. DALY. I think the hon. gentleman will be convinced of the contrary when I get through. In order to be brief in this matter, I take the statement, which I have had prepared, showing the expenditure and revenue in connection with Dominion lands for the five years from 1873-74 to 1877-78 inclusive, and from 1878-79 to 1893-94 inclusive. The expenditure and revenue as regards Indians, minor revenue, ordnance lands, North-west Mounted Police and Geological Survey not included. The statement is as follows:—

DOMINION LANDS.

STATEMENT of Expenditure and Revenue in connection with Dominion Lands for five years from 1873-74 to 1877-78 inclusive, and from 1878-79 to 1893-94 inclusive.

(Expenditure and Revenue as regards Indians, Minor Revenue, Ordnance Lands, North-west Mounted Police and Geological Survey, not included.)

	Expenditure.				
Period.	Civil Government.	Dominion Lands, Income.	Dominion Lands, Capital.	Total Expenditure.	Percentage of expenditure compared with revenue.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
From 1873-1874 to 1877-1878, inclusive	204,470 43	147,264 62	711,642 08	1,063,377 13	303¾ per cent.
From 1878-1879 to 1893-1894, inclusive	1,389,570 88	2,218,399 76	3,720,858 83	7,328,829 47	81¼ do

REVENUE.

Period.	Total Revenue.	Cash.	Scrip and Warrants.	North-west Half-breed acres scrip located.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
From 1873-1874 to 1877-1878, inclusive.	350,440 35	93,005 65	257,434 70	
From 1878-1879 to 1893-1894, inclusive.	9,020,556 70	6,552,981 02	2,343,123 29	124,452 39

This shows a percentage of expenditure, compared with revenue, of only 8114 per cent, as compared with 303 per cent during the period hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. Now, I find that between 1874 and 1878, the average number of letters received and sent, including those relating to Indian Affairs, was 6,922 per annum. From 1879 to 1894, sixteen years, the average, per year, of letters received and sent was 73,373—over ten times as much as the preceding period. Now, in 1894, there were received and sent by the department, 98,066 letters, exclusive of departmental letters, because my own individual correspondence, which I conduct myself and sign with my own hand, equals the total average correspondence of the whole department from 1874 to 1878. I find that there are 385,000 files, dealing, every one of them, with separate questions. No doubt a number of these are settled, but, at all events, there are 385,000 files relating to separate questions in the department, as against 35,000 when the hon. gentleman administered its affairs. Those facts prove beyond doubt that the affairs of the department must have increased in a very considerable ratio since 1878; and if the expenditure has increased, it has only increased in proportion to the business done. Now, I shall give a statement showing the number of employees, permanent and temporary, whose names appear on the pay-list of each financial year, also the amounts paid for salaries in Ottawa, and the outside service, from the 1st July, 1887, to 30th June, 1895. The following is the statement:—

STATEMENT showing the number of Employees, permanent and temporary, whose names appear on the June pay-list of each Financial Year; also, the amount paid for Salaries at Ottawa and for the Outside Service pay-list, from 1st July, 1887, to 30th June, 1895, also the Estimate for 1895-96.

Service.	1887-88.		1888-89.		1889-90.		1890-91.		1891-92.	
	No.	$ cts.	No.	$ cts.	No.	$ cts.	No.	$ cts.	No.	$ cts.
Permanent Staff at Ottawa	71	78,060 67	68	78,430 40	67	77,921 01	82	80,821 83	85	84,883 66
Temporary Employees at Ottawa—Dominion Lands	51	32,658 52	51	33,000 51	47	32,430 88	29	26,786 40	9	4,817 87
Temporary Employees at Ottawa—Technical Branch	26	20,994 00	23	19,078 26	25	19,407 45	25	20,859 35	20	19,733 46
Permanent and Temporary Employees—Dominion Lands, Outside Service	86	105,672 69	87	105,052 33	89	101,481 18	82	92,082 13	80	91,182 23
	234	237,385 88	229	235,561 50	228	231,240 52	218	220,549 71	194	200,617 22

Service.	1892-93.		1893-94.		1894-95.		Estimate, 1895-96.	
	No.	$ cts.	No.	$ cts.	No.	$ cts.	No.	$ cts.
Permanent Staff at Ottawa	88	91,312 33	89	94,794 16	89	97,891 67	86	98,454 00
Temporary Employees at Ottawa—Dominion Lands	10	4,337 86	9	4,705 91	6	2,963 34	6	2,879 50
Temporary Employees at Ottawa—Technical Branch	21	20,504 20	22	19,807 22	21	20,484 63	21	19,650 00
Permanent and Temporary Employees—Dominion Lands, Outside Service	90	89,333 11	80	88,454 80	80	88,353 15	77	81,890 00
	199	205,487 50	200	207,762 09	196	209,692 79	190	202,873 50

The above shows a reduction in the expenditure, provided the amount estimated for 1895-96 will all of it be expended, amounting to $34,512.38, and a reduction of forty-four in the number of employees. In the meantime, the civil government appropriation has been charged with the salaries of the staff who came over when the immigration business was transferred to this department in 1892; and over $18,000 has been added to civil government for statutory increments. But, notwithstanding that $18,000, there is a saving of $34,512 since 1887-88, and a reduction of forty-four in the number of clerks. I will not weary the House with any more figures in connection with this matter. I will simply say that although the expenditure may have been large years ago, it has been greatly reduced. While we had fifty-one temporary employees in 1887, we have only six now, which must indicate to the hon. gentleman that those who are administering the department are desirous of one thing only, and that is to administer it in such a way that all the business of the department will be attended to, and the most rigid economy practiced, and a way that will not only give satisfaction to the Government, but will give satisfaction to the public. I could give the hon. gentleman the position and duties of every clerk in that department, and I could illustrate to the hon. gentleman in more ways than one, how the business of the department has increased between that time and this. For instance, I showed the hon. gentleman last year, that in the timber and lands branch, in the receipts of the branch, the number of letters written and documents prepared, the work exceeded the work of the whole Department of the Interior in 1878. In addition to that, I could show that in the accountant's branch alone the Auditor General has occasioned work in that department as in every other department that necessitates the employment of three or four additional clerks. Then the hon. gentleman must remember that in his time he had no school lands, or very little school lands to administer. All that means book-keeping and clerical work. He had very little half-breed scrip and very few half-breed claims. He had very little railway lands to deal with as we have now. He had not bonused railways with land grants as has been done since. The land grants given to railways and all the items I have enumerated have entailed a large amount of work; and I say to the hon. gentleman, with every desire to be perfectly fair, that the department is being administered as economically as it possibly can, having due consideration for the increased work and the necessity of giving satisfaction to the public. The hon. gentleman compares expenditure with revenue. The hon. gentleman knows that we have scarcely any revenue from Dominion lands now. Since the change with regard to pre-emption, where formerly we received thousands we do not now get hundreds. By an Act passed in 1891 parties were permitted to homestead their pre-emptions and since then the Dominion lands income has been decreasing year after year. In addition to other reasons for increased work, I could mention the subject of surveys. A vast amount of work has been entailed by the necessity of surveying the millions of acres that have been surveyed since 1878. A large staff has been required for making out the plans and conducting the surveys——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And re-surveys.

Mr. DALY. Only in a few cases, and most of those were made in years gone by. No corrections have had to be made in surveys that have been made under the proper system of inspection that was inaugurated a few years ago. Now, I am afraid I have wearied the House, but the subject to which I have addressed myself is a large one, and even yet I fear I have not done it justice. I have endeavoured fairly, with the material at my hands to illustrate to the hon. gentleman, and I think I have done it conclusively in the opinion of any one who looks at it from a proper standpoint—so far as the administration of Indian affairs is concerned it is being conducted on proper lines and on the only lines that can result in making the North-west the peaceful country we expect it to be. The hon. gentleman referred to other expenditures. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he regrets that the money is being spent in the North-west, that he begrudges the money that is being expended there? Do I understand him to enunciate on behalf of his party a policy of lower expenditure in the North-west, that he does not think the money expended on these services is proper? Because, if that is his policy, I do not think the people will be disposed to agree with him, but that they will take the same view of his policy and his party as in times past. I am satisfied that on reading his speech they will come to the conclusion, as they have in former times, that the Government that has properly conducted its affairs in the North-west, the only Government that has worked upon broad lines and has followed a policy of developing and opening up the country has been the Liberal-Conservative Government, and that on the contrary, the party of gentlemen opposite has begrudged every item of expenditure that has been made in that country for the last nine years. The hon. gentleman has shown by his speech, and more by his manner than his speech, that he begrudges every dollar expended in Indian management or territorial administration by this Government in the North-west or Manitoba.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I suppose that after so long a speech as that of the hon. gentleman, those who have listened to him are tired. I have listened for the last two hours and a half to a speech fully five-

sixths of which did not bear upon the issue brought before the House by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The hon. Minister gave us the history of the Indians, almost enough to enable us to write a biography of every Indian in the North-west Territories and British Columbia. And I wonder the hon. gentleman did not give us the names. I suppose he would have done so only that he could not pronounce them. I thought this audience was very patient. In fact the thought came into my mind that if the hon. gentleman had been speaking to a Toronto audience he would have been brought to his seat long ago; but fortunately for him he was speaking to an audience more patient than the people of the west.

Now the hon. gentleman sought to put into our mouths as Liberals a certain policy and to impress upon the people of the North-west the idea that we were opposed to a liberal expenditure of money upon the Indians of Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia. We would act as liberally in regard to the Indians as it was possible for this country to do. We take as much interest in the welfare of the Indians and would be as ready to do anything to promote their interest as the Liberal-Conservative Government.

We are in favour of the red man having everything, for we know that we have taken everything from him, and he is entitled to a liberal compensation at our hands. That would be the policy of the Liberal Government.

I understood the hon. member for Bothwell to talk in that strain. He did not find fault with the schools established in Manitoba or with the training given the Indians in agriculture; but he did find fault with the manner in which the money was expended, because it was extravagantly expended, and because the money appropriated for the Indians was filtered through the hands of so many officials that only a small moiety of it ever reached the Indians. It is well known that out of every dollar appropriated for their benefit the Indians received only 48 cents, and that the balance of 52 cents went to the official who handled the money and managed affairs.

Now, during the time of the Liberal Government from 1874 to 1878, the average amount spent for the Indians in British Columbia was $25,000. Every cent of that went into the hands of the Indians, with the exception of $6,000, or a little less than 25 per cent, instead of 52 per cent which goes into the hands of the officials under the present Administration.

Now, the hon. gentleman compared the condition of the Indians ten years ago with their condition now and said that they were better educated. That was well known to everybody. He said they were better trained in the art of agriculture, that they were better prepared in many ways to earn their own living.

Now, how much money has been expended by the Government upon the Indians for the last sixteen years in order to bring them up to the state of efficiency in which they are said to be at the present time? No less a sum than $12,000,000. You would reasonably expect that with $12,000,000 spent on the education and instruction of the Indians during sixteen years, they would be in a better position than they were sixteen years ago.

Now, is the Government deserving of that credit? Not at all. Then he went on to show that these schools were conducted as economically as possible. But it is known to everybody who has looked through the accounts of the Indian affairs, as the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and I did this year, that there are some extraordinary expenditures. An expenditure of $185 on the average for each pupil of those schools, is utterly extravagant, not $185 for the average attendance, but $185 for every pupil enrolled, when we can maintain grown up men, well fed and well clothed, in the prisons of our country for much less a sum. In addition to that, you will remember that the various religious communities sent out a large proportion of the clothes used by the Indians upon the reserves, and therefore the expenditure of the Government in that particular is reduced very much.

Now, what we contend is that the expenditure on the whole is largely beyond what it should be; and when I tell you that no less than $106,682 have been paid as salaries to the officials in the Indian Department for the province of Manitoba, you will have an idea of the extravagance in that particular; and consequently the Indians do not receive the assistance which they would receive under a more economical Government.

The hon. gentleman speaks as if the Liberal party wished to keep the Indians in ignorance. Now, that is not the policy of the Liberal party. Hon. gentlemen opposite always try to put a policy of their own choosing into the mouths of the Liberal party. Why, Sir, we have men of superior capacity in the Liberal party, men of superior judgment, as is admitted by the entire country, and we can formulate our own policy and put a proper construction upon it, without asking hon. gentlemen opposite to do it for us. Our policy is to do all we can for the Indians, and to be as economical as possible in the distribution of the money. We take our stand upon that policy, and let it not be unknown to those who spoke upon the other side.

Now, the hon. gentleman gave many figures in regard to the position occupied by the Indians to-day in the different provinces, and the various improvements made amongst them. I think that does not bear upon the question at all. Our charge under the resolution before the House is that the Government has been spending too

much money, not only in the Indian Department, but in every other department, which I will be able to show before I take my seat. In fact, they have admitted as much themselves. We have brought this question up for many years. Last year we pressed upon the Minister of the Interior the charge that there was an extravagant expenditure of money in this department, and he stated last year, as he states to-night, that not one dollar could be saved, that they are just as economical as possible. But what did the Minister of Finance say in his Budget speech this year? He said there had been more money spent in the past than was necessary, and he proposed to cut off from the Indian vote, $85,000. We had pointed out that the expenditure was too much, that the efficiency of the department might be kept up by a lesser sum, and the Minister of Finance admitted it this year by cutting down the vote $85,000.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have been very anxious this year in their speeches, to draw comparisons between expenditures under the Liberal administration and the corresponding expenditures under the Liberal-Conservative administration, and perhaps you will permit me to-night to give a few comparisons on this point, which I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will take to heart. We will take comparisons in controllable expenditures under the two regimes. I have no doubt that any head of department might get up here and, in a two and a half hours speech, explain their extravagance away, and sit down with the belief that he had justified such extravagance, as the hon. Minister of the Interior has done to-night. On civil Government, in 1878, there was spent by the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, $822,000; in 1894, $1,402,000 were spent under that head. Now, that is a controllable expenditure which they have increased during that time, 70 per cent. Then again, take the Department of Militia and Defence. When the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie conducted the Militia affairs of this country they were better conducted than they are to-day, and he administered that department with $618,000, whereas last year the expenditure upon Militia was no less than $1,285,000, or an increase during that time of 170 per cent.

Now, I am not personally competent to speak upon the efficiency of the administration of our militia affairs, but I will give you the testimony of a gentleman who understands them thoroughly, and if his testimony is correct, there has been blundering and extravagance in that department.

Let me give you the opinion of a gentleman who was in the militia for a great number of years. Col. R. H. Davis. He belonged to the 37th battallion, and in a paper read before the Military Institute, Toronto, early in 1895, he said:

> We have no corps fit to take the field——

That was a sweeping statement from a military man, a man who belonged to that battalion for nearly twenty-three years.

> —nor organization for a campaign, nor stores to supply it. The Militia Department knows nothing about the rural militia, and cares less.

A very serious charge against the Militia Department of the country. Then he goes on to say:

> Their darkness and ignorance, or worse, have prevailed for many years. The country well knows, and the department should know, that the militia is not only disorganized, but demoralized.

Now, there is the statement of a man whose testimony cannot be gain-said. Sir, let me say that I am in favour of an efficient militia. I am in favour of expending a reasonable sum in order to keep it efficient, and I am not here to-night for the purpose of throwing cold water upon the militia of this country. I know that it is chiefly composed of young men who would come to the rescue of their country if necessity arose. I am here to condemn the extravagant expenditure of large sums of money, without promoting the efficiency which we desire to have in our militia.

Next let me give you the opinion of the "Military Gazette," in its issue of January, 1895:

> The militia has never been in a worse condition than it is to-day. Ignorance, incapacity and systematic neglect are the prominent characteristics of the present militia system.

Is that all the testimony I can bring to bear as regards the disorganization of the militia force? Major General Herbert, in his annual report of 1891, says:

> The rural corps are very deficient in instruction, but their organization is still more defective. Money is spent for instruction by officers incapable of imparting it.

In whose hands is the power of appointing those officials who are incapable of imparting instruction, and to whom has money been given for imparting what was supposed to be instruction? That money has not only been a loss to the militia force, because it was expected that the force would receive instruction, but it also represents a loss to the country. I therefore condemn the extravagance shown in the militia expenditure, because the Dominion has received no adequate return for such expenditure. The Major General goes on to say:

> The arms and equipments are, for the most part, obsolete.

That is the character given to the militia by those qualified to speak with authority. Need hon. gentlemen wonder that in the face of such testimony, given by high authorities, independent authorities, who have no political axes to grind, to the effect that the militia has been governed in an ignorant

manner, I denounce it. We are called upon to expend one million and a quarter dollars every year to maintain the force, and yet when we criticise this expenditure we are accused of doing so simply for the purpose of finding fault. Such is not the fact, but we do so simply for the purpose of saving the people's money, and if possible preventing it being placed in the hands of inefficient officers authorized to give instruction to the militia force.

Let me pass to the expenditure of two periods, 1878 and 1894, under the head of legislation. In 1874 the Mackenzie Government expended $618,035 under this head, and the present so-called economical Government expended in 1894, $698,000, or an increase of 13 per cent

The expenditure for the Mounted Police was necessarily more required in 1873 than it is at the present time, for there was greater danger to the people, yet the Mackenzie Government expended on that service $334,748, as compared with an expenditure by the present Government last year of $611,264, or an increase of 82 per cent. I hold that to be another extravagant expenditure that should be largely cut down.

On public works, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie spent, in 1878, $998,000, and certainly it cannot be said that he allowed the Public Works Department to be conducted in an inefficient manner. The present Government, however, for the purpose of putting money in the pockets of contractors, spent, in 1894, $2,034,000, or an increase of 104 per cent. Again, we have been told in this House that the Mackenzie Government increased the superannuations in larger proportion than the present Government. It is said that figures will not lie, and they do not lie in my hands, for I simply give correct figures to the House. In 1878 the expenditure under this head was $106,588: in 1894, it was $262,302, or an increase of 146 per cent.

Under the head of immigration and quarantine, I find that in 1878 the Mackenzie Government expended $180,691, as compared with $316,803 last year. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite if more people did not come in from abroad during the regime of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie than have come into the country since. Yet only half the money was spent under the Reform Administration as compared with the expenditure of the administration of 1894.

Let me make another comparison. The total controllable expenditure in 1878 was $6,542,510, as compared with the present expenditure of $17,927,477, or an increase of 174 per cent under the present Government. Take, again, a comparison of the cost of collecting revenue. In 1878 the cost of the Liberal Government was $5,301,124, as compared with $9,132,616 in 1894, or 72 per cent increase. Take the total expenditure in the two periods. In 1878 the total expenditure was $23,503,159, and last year it was $37,585,025, or 60 per cent increase. Take again the redemption of the debt. In 1878 there was $1,738,745 paid on redemption of debt, and $6,400,997 for savings bank redemption, making a total of $8,139,742, as compared with a redemption of debt last year of $1,574,628. Those increases, varying from upwards from 13 to 100 per cent, have been made by the present Government, while our population has only increased 18 per cent during the last fifteen years. Is it not apparent that gross extravagance has prevailed, against which the Liberal party has raised its voice from one end of the country to the other? But let me institute another camparison.

In 1868, the first year under confederation, the expenditure under consolidated fund was $13,486,000; in 1873, six years afterwards, under a Conservative Government, the amount had risen to $23,316,000, or an increase during the six years of $9,830,000, an average increase for each year of $1,638,000. Take the expenditure under the Reform party. The Mackenzie Government came into power with an expenditure of $23,316,000; they went out of power with the expenditure at $23,503,000, or an increase during five years of $187,000, or an average of $37,400 yearly, as compared with an average increase under the Conservative Government of $1,638,000. Let me now take expenditure under a Conservative Government. It came into power in 1878, with the expenditure at $23,503,000, and at the end of 1894 the expenditure had increased to $37,585,000, or an increase of $14,082,000. I am giving the Government advantage of the supplementary Estimates. The average of sixteen years is $880,125, as compared with an increase during the Liberal administration of $37,400.

In the first period under Conservative rule, the expenditure increased 73 per cent. In the second period of five years under the Liberal administration it increased less than 1 per cent, and in the third period of sixteen years under Conservative administration, it increased 60 per cent. The population under the five years of Liberal administration, increased nearly 9 per cent, while the population for the sixteen years under Conservative party, and under the benign influence of the National Policy, as the manufacturers say, it only increased 18 per cent. These are facts which cannot be controverted and which go to show the extraordinary extravagance of the present Government as compared with the economic Government of Alexander Mackenzie.

Let me give you another form of comparison, Mr. Speaker. The controllable expenditure in 1868 was $3,630,000. In 1874, when the Conservative party went out of power it was $8,324,000, or an increase of 123 per cent. The Liberal party came into power with that controllable expenditure of $8,324,000, and they went out of power leaving a controllable expenditure of $6,542,000, or a reduction of 21 per cent.

In 1878, the controllable expenditure was $6,542,000, and in 1894, after sixteen years of Conservative rule, it amounted to $17,927,477, or an increase for that period of 174 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, let me take another comparison to show you the difference between the expenditures of the two political parties when in power. This time I will base the comparison upon the population. In 1868 we had a population of 3,375,000, and an expenditure of $13,486,000, or about $4 per capita. In 1874 when the Conservative party went out of power we had a population of 3,830,000, with an expenditure of $23,316,000, or in round numbers $6 per capita, an increase during the Conservative regime of 50 per cent on the controllable expenditure. In 1878 when the Liberal party went out of power, we had a population of 4,124,000, an expenditure of $23,503,000, or $5.70 per capita, a decrease of 5 per cent under the Liberal administration. The entire expenditure during these sixteen years of Conservative rule, with a population of 5,000,000 rose to 7·52 per capita or an increase of 32 per cent. Here are several comparisons made upon different bases for the purpose of showing that the administration of public affairs by the Conservatives has always been more extravagant than the administration under the Liberal Government from 1874 to 1878.

I will give another comparison and I think it is a fair one. Our circumstances as regards the payments of our accounts are nearly similar to those of the United States. In 1820 the population of the United States was 9,900,000, and the expenditure, $18,285,000, or about $2 per capita. In 1830 the population of the United States was 12,886,000, and the expenditure, $15,140,000, or $1.25 per capita. In 1840, the population of the United States was 17,000,000, and the expenditure, $24,000,000, or about $1.50 per capita. In 1850, the population of the United States was 23,191,000, and the expenditure, $41,000,000 or an expenditure, $1.80 per capita. In 1860, the population of the United States was 31,500,000, and the expenditure, $63,190,000, or about $2 per capita. Now, Sir, we come to the year 1860, and a change will be found in the expenditure of the United States. We all know that shortly after that year there befel that country one of the most sanguinary wars that ever cursed any nation in the world. For three or four years one half that country was in deadly conflict with the other half. Property was destroyed by the millions, railways torn up, telegraph lines rendered useless, and nearly 2,000,000 of the population died on the battlefield and in the hospitals. In 1864 when the smoke of battle had passed away, they found themselves indebted to an enormous extent for the extraordinary expenditures of that war. There was no less a debt than $2,750,000,000 lying on the shoulders of the people in 1865, but what did they accomplish? To-day they have only a debt of $838,000,000. They have paid off $1,900,000,000 of their debt, and that did not hamper their prosperity in the least. They constructed railways and built canals and re-erected the cities that were destroyed by the armies of the south and of the north, and yet they reduced degree after degree that enormous debt. Canada never had any war of any consequence except the little squabble that took place in the North-west ten years ago and we have heard more about that to justify our enormous expenditure than was ever heard in the Senate or House of Representatives in regard to the expenditure on their war.

Notwithstanding all that, the population of the United States in 1894 was 68,000,000, and they expended in 1892, $345,000,000 or about $5 per capita as compared with our per capita expenditure in Canada of $7.50. I know what the Finance Minister said before in answer to this, and I know what he will say now. He asked us: do you not know that there are many payments made in Canada, for which there are no corresponding payments in the United States. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know that. Here are some of the expenditures in Canada that the Federal Government of the United States do not have to meet:

Penitentiaries	$ 446,000
Subsidies to provinces	4,207,000
Mail subsidies and subventions	531,000
Government of N.W.T.	277,000
Militia	1,285,000
Fisheries	467,000
Pensions and superannuations	287,000
Total	$7,499,000

These sums total $7,499,000, leaving a balance of $30,086,000 to be divided amongst 5,000,000 population, which makes $6 for every man, woman and child in the country for our ordinary expenditure. But, Sir, if we strike these items out of our calculation, we are justified in striking out of the expenditure of the United States payments made by them for which we have nothing to correspond in Canada. What are they? They are the following:—

Army pensions	$159,360,000
Cost of navy	30,136,000
Cost of military	49,642,000
Sugar bounties	9,375,000
Foreign diplomacy	1,750,000
Total	$250,263,000

This sum must be struck out of their account. Now, compare the balance outside of these items. All the general expenses for the maintenance of the entire Federal Government amount to $133,263,000, to be divided among 67,000,000 people. This is equal to barely $2 per capita, while we pay $6 per capita. Now, I defy and challenge any hon. gentleman on the opposite side who may follow me to give a fairer comparison of the finances of the two countries.

In 1860 the United States, after almost a century of existence, and after building many public works, and making provision for various undertakings, had a debt of only $64,843,000, while we, a little country of only 5,000,000 people, with no longer history than they had at that time, have a net debt of $250,000,000. This is equal to $51 for every man, woman and child in the country, or $250 of a mortgage upon the property of every family in Canada, on which they have to pay interest: while the present debt of the United States amounts to only $12.52 per head.

But, Sir, let me call you attention to the extraordinary—and if I had a more powerful voice, I would put greater emphasis on that word—the extraordinary expenditure which is required to govern this country. The Conservative party, during the last sixteen years have drawn from the people of this country, $518,560,000 to be spent in the various departments of the Government, and they have added to the debt no less than $106,000,000, which makes $624,560,000 which it cost this country to be governed during the last sixteen years, or an average of $39,000,000 every year. I am certain that if economy had prevailed to a greater extent, large sums of that money could have been saved. Now, let us compare that with the expenditure under Liberal rule. During their five years, the Liberal Administration spent $118,440,000, and increased the debt $40,000,000, making a total of $158,440,000, or an average expenditure for each year of $31,688,000. The average excess of Conservative expenditure over Liberal expenditure was $7,347,000 per year. For sixteen years this would amount to the enormous sum of $123,552,000, in excess of what would have been spent had the rate of expenditure under the Liberal Administration been maintained. Sir, have you ever considered what an enormous amount $133,000,000 is? Let me make it a little plainer, so that we may be able to grasp it. We are accustomed in this House to talk so much of millions that we have little idea of their enormity. If this sum were made into coined gold, which is worth $17.60 per ounce, it would make 316 tons of coined gold. If each ton of gold were placed upon a wagon, and a team hauled the wagon, they would form a golden procession over three miles in length. That will give you some idea of the amount of money which has been taken out of the pockets of the people of this country in excess of what would have been taken under the expenditure of the Liberal regime. If that gold were changed into silver dollars, and one placed upon another, they would form a silver colum 263 miles high.

Now, it may be argued that this expediture was necessary. Some of it was spent on works of no public utility, and other great sums were spent extravagantly, and shall I say corruptly? I think I can venture to use that word. Let me give you a few instances in which money has been spent corruptly, and blundering and incapacity exhibited. You will remember that, a few years ago, the contractor named Onderdonk received $209,000 which, it is proved, he should not have received. That was lost to the people of this country. I will not take time to go into the history of that matter; it is well known to all. It was admitted by the men then in office that that amount was lost to the people, although, like the Ministers to-day, they would not assume the responsibility of it. And who does not remember John Shields and the section B job in connection with which he was accused of stealing $365,000? He was accused by the "Globe" newspaper, openly and above board, and he had his alternative to take the matter into the courts; but, though he threatened to take an action for libel, the "Globe" invited him to come on; but, after letting the case lie in Osgoode Hall for six months, he withdrew it. Then, has it not been proven that in connection with the Langevin block, $300,000 was spent corruptly, and that the contracts and agreements were drawn in such a shape as to place in the hands of Charlebois, the chief contractor, the power to extract from the sub-contrators, 25 per cent of their contract prices? And need I remind you of the discussion which has taken place on the Curran bridges, in which it has been admitted that there has been a steal of $200,000 of the people's money? Nobody denies the steal, although the Government deny their responsibility; yet the money came out of the pockets of the people of Canada, and will not go back into them. Now, I refer to other extravagant expenditures:—

Little Rapids locks	$140,000
Fredericton bridge	300,000
Sheik's Island dam	150,000
Lake St. John Railway	50,000

And now I come to a particular point, and I am sorry the Minister of Railways and Canals is not in his place. I am going to give him some credit. He is deserving of credit. He took hold of the Intercolonial Railway two or three years ago and managed it in such a masterly manner that he saved $500,000, and I am prepared to give him the credit for this. He can give the credit to Mr. Pottinger or any other man he pleases, but I give it to him. And I give him credit for this, that he says he has not interfered with the efficiency of the road in any particular but ordered his engineer to maintain the condition of the road and cut down the expenditure. The result was that he saved this country $500,000 or $600,000. But how many years has the Liberal party pointed out in this House to the Government their extravagance in the management of the Intercolonial? I have been here nine

years, and every year I have pointed out, and the Reform party has pointed out, that that road was not run in an economical manner. We proposed the appointment of a commission to investigate the matter, but one after another hon. gentlemen opposite got up and said that everything was done as economically as possible and that not a dollar could be saved. Yet after fourteen years of deficits, $500,000 each year, making a total of $7,000,000 taken out of the pockets of the people, the Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Haggart, saved $500,000, and thus showed that the Opposition were right in their protests. But what about the Ministers of Railways who preceded him? If credit is to be given the present Minister for saving half a million dollars, the responsibility rests on the Government of not having effected that saving years ago.

Then there has been a great deal of money spent in works of no national utility. Will any hon. gentleman opposite say that the Tay Canal is a work of national utility? In that canal, only 6 miles long, which runs through a level country, for the canal has only one lock where it empties into the Rideau Canal, $83,000 per mile has been sunk, or no less than $476,000 altogether. I never heard any one yet attempt to justify that expenditure. I have heard the Minister of Railways and Canals plead this justification on the public platform, that when the grant was asked in 1883, the Liberal party did not oppose it. But he must admit that I am not responsible. Had I been here I would have opposed it; and it is no justification for taking money out of the pockets of the people to say that the Liberals did not oppose it. There was at that time only $132,000 required. The following year Sir Charles Tupper brought in another estimate, and the ensuing years up to 1887 further amounts were voted each year to build the canal.

Do hon. members know what boats ply on the canal? There is the steamboat "John Haggart," 117 tons; there is the "Harry Bateman," 116 tons; there is a yacht belonging to Mr. Peter McLaren, who goes up and down the river in it for the enjoyment of himself and family; there are two other boats called the 'Rover" and the "Firefly," and an old tug not deserving of a name, and which has not got one. This is the whole flotilla that navigates this grand canal, at an expense to the country of a half million dollars. What revenue is received from this public work every year? The magnificent sum of $126. How much does it cost for maintenance? Last year it cost $2,000 besides the interest at 4 per cent on the $500,000, making $20,000, or a total of $22,000 for maintaining this canal which is not worth 5 cents to the people.

Then another work of the national utility is the Trent Valley Navigation Canal. That is a work which should belong to the province, and which will never become a national one. I challenge any one to show me where at any point it can become national. You can only get six feet of water at any point on the canal, and in fact now one of the locks is only fitted for 5 feet of water. The shipping from the northern lakes wil never be able to send their boats through the canal to reach Lake Ontario, because the cost of loading and reloading would be greater than the expense of going round by the upper peninsula. So eminent an engineer as Mr. Shanly said it would never be more than a local work. Yet this Government have spent no less than $803,000 on it, and they have now a contract given to Mr. Onderdonk, of Canadian Pacific Railway fame, for $492,000, making $1,250,000 which will be spent for the purpose of giving a route—and a long route at that—to 12 or 15 districts. Had it not been for the late Sir John Macdonald, this work would have been in the hands of the local government.

Arrangements had been entered into between Sir Oliver Mowat and the late Mr. Alexander Mackenzie, under which Sir Oliver was to take it over. All the negotiations were ready to be signed when Mr. Mackenzie was defeated in September, 1878, and the arrangements were not completed. Sir John Macdonald went before the constituencies and said he would make this a national work. Every year, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, and 1887, money has been voted until nearly $800,000 has been spent, and now, on the eve of another election, the Government is about to spend $492,000 more in order to curry favour with the constituencies along that line.

I might go on almost ad infinitum pointing out the various extravagances, but I will be satisfied with pointing out one or two more. Do you really suppose that this Royal Commission on the liquor question was not an absolute waste of money—$91,000 thrown away? The result of that royal commission is not worth the snap of one's finger, so far as any practical value can arise from it. It was appointed solely to avoid a direct vote upon the prohibition question; and if I could only appeal privately to the judgment of the men looking at me from the opposite side, every one of them would say that there was not a scintilla of justification for the appointment of that commission.

If we were economical in the administration of public affairs, we would never have passed that iniquitous Franchise Act, which was passed in 1885, and which has saddled this country with a great number of inconveniences, and which has cost up to the present over $1,250,000.

For seventeen years before that, we used the local lists and no one found fault with them until Sir John Macdonald, in 1885, sought to manipulate the lists in order to get more power into his own hands. The scheme was a fit sequel to the Gerrymander Act which he introduced a few years before.

In Ontario, during the last election, the Liberals polled 182,000 votes in round numbers, and the Conservatives 186,000; and yet the Liberals have only 27 members as compared with 59 Conservatives. What was it caused this disparity? It was the iniquitous Gerrymander and Franchise Acts.

I will not detain the House any longer, but thanking hon. members for the attention they have given to my remarks and expressing the hope that they will take to heart the facts I have established, I beg to resume my seat.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Mills):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Landerkin,
Bain (Wentworth),	Langelier,
Beausoleil,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Leduc,
Boston,	Legris,
Bowers,	Lowell,
Bowman,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brodeur,	McGregor,
Brown,	McIsaac,
Campbell,	McMillan,
Carroll,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Mignault,
Casey,	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Monet,
Christie,	Mulock,
Colter,	Proulx,
Davies,	Rider,
Dawson,	Rinfret,
Delisle,	Sanborn,
Devlin,	Scriver,
Edwards,	Semple,
Featherston,	Somerville,
Flint,	Sutherland,
Gibson,	Tarte,
Gillmor,	Vaillancourt,
Guay,	Welsh, and
Harwood,	Yeo.—57.
Innes,	

NAYS:

Messieurs:

Bain (Soulanges),	Macdonell (Algoma),
Belley,	Maclean (York),
Bennett,	McAlister,
Bergeron,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Bergin,	McDonald (Victoria),
Boyd,	McDougald (Pictou),
Boyle,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cameron,	McKay,
Cargill,	McLennan,
Carling (Sir John),	McLeod,
Carpenter,	Madill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mara,
Chesley,	Marshall,
Cleveland,	Masson,
Coatsworth,	Metcalfe,
Corbould,	Mills (Annapolis),
Craig,	Montague,
Curran,	Northrup,
Daly,	Ouimet,
Davin,	Patterson (Colchester),
Davis (Alberta),	Pelletier,
Denison,	Prior,
Dugas,	Putnam,
Dyer,	Reid,
Earle,	Robillard,
Fairbairn,	Rosamond,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),	Ross (Dundas),
	Ross (Lisgar),
Foster,	Ryckman,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Grandbois,	Stevenson,
Grant (Sir James),	Taylor,
Guillet,	Temple,
Haslam,	Tisdale,
Hazen,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Henderson,	
Hughes,	Turcotte,
Hutchins,	Wallace,
Jeannotte,	White (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,	White (Shelburne),
Kenny,	Wilmot,
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wilson,
LaRivière,	Wood (Brockville), and
Lippé,	Wood (Westm'd).—87.
Macdonald (King's),	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Haggart,	Edgar,
Patterson (Huron),	Rowand,
Pridham,	Grieve,
Moncrieff,	Lister,
Stairs,	Forbes,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Frémont,
Ives,	Paterson (Brant),
Joncas,	Préfontaine,
Smith (Sir Donald),	Béchard,
Smith (Ontario),	Livingston,
Bryson,	Fraser,
Simard,	Godbout,
Amyot,	Bourassa,
Baker,	Choquette,
Tyrwhitt,	Perry,
Macdowall,	Fauvel,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),	Geoffrion,
Cochrane,	Martin,
Lachapelle,	Bruneau,
Weldon,	Borden,
McNeill,	McCarthy.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) has not voted.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I did not record my vote, because I understand that I am paired with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Fauvel) when either of us is absent. I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) did not vote.

Mr. LISTER. I am paired with the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff).

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for King's, N.S., (Mr. Borden) did not vote.

Mr. BORDEN. I am paired with the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). I would have voted for the amendment.

Main motion agreed to; and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Contingent expenses in connection with the Voters' Lists $2,500

Mr. McMULLEN. Does this complete the expenditures for the voters' lists ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is the usual annual vote taken in connection with the voters' lists. A great portion of it has to do with the distribution of the lists.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the total amount expended this year ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. This vote has not to do with the printing. I have not the figures asked for by the hon. gentleman at hand for the moment ; but he will find them all in "Hansard."

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is it half a million ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, about $140,000.

Salaries of officers of the Library..... $17,262

Mr. McMULLEN. How many officers are there ?

Mr. FOSTER. The same as last year, exactly ; there has been no addition.

Mr. McMULLEN. I hope the Finance Minister will see his way to begin to make reduction before long. He ought really to commence this year. I do not wish to detain the committee with a long discussion of this matter, but I think that reductions should be made.

Mr. FOSTER. I will look into that matter very carefully.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a matter of no very great moment, but I observe the hon. gentleman provides for two increases amounting to $100, but in the summary he provides only for the regular vote. What is he going to do with the item on page 35 ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a mistake in addition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All the worse for the parties who were to have got the benefit.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose we could call it a clerical error, and put a "2" in there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You can't do that.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be some way out.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the regulations as to returning books, and what is the number generaly out ? I have often thought that a return should be laid on the Table at the opening of every session, showing the number of books taken out, and the number not returned, according to the rules of the library. I have no doubt there are large numbers not returned.

Mr. FOSTER. The chairman of the Library Committee, the hon. the Speaker will give the information.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rules regulating the library will be found among the standing rules of the House of Commons, and I would refer the hon. gentleman to these rules, beginning at 111. The following is one of the rules :—

114. During the Recess of Parliament, the Library and Reading Room shall be open every day in each week, Sundays and holidays excepted, from the hour of ten in the morning till three in the afternoon ; and access to the Library shall be permitted to persons introduced by a member of either House, or admitted at the discretion of the Clerk or Librarian ; subject to such regulations as may be deemed necessary for the security and preservation of the collection ; but no one shall be allowed to take any book out of the Library, except members of either House, and such others as may be authorized by the Speaker of either House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was aware of the rule, but I wanted to know the extent to which books are got out and not returned in accordance with the regulations of the library. No doubt some do not comply strictly with the rules. If there are defaulters, we should know the extent to which default exists, and I think it would be of great advantage if the Library Committee would lay before Parliament a list to show who were in default, and to what extent.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think there are defaults to any considerable extent. The librarians are very particular, and if a book remains out for a considerable length of time in the hands of a member of Parliament, he is notified to return it. These notifications go very frequently and the librarians take care that books do not remain out for any length of time. My own impression is that very few books are lost or destroyed in that way, and certainly no books of any great value to members of Parliament.

Printing, printing paper and binding.... $85,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do you propose to make a saving of $15,000 ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The experience of last year justified us in coming to the conclusion that $85,000 would be sufficient for the present year. The Estimate is usually made by the clerk of the Printing Committee, but the Clerk of the House had a fair idea of the amount that was required, and he thought we were justified in reducing the previous vote by $15,000.

Archives $6,000

Mr. CASEY. What was Mr. Brymner doing in London ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. He was occupied in copying important documents, especially papers relating to the two Canada's down to 1812,

and immediately preceding the union of the provinces. Special investigation was made of those documents by Mr. Brymner himself in London.

Mr. CASEY. He was looking into what documents could be copied, I suppose.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Because I see there is a charge for a large number of copies besides.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He was investigating them, and of course had to employ some clerical assistance.

Mr. CASEY. Was his presence required there for the whole year?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I had some conversation with him the other day, and he said that many documents that he did not investigate ought to be investigated.

Mr. CASEY. Is he to be sent back?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have not information on that point.

Mr. FLINT. I would ask the Secretary of State if any inquiry has been made, and if so with what result, as regards the missing documents connected with Confederation, concerning which considerable discussion took place a few weeks ago. It will be remembered that one of the prominent delegates connected with the original scheme of union, stated that all the documents relating to that matter and leading up to the British North America Act, would probably be found on file in the archives at Ottawa. Immediate inquiry was made, with the startling discovery that they were not on file at Ottawa, and could not be found. I would ask the Secretary of State if any steps have been taken to look into this matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not able to answer the hon. gentleman off-hand, but I will get the information and convey it to him, either privately or publicly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are, I believe, a large number of documents in the Privy Council office of a historical character, and of great value. Has the Privy Council office been searched for those papers to which my hon. friend has referred?—because that would be the most likely place in which to find those documents. While I am on my feet I may as well put another question to the hon. gentleman, and it is with regard to the journals of the Frobishers. I made inquiry a few years ago about the brothers Frobishers, who, in the last century about the same time that the elder Henry went from Mackinaw up into the North-west Territories, also went there, and we know from what Mr. Henry has stated in his journal, that these brothers also kept a journal of the North-west Territories. They were connected at the time with the North-west Trading Company. Those journals would be very valuable contributions to the history of that country. I think we have here in the library in manuscript the journal of the younger Henry. The elder Henry went up into the North-west Territories shortly after the destruction of Mackinaw by Pontiac, about 130 years ago, and the Frobishers were there about that time. We have the younger Henry's journal beginning with the year 1799, and coming down to 1814, here in the library in manuscript, and we have also in printed form the journal of Daniel Harmon, but the journals of the two Frobishers, so far as I know, have not been discovered. Yet they must be in existence somewhere, and I think likely in Montreal or Quebec.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no doubt that a search of the Privy Council was made for these missing documents. However, I have no special knowledge, and am therefore unable to answer. With regard to the other matter, I will call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to it.

Mr. CASEY. There is something over $1,000 here in salaries to binders in connection with the Archives branch, and only about $200 is for printing. I do not understand the discrepancy between the items for printing and binding.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have not the figures with me, not being the head of the department, but there must be some explanation.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister who is responsible for this, should have furnished the Secretary of State with a full brief. There are $1,045 charged for salaries of binders, and only $204 for printing. I suppose they are for binding other than printed books. The items are on page A—7, Auditor General's Report. It seems strange that binders should be specially engaged for that department when we have a Printing Bureau where binding is done. But I wish to make one or two general remarks. It is important that in addition to this considerable expenditure for accumulating precious documents, there should be a well judged expenditure every year in printing some of the more valuable ones. There is no such security for the perpetuation of a document as to have printed copies of it in a good many places. In case of a fire in the department, all of these valuable papers might be lost with no hope of replacing them. It should be left either to the archivist or to a committee to see what documents should be published. Has a search been lately made for any additional records in Paris on the earliest history of Canada?

Mr. MONTAGUE. A search was made last year in Paris by Mr. Brymner. With respect to the printing of historical documents, it is a matter of importance, and

several of them are being printed each year. It is not desirable, however, to expend too much money, but it is intended to continue the work.

"Patent Record"..... $9,250

Mr. CASEY. Does the "Patent Record" pay its way?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It costs $9,450 for printing and engraving. There are fees charged for the registration of patents, and the amount received, not only pays for the issue of the "Record," but also covers the whole expense of the department.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is any fee charged for printing cuts of patented articles?

Mr. MONTAGUE. A fee is charged for issuing each patent, such fee running from $40 to $60: that includes publication.

Mr. CASEY. I notice that considerable sums are paid for lithographing, the principal amount being paid to the Sabiston Company, of Montreal, $1,200. Is not work of this class done at the Printing Bureau?

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have not facilities there for doing that special class of work.

Statistics, Printing Year-Book and Statistical Abstract of Canada..... $4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt very much whether we could not advantageously wipe out this whole amount, but in any case I am decidely opposed to an increase. The amount previously voted, $3,200, is ample to more than pay for the results we obtain. There is no justification whatever for proposing that at a time when we are decreasing every other item, to increase this item by $800.

Mr. FOSTER. It was done at the urgent request of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), and one or two other members of the Opposition who desired more copies.

Mr. CASEY. That is a pretty good joke on the part of the Finance Minister, but the Estimates were prepared before any reference was made to the subject.

Mr. SPROULE. As one who has received a number of applications for copies of this book, I may say that I have been unable to obtain copies although I have visited the different departments and have endeavoured to either buy or obtain copies, they being specially sought for by school teachers who find the book very valuable. I have received six applications from school teachers for copies of the book, but have not been able to supply them. In my opinion the Government should print a larger edition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I move that the $800 be struck off.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) must have none but Conservative teachers in his constituency, because, after all, it is a partisan book.

Mr. SPROULE. The last application I had was from one of the worst Grits in the county.

Mr. MONTAGUE. With all due deference to the opinion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) there is a genuine demand for this work, and not from persons engaging in election campaigns, but from colleges and universities, and teachers in the various institutions of the country, as well as from public men in other countries. The demand last year from all sections, and from the various provinces, was greater than could be supplied by the sum voted. This small addition will not print nearly as many copies as were asked for last year. The demand comes from members of the local assemblies, and others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a very brilliant commentary on the desire for economy by the Government, that you could not allow $500 to give the Auditor General the requisite clerical assistance to complete his work, but that you can vote $800 for this campaign document.

Mr. FOSTER. This is to meet the demand which comes from countries outside of Canada for real information in reference to the resources of the country. I suppose an antidote is necessary for some of my hon. friend's speeches which sometimes go outside. The Queen's Printer sells quite a number of copies and that will recoup the added expense, I hope.

Mr. McMULLEN. Some two years ago, this production was subjected to severe criticism in the House, and it was then shown that it was nothing less than a compilation of campaign figures for the use of the supporters of the Government. The newspaper press of the country has shown clearly and distinctly that in many cases it is an attempt to offer all manner of excuses in favour of the National Policy. If this additional $800 would produce a respectable and reliable Year-Book, I would not hesitate a moment to consent to it, but if we are going to have a repetition of a production containing arguments in favour of the policy of the Government, then this is only money thrown away. If we do not get a guarantee that we will have a reliable statistical record, then we are better without a Year-Book. If hon. gentlemen opposite want campaign literature, they should pay for it as we do on this side of the House, and not charge it up to the country.

Mr. HUGHES. I am surprised to see that not more than $800 increase was asked for. This year applications have been coming in for this book from the teachers of the collegiate institutes and public schools throughout the land, as well as from various others. I do not say that it is exactly perfect in all respects; very few books are perfect. At the same time, there is in the work an im-

mense amount of accurate and useful information concerning the Dominion, and it is sought for very eagerly by teachers. Some years ago I distributed this book in the county I represent, and ever since, I have had numerous applications from all the teachers of educational institutions in the country, as well as from the cities and towns surrounding. I think the Government would be wise in spending sufficient money to furnish a copy to every school from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. FLINT. Some hon. gentlemen appear to misapprehend the line of objection taken on this side of the House. We do not object to the publication of a statistical abstract of the condition of the country, if that abstract were satisfactory and accurate. But, it appears to gentlemen on this side of the House, and I think it appears also to any impartial observer, that this is an argumentative document in favour of the Government's policy. It does not give statistical tables, and leave the reader to draw his own conclusions, but the statistician, who is a man of a great deal of ability, proceeds to debate and argue the matter by a very ingenious method, and the whole tenor of the book is to assist the supporters of the Government in their policy and campaign utterances. All this make the book more expensive than it ought to be. I believe that without the least deterioration to the value of the book, 30 or 40 per cent of the matter in it could well be struck out. I have seen statistical abstracts published by the United States, and there is nothing of this kind in them. I made a memo. at one time of many allusions in this book which were of so strong a partisan character that it was clear that the statistician, who is a strong supporter of the present Administration, had been led away by his political feelings. Other parts of the book might be criticised as regards its arrangement, for in many cases it is very scrappy. It selects, apparently, without any logical reasons, very peculiar periods for comparison, and to my mind it conveys a very strong impression that the compiler presents only one side of the political case, so far as he can. I think the Government should caution the statistician, and insist that an immense amount of the text between the tables be struck out. It is my opinion the committee ought not vote this large sum of money for the publication of this partisan book.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was very much surprised, in looking over the Year-Book to find that an effort has been made there to make the condition of the farmers of the country in 1891, appear more prosperous than they were in 1881. It endeavoured to make out that the farmer of 1891 had an annual income of $71 more than the farmer of 1881, but, by a strange system of manipulation, it was shown that there was a large number more owners of the soil, according to the census, in 1891 than in 1881. However, it made out 7,000 fewer farmers in the Dominion. I cannot understand how there could be a large increase in the number of the occupants of the soil without an increase taking place in the number of the farmers, and in making a careful calculation, instead of the farmer in 1891 being $71 better off than the farmer in 1881, he was $70 worse. That is just a little mistake of $150 by the system of manipulating the number of farmers in the country. I hope that all these inferences and deductions in favour of the National Policy will disappear from the Year-Book. If it is to be of any benefit to Canadians, as well as to strangers, all the partisan writings should be struck out from it.

Mr. CASEY. As one of those who complained, in the earlier part of the session, of not getting extra copies of the Year-Book, I think I am right in saying something on the question. The Year-Book is undoubtedly open to the accusation made by my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), and by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan), that it is not of the nature of a statistical record at all, but of the nature of an argument based upon statistics. A statistical abstract should not be made on any such plan. It should not be a set of reasonings from the figures, but a mere setting forth of the figures themselves, leaving everybody to form their own conclusions. In that respect I am thoroughly in accord with the position that the Year-Book is a campaign document. We are all aware of the peculiar manner in which it has treated manufactured goods. Up to a few years ago the exports of manufactures as set forth in the Year-Book and in the Trade and Navigation Returns, included only those things which were commonly considered as manufactures—the product of factories. But at a certain period it was decided to include among manufactures in these publications such articles as lumber, because it had passed through a mill. Lumber, which always used to be included amongst the products of the forest, was put among the list of manufactured goods for the purpose of booming the National Policy. That is one of the instances in which the record has been doctored for party purposes. It would take a great deal too long to read extracts from the book to show the way in which the arguments are fitted in between the tables for the purpose of misleading anybody who is not acquainted with the facts or the opposing arguments. But, with all these faults, the Year-Book has the sole merit of containing in brief shape a mass of statistics which otherwise could only be got by compiling them from the reports of the different departments. It is for the sake of that compilation alone that I have ever expressed a desire to get hold of the book. Seeing that it is issued as a campaign document to the extent to which I have referred, I think those in Opposition should

get it as freely as others. I am aware that a large number of these books were placed at the disposal of Ministers as well as those that were sent to members. These would, of course, go where they do most good, and I think the book should be placed also in the hands of people who can see its inconsistencies. In an election campaign it should be put in the hands of both sides. The increase in this item which the hon. member for South Oxford proposes to strike out has not been stated to be for the purpose of more widely distributing the book. We have had no explanation yet of the object of this $800. If the Minister will state distinctly that it is for printing, it will be information for the committee; but as this increase was made in the Estimates before the question of the small supply of the book was raised in the House, I do not see any connection between the two matters. I think the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, under the circumstances, is not unreasonable.

Amendment negatived.

Aid to Agricultural Societies, North-west Territories $7,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is it proposed to distribute that amount?

Mr. MONTAGUE. This amount is the same as last year. The vote is distributed among 38 societies on the principle of the number of members belonging to each society, the largest sum any society can receive being $250. The amount is divided proportionately among the societies according to the number of their members.

Mr. CASEY. Last year one society received as much as $307, and another $262. So that principle must be new.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is for the future.

The Haras National, for the use of six stallions for the Experimental Farms.. $6,000

Mr. McMILLAN. Is this the last year this amount is to be paid?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may comfort my hon. friend's soul by saying that it is.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have great objection to the report of any Minister being used by any company to advertise their goods. At page 101 of the report of the Minister of Agriculture there is an advertisement of the goods of this company, which, I think, is out of place altogether. When they are getting such a large amount of money, I think it is wrong to allow them to have this advertisement sent throughout the length and breadth of the land at the expense of the Government, particularly as it places these animals in a very favourable light. I have seen a number of them, and I must say that I would not favour them at all as breeding animals; and for the Government to give this company such an advertisement is unjust to all the other breeders in the country who are keeping animals of the same description.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I quite agree with my hon. friend that no advertisement should appear in the report. I fancy it must be some statement in connection with the department.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is a glowing description of these animals that they are not entitled to receive.

Mr. CASEY. There is great force in the hon. gentleman's contention that the goods of a company who happen to be used by the Government should not be advertised at the public expense. I call the attention to the fact that the goods of any company which happened to be used by the Government should not be advertised at the public expense. The whole episode of this hiring of stallions from the Haras National for the purpose of improving the breed, whether of Conservative voters or of horses I do not know, is a very scandalous one, and one which reflects no credit upon the department which the Secretary of State unfortunately has to represent to-night.

Printing and distribution of reports and bulletins of Experimental Farms, and distribution of seed grains for testing by farmers; also trees and tree seeds.. $2,000

Mr. McMILLAN. When are we going to get the report of the Dairy Commissioner? Dairying is one of the most important branches of the farming industry, and we have not had a report from the Dairy Commissioner since 1893, nor have we had a report from the Experimental Farms of 1894. If there is to be any benefit to be derived from keeping a farm like this in operation, with all the expenditure it entails, benefit can only be derived when the information gained from its operation is laid before the farmers in such a manner that they can understand the benefit of it. We have not had the report of the Dairy Commissioner since 1893. It was recommended last year by the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization that the dairy and farm reports should both be included in one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The report will be in the hands of the printer at the end of this month, covering the two years, 1894 and 1895. In that the work is brought up to the end of June this year. I give my word that it will be published as quickly as the Printing Bureau will allow it to be done.

Additional for promoting dairy industry in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, North-west Territories and British Columbia—

Additional travelling instructors in Nova Scotia for the whole year.....	$ 200
Two travelling dairies in Manitoba and the North-west, four men at $500 each.	2,000
Travelling expenses, $350 each.....	1,400
Three dairy stations in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, at $500 each..	1,500
Amount for additional work in Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, North-west Territories and British Columbia.....	2,500

Mr. PRIOR. I do not see any mention of British Columbia in the amounts, although the item is stated to be for the purpose of promoting dairy industry in British Columbia. What do the Government intend to do in regard to British Columbia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The same work which was performed by Mr. Robertson in the other provinces, namely, visiting the factories and districts for the purpose of giving instructions in the work. Mr. Robertson intends to visit British Columbia.

Mr. CASEY. What is the difference between these two items? They appear to be both for the same purpose.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The second item is an additional sum for the same class of work. There was pressure brought to increase the amount after the first item was prepared, and an additional item was added, though they both might be included in the one vote.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, but that is no explanation at all. The first item apportions the expense—so much for travelling inspectors, so much for travelling dairies, so much for dairy stations, and so on. The next item which is to be added to the item already voted has nothing to show how it is to be distributed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think it would be unwise to restrict the department as to that. My hon. friend knows that the department is run in excellent order—none better on the continent. This is for carrying out the general work. In reply to my hon. friend from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior), I would say that the work was not undertaken in British Columbia last year, but it is to be undertaken this year.

Mr. CASEY. But in explanation of an item we expect to get some statement of the work, and where there is an increase of $2,500, as in this case, we expect some explanation of how the money is to be spent. As the hon. Minister has his advice near him, he ought to be able to give the information at once.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have these items already voted for work in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, North-west Territories, and British Columbia, and also this vote of $2,500 for additional work, making in all $7,500. It is under the head of maintenance, and not expected to be continuous, and therefore kept distinct.

Mr. CASEY. Is it intended to spend more on existing stations or to increase the number of stations?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is in the discretion of the department. I suppose it will increase the number of stations.

Special Exhibition of Photography at the Imperial Institute..... $1,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. The object of this is to give effect to an Order in Council for Canadian representation of photography at the Imperial Institute. The charge will be mainly for express, and will be kept as low as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do these photographs include photographs of the present Cabinet?

Mr. MONTAGUE. And of leading gentlemen on the other side as well.

Mr. CASEY. Is there to be an exhibition of photography at the Imperial Institute?

Mr. MONTAGUE. This will include photographs of Canadian scenes taken by Canadian artists.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the object simply to show the skill of the photographers, or to show the beauty of Canadian scenes?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is designed to do both.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not see, at this moment, any justification for spending money to show the skill of the Canadian people in the art of photography.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend will see, from his wide knowledge of these matters, that it is impossible to separate these two. In exhibiting photos of Canadian scenes you must of necessity exhibit the skill of Canadian photographers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would it not be well to have a set of magic lantern slides for the use of peripatetic lecturers whom we employ. They would be much more interesting than the lecture we heard in another place, either from a High Commissioner or any of his deputies.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We will keep those for the campaign.

Mr. MULOCK. I am inclined to doubt that the object is to exhibit Canadian scenes. In the item the words used are, "Special exhibition of photography." It seems to me the object is to exhibit the skill of Canadian photographers. The Minister is ingenious in finding an explanation. But I am hardly able to accept what he says as serious. It is certainly highly creditable to his ingenuity.

Mr. FOSTER. A special exhibition, so to speak.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that the item stand over until we have the report on which it is based, because at present it looks like the commencement of an item that will be found year after year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is the last time of asking.

Mr. MULOCK. Up to this time, the hon. gentleman has produced nothing in favour

of this item. We have been exceedingly lenient in passing these items upon the vaguest sort of explanations—if they may be called explanations—that the hon. gentleman has given.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think my hon. friend is hardly as fair as he usually is in making the criticism he has made. Undoubtedly good will come to the country if Canada takes a high stand in any exhibition. I am sure my hon. friend agrees with me.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not. I think it is perfect rubbish.

Mr. CASEY. Is this an exhibition of photographs bought or procured by the Government, or is this for the purpose of aiding Canadian exhibitors generally at that exhibition?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand it is to aid Canadian exhibitors as well as to exhibit Canadian scenes.

Mr. CASEY. There is a photographic branch in the Department of the Interior, where a vast number of views have been obtained of scenes along the Canadian Pacific Railway, and so on. These photographs have come to the department in the regular way, and without special expense, except the cost of shipping. These should suffice to exhibit Canadian scenery.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is to meet freight and express charges.

Mr. MULOCK. Surely such a large item could not be for that purpose. Were any representations made to the Government in favour of this appropriation?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I believe so, the Photographic Association asked for this.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that the item stand over for further information. I am not at all satisfied that this is a wise appropriation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There are no campaign pictures in it.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the hon. Minister to allow the item to stand. I do not think it is fair of him to press it. I do not wish to be unreasonable in regard to any estimates in his charge, as he is only new in office.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you move to strike it out?

Mr. MULOCK. If the Minister insists upon going on with this question I shall have to take some formal stand upon it. I think, considering the manner in which his items have been treated he would promote the progress of the others by not insisting upon this. This is a new item, and the hon. Minister cannot give details. If the hon. gentleman refuses my suggestion, I shall have to make a motion on this question, that is all. I move that the item be struck out.

Motion negatived.

Salaries for Organized Quarantine Districts $35,000

Mr. CASEY. I see there is a reduction on this item. The Minister is aware that cholera is again on its travels, and I should like to be assured that this reduction of $5,500 does not mean any relaxation of the provisions taken against the introduction of cholera. I was sorry to be told the other day that certain improvements ordered by Dr. Montizambert for the quarantine station at Quebec, had been stopped, or payment was refused. Now that the fright we had some time ago has passed over, is it that less watchfulness is necessary this year? Perhaps the Minister will explain the reduction of this item.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No relaxation whatever will take place in the efforts of the department to prevent the introduction of cholera. No works have been stopped at Quebec.

Mr. CASEY. I do not suppose the Minister could tell of his own knowledge, but perhaps he will inquire about that. I am told positively that certain things had been ordered there by Dr. Montizambert, and were countermanded by orders of the department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will give you the information.

Public Health in other Quarantine Districts $5,000

Mr. FORBES. Where is that going to be spent?

Mr. FOSTER. Wherever it is required, as need arises.

Tracadie Lazaretto $4,000

Mr. PRIOR. I understand this vote is in support of the Lazaretto in New Brunswick, and I believe that in accordance with terms of union, the Dominion has to look after lepers in that province. But unfortunately they do not do the same thing in British Columbia. At the present time we have some eight or ten lepers in British Columbia, all Chinese. No white people have been affected with that dreadful disease, so far. Up to the present time, in Victoria and Vancouver, the city councils have paid for their keep and their care. They have them on an island by themselves, Darcey Island, and the cities have to pay the expense of their maintenance. But they think, as I think, that it is time now that the Dominion Government took over this charge. Although there was no mention made of it in the terms of union, the reason I believe is that then there were no lepers known to be in the country. But there are some now, and we think that the Dominion should take them over, especially when we consider that they are all Chinese, and that

the Government get a large revenue from the Chinese tax. If they were white people, I do not think we would have so strong a claim, but considering that they are all Chinese, and that the Government get two-thirds of the head tax on Chinese immigrants, the city councils of those towns think that this Government might fairly take over that charge.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the actual cost of keeping them ?

Mr. PRIOR. I think $3,000 or $4,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Dominion Government are at present paying part of the expense. For the past two years the Department of Agriculture has taken part of the general vote for health, and have contributed it towards the expense of those lepers on that island.

Mr. PRIOR. They think you ought to pay all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what score do you make this decrease of $600 in the Tracadie Lazaretto ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is a mistake of the printer ; it should be $4,600. There are at present 21 lepers in the Lazaretto.

Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospital..... $4,000

Mr. CASEY. Is this amount paid in a lump sum, or per capita ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. This vote used to be $10,000 a year. It is a vote in accordance with an agreement made in 1880 between delegates from Manitoba and the Dominion. Settlement at that time had not extended in the North-west Territories to so great an extent as has followed the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The payment is made pro rata, in proportion to the number of inhabitants in each.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 26th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SAVING BY REDUCTION OF ACTIVE MILITIA FORCE.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, What will be the annual saving in expenditure effected by the proposed reduction of the active militia force ?

Mr. PRIOR.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The reduction in expenditure effected by the proposed reduction of the permanent corps and the reduction of drill is $479,298 ; miscellaneous items, $50,000.

FRANCO-CANADIAN TREATY.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, When is the Franco-Canadian Treaty to be finally ratified and put into operation ?

Mr. FOSTER. The Franco-Canadian Treaty will be finally ratified and put in operation directly after legislation which is now pending before this House.

EXEMPTED STREAMS.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, 1. What are the streams which were wholly or partially exempt from the operation of subsection two of section fifteen of "The Fisheries Act" ? 2. What are the streams which were wholly or partially exempt from the operation of section six of chapter 51, "An Act further to amend the Fisheries Act" ?

Mr. FOSTER. The following are the streams referred to :—Exempt by Order in Council : 1. Crooked Creek, Albert County, N.B. ; Nashwaak River, York County, N.B. ; Beaver Creek, Waterloo County, Ont. That portion of St. Francis River in the county of Richmond, in the province of Quebec, called "Brompton Falls." All that part of the Ottawa River lying between the Chaudiere Falls and Mackay's Bay, and also all that part of the Gatineau River from the mill pond above Gilmour & Co's mills at Chelsea to the mouth of the said Gatineau River. Exempted by order of the Minister : Madawaska River, Victoria County, N.B. ; Presqu' Ile Stream, Carleton County, N.B. ; Great Salmon, St. John County, N.B. ; Stream at Alma, Albert County, N.B. ; Point Wolfe, Albert County, N.B. ; Mill Stream, Westmoreland County, N.B. ; Bristol Brook, Westmoreland County, N.B. ; Little Chockfish, Kent County, N.B.; Kouchibougiac, Kent County, N.B.; Nicholas, Kent County, N.B. ; Two Rivers, Cumberland County, N.S. ; Brownell Brook, Cumberland County, N.S. ; East River, Sheet Harbour, Halifax, N.S. ; brook on Argyle River, Yarmouth County, N.S. ; Bear River, west branch, Digby County, N.S. ; Liverpool, Queen's County, N.S. ; Port Medway, Queen's County, N.S. ; Morden's Creek, Wentworth County, Ont. ; South-west Rideau, Grenville County, Ont.

RICHMOND STATION, P.Q., AND DENISON MILLS MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, 1. How many days after asking for tenders was the contract for carrying the mail from Richmond station post office to Denison Mills post office, in the county of Richmond, P.Q., given in 1894 ? 2. At what date were the

advertisements asking for tenders in relation to said contract made? 3. At what date was the contract given, and to whom? 4. What was the reason of the Government for removing the Denison Mills post office to a distance of over four miles from its former place, and keeping the same name to it? 5. Has the Postmaster General received petitions from over three hundred people asking for leave to take their mail at Richmond station post office? 6. Were the prayers of these petitioners granted or refused? 7. Is the Postmaster General aware of the fact, that the location of the new post office at Denison Mills is only at a distance of one mile and a quarter of a post office called "St. Cyr," in the county of Richmond, and that the mail could be carried from that last post office to Denison Mills post office at a greatly reduced rate, instead of having it carried from Richmond station, which is at a distance of eight miles from the actual post office of Denison Mills?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. Tenders were opened at the department thirty-two days after the date of the notices. 2. Advertisements were dated 13th August, 1894. 3. Tenders were opened and contract awarded on the 18th September, 1894, four days after the date fixed for the reception of tenders. H. McDarby, the lowest tenderer, received the contract. 4. The distance between the former site and the present one is one and one-quarter miles, and the office was removed because the postmaster refused to continue the office, and every effort to secure a postmaster in the immediate vicinity was unavailing. 5. A largely-signed petition was received at the department on the 31st January last, asking either that the office be restored to its former site, or that the petitioners be allowed to receive their correspondence at Richmond station. 6. The petition was not complied with for the reason given above. 7. The Postmaster General is not aware of the proximity of the Denison Mills post office to St. Cyr post office, but will have the question of serving Denison's Mills from that office inquired into without delay.

SEIZURES OF ILLICIT DISTILLERIES.

Mr. FRASER asked, 1. Have any seizures been made by Mr. Bourinot, collector of customs at Hawkesbury, N.S., in the county of Inverness, during the year 1894, of illicit distilleries? If so, now many, and their names? 2. What amount was collected from them or obtained by sale of seized property? 3. How much was paid the informer, and what sum was paid or retained by the collector?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). 1. Yes, three—from Alex. and John Campbell, from John McIsaac, and from Alex. B. Beeton. 2. Nothing has yet been collected from the above-named persons. There are no proceeds from the sale of articles seized. 3. The sum of $292.80 was forwarded to Collector Bourinot to pay the informers in these cases. The department is not aware of the sum retained by the collector.

J. A. SECRETAN.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) asked, What amount has been paid by the Department of Militia and Defence to J. A. Secretan, from the 1st of July, 1893, to the 1st of June, 1895? What duties has he performed? Upon what matters, if any, has he reported to the department?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. The sum of $649.45 was paid to Mr. Secretan by the department, from July 1st, 1893, to June 1st, 1895. 2. His duties were of a confidential nature. 3. He reported direct to the Minister. There is no record of his report in the department.

LIEUT.-COL. JOHN GRAY.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) asked, What position in the militia of Canada does Lieut.-Col. John Gray hold at the present time? When was he appointed Superintendent of Stores? What are the special duties assigned to him as such superintendent? What is the salary allowed him? Are any allowances granted to him in addition to his salary? If so, what is the amount?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. He is inspector of stores. Appointed by Order in Council of the 31st January, 1895. 2. He was appointed Superintendent of Stores on 22nd August, 1893. 3. His duties as superintendent of stores were to take charge of all military stores at the head-quarters of his military district, being held responsible for all receipts and issues of clothing and stores, and the proper discharge of all duties assigned to the store men and labourers under his control, and to make such returns as are called for from time to time by the department. 4. His present salary is $1,200. 5. Yes, he receives a lodging allowance. 6. $1 per diem.

LIEUT.-COL. G. MATTICE.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) asked, When was Lieut.-Col. G. Mattice retired as brigade major from the service? What was the amount of allowance paid him at retirement? How long after was it before he was reinstated? What is the amount of his salary? What other sums are paid him in addition to salary? Why was he retired, and why was he reinstated?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. Lieut.-Col. Mattice was retired as brigade major from the service by Militia General Order No. 51, dated 25th August, 1893. 2. A gratuity of $2,400 was paid Lieut.-Col. Mattice on his retirement. 3. He was not reinstated, but

was appointed superintendent of stores at Montreal by Order in Council of 31st January, 1895. 4. His present salary is $1,200 per annum. 5. None. 6. Lieut.-Col. Mattice was retired on the recommendation of the General Officer commanding. He was not reinstated as brigade major, but was appointed superintendent of stores on the 31st January, 1895, by Order in Council, to fill the vacancy created by the removal of Lieut. Col. Gray to the position of inspector of stores.

CUSTOMS OFFICER AT COURTRIGHT.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Lister) asked, Whether Mr. Cronk, the Customs officer at Courtright, has been superannuated or retired? If so, has the position been filled by the appointment of some other person, and if such appointment has been made, who is the appointee?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Cronk has not been superannuated or retired, and there appears to be no necessity to do so, as the records of the department show the duties of his office to be carefully and efficiently attended to.

SUGAR ISLAND.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (for Mr. Grieve) asked, Has the island about six miles east of Gananoque, in the Thousand Islands, known as "Sugar Island," been sold by the Department of Indian Affairs? If so, when? To whom, and at what price?

Mr. DALY. Sugar or Mulcaster Island was sold on the 25th July, 1894, to Alexander Ferguson, for $900.

THE GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. MIGNAULT asked, What is the amount paid by the Government out of the subsidy voted in aid of the construction of the Great Eastern Railway? Of the amount paid, how much was given for that part of the line extending from Yamaska to St. François du Lac?

Mr. HAGGART. The amount paid by the Government out of the subsidy voted in aid of the construction of the Great Eastern Railway is $40,345. Of the amount paid, there was given for that part of the line extending from Yamaska to St. François du Lac, $19,260.

NAVIGATION OF THE ST. JOHN RIVER.

Mr. COLTER asked, Was any work done last year in improving the navigation of the St. John River between Fredericton and Woodstock? If so, where was the work done? What are the names of those who did the work, and what is the amount received by each? Was the person who had charge of the work recommended by the engineer of the department? If not, who was, and why was not the recommendation carried out?

Mr. OUIMET. Work for improving the navigation of the St. John River between Fredericton and Woodstock was done in September, October and November of last year at Springhill. The following men were employed on the work and received the amounts set opposite their name:—

John A. Campbell, foreman		$121 25
Harry Dumphy, labourer		58 12
Chester Dumphy	do	55 62
Steven Robinson	do	21 25
James Myrsall	do	18 75
Ephraim Myrsall, jun.	do	56 25
Alex. Goodine	do	55 00
Geo. Sylliphant, watchman		24 50
W. Leek, labourer		40 62
Ira Dumphy	do	39 37
Wm. Currie	do	3 12
Edw. Currie	do	2 50
Ephraim Myrsall, sen., labourer		36 25
Emery Currie, labourer		10 50

The person who had charge of the work was appointed by the department, and I am not aware that the engineer in charge ever made a recommendation or a complaint.

POST OFFICE AT LAURENTIDES.

Mr. MONET (Translation) asked, 1. Whether the Government have leased the property of Ovide Brien, on which they are about to spend $350, with a view to make it the post office of Laurentides, in the county of L'Assomption? 2. If so, on what date was the lease executed and what are the conditions as to length of term and amount of rental?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) I may say that the property of Mr. Brien was leased by the Department of Public Works. The lease was signed on the 2nd of April last, and it is for five years; the rent is $300 per annum and that includes the lighting, the fuel and all repairs to the building during the lease.

LOBSTER FISHING SEASON.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, Have any extensions of the lobster fishing season been granted in any parts of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick? If so, what parts of the coast of each province, and what times do these extensions cover?

Mr. FOSTER. There has been no extension of the lobster fishing season in the provinces of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick.

MANITOBA SCHOOLS—BISHOP GRAVEL'S COMMUNICATION.

Mr. HUGHES asked, 1. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the recently published communications of Bishop Gravel, of Nicolet, Quebec, as follows:—

Sacred Congregation for the propagation of the Faith.

Protocol No. 12051.

Rome, May 14th, 1895.

Most Illustrious and Reverend Lord Bishop :

The Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda is informed that laws very onerous for the Catholics of Manitoba have been recently adopted by the Provincial Government. That fact is the more to be deplored because those laws are contrary to a condition of things established in favour of the Catholics of that province by solemn compacts, and because they discriminate against Catholic schools, which had been flourishing in that country.

It is, therefore, with reason that in order to remove such a serious danger all the Canadian Bishops have undertaken the protection of those Catholics by most praiseworthy communications with the Federal Government.

The good-will and the authority of the Dominion Government in favour of the violated rights of the Catholics and in support of the efforts of the Bishops, have not been wanting. But obstacles of no light character have up to this moment prevented the carrying into effect of these good intentions. Now, however, that by the judgment of the English Privy Council, recently given, full authority is given to the Federal Government to deal with that most important business, there is hope that the affair will take such a turn that both the undoubted rights of the religion and the good of the country will be accomplished. But the opportunity must be seized without loss of time, and the protection of those Catholics must not be abandoned. Therefore, this Sacred Council, in a matter of such great importance, cannot but encourage and confirm by its words the zeal displayed by the Catholics, and especially by the Canadian Bishops. While also praising them for the earnest work already done for that most just cause, we express the hope that they will, with all their power prosecute the noble work thus commenced and press it to a happy termination.

An erroneous opinion seems to exist in certain minds to the effect that there is no danger in what are called neutral schools, and that Catholic children may, without any difficulty attend them. For, with few exceptions, these schools, which are called neutral, because the true religion is excluded from them with all other religions, have this bad effect that they exclude the religious principles, which should preside over human affairs, and especially in the education of youth. It is not permitted to assert that the private tuition of the parents can sufficiently remedy that defect. It can only remedy the evil partially, and it does not remedy the great wrong caused by an education given in godless schools. To that, we must add the fact that the dignity of religion must be much diminished in the opinion of children if they see it deprived of all public honour and confined within the walls of private houses. What will it be, if the parents, through negligence or on account of their ordinary occupations, do not give or cause others to give to their children any other education than that given in the school, and do not provide for their religious education.

Therefore, nothing is more conducive to the preservation of the faith among the people, nothing better can be done, especially in these times, when we see it attacked by so many errors, than to inculcate by means of the Catholic schools religion and piety in the tender minds of young children, in order that at the same time that they learn literature and the liberal arts they shall learn the doctrines ordained for a Christian life, and shall retain them firmly engraved in their minds for the rest of their lives.

He will have deserved well of religion who shall have given his care and his strength to the attaining of that object.

In conclusion, impressed by those principles which the Canadian bishops have promoted with so much constancy, this Sacred Council commend most strongly their zeal in favour of the religious education of the Catholics of Manitoba, and hope that they will secure the triumph of their just cause, and will save the Church from a grievous wrong.

In the meantime, &c., &c.,

(Signed) CARD. LEDOCHOWSKI,
Prefect.

Mgr. Gravel's circular letter, including his report to Rome, written in French, reads as follows :—

CIRCULAR TO THE CLERGY.

Gentlemen and dear fellow workers :

I shall meet your wishes, I have no doubt, by bringing to your notice two documents relating to the Manitoba school question. The first is a memorandum which I prepared at the request of the Most Eminent Prefect of the Propaganda, and the second is a very important letter addressed by the same eminent personage to all the Bishops of the Dominion of Canada.

THE REPORT TO ROME.

Rome, December 7th, 1894.

To His Eminence Cardinal Ledochowski, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda :

Your Eminence :

I have the honour to submit to your Eminence the report which you have requested me to prepare on the question of the Manitoba schools.

I have done the work from memory, not having at hand any book or document relating to this question.

I believe, however, that I can affirm that the account which I give of the events surrounding this affair is strictly true.

The Confederation known under the name of the Dominion of Canada is composed of seven fully organized provinces, and of four territories still partially unorganized. Manitoba is one of these seven provinces. Her capital is the town of Winnipeg, separated from the town of St. Boniface by the Red River. Winnipeg and St. Boniface are about 1,200 miles from Ottawa, the Federal Capital. Ottawa is about 120 miles from Montreal, and 300 miles from Quebec. There exists at Ottawa a Parliament for the whole Dominion of Canada, and each province administers its local affairs by a Legislature, at the head of which is a Lieutenant-Governor appointed by the Federal Government. The Governor General, who resides at Ottawa, is always an English nobleman appointed to this office by the Queen of England.

Among the local affairs left to the administration in each province, we must include all questions that relate to schools. However, the provinces are not all in the same condition in reference to schools. Quebec and Ontario, which are the two more important provinces, have a system of separate schools. This privilege is guaranteed to them by the constitution itself. In the other provinces the schools are common to Protestants

and Catholics. At the same time, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, a certain tolerance has been exercised towards the Catholics, who can, thanks to this tolerance have their separate schools in various localities.

As far as concerns the province of Manitoba, it is well to say that it has only been under a system of Common Protestant schools since 1890. Its history before the year 1890 includes two phases, which it is necessary to understand to appreciate the present school difficulty. The first phase embraces the period that preceded its erection into a separate province, and the second phase includes the twenty years which have elapsed since its erection into a province, that is to say, from 1870 until 1890.

FIRST PHASE.

Previous to 1870, the territory which now forms a province under the name of Manitoba was part of an immense extent of country, which was civilly administrated by an English company of fur traders. That company was named the Hudson's Bay Company. It had received from the English Crown an exclusive privilege to carry on the trade in furs in that vast country, which then contained but few inhabitants, the great majority of whom was Roman Catholic. That majority was composed of whites, half-breeds and Indians.

Wherever there was a group of population the missionaries used to open schools for Catholics, and the Protestants were also in the habit of opening schools for their co-religionists. Several of those schools, under the direction of devoted nuns, or of brothers of the Congregation of the Oblats, were enjoying a pretty large amount of prosperity. The Catholic schools were supported by the Catholics and the Protestants by the Protestants. The Hudson's Bay Company used to make them, from time to time, grants of money, as pure gifts.

Such was the state of things when an important political revolution took place in Canada. The provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which up to 1868 had been isolated, formed the confederation as stated above. The Government of the new confederation immediately turned its attention to the vast country to the north, the possession of which had been granted by the Crown to the Hudson's Bay Company, and with the consent of England, bought that country.

When that transaction became known to the inhabitants, they thought they should not allow themselves to be sold as a vile herd of cattle, and formed a government, at the head of which they put an able man named Riel, to whom they gave the mission to prevent the entrance into the country of the officials of the Government of Canada. That leader accomplished his purpose victoriously. The Canadian officers presented themselves with certain troops, but were repulsed.

In that embarrassing predicament the Federal Government requested Mgr. Taché, who happened to be in Rome for the Vatican Council of 1869, to come back as soon as possible in order to pacify his people, and to act as a mediator between the two parties. Mgr. Taché hastily came back in order to play the difficult part of a pacificator. the whole country—1,200 miles in width by 600 miles in depth—entertained fears concerning the practice of their religion and the existence of their Catholic schools, after they would have passed under the authority of the Ottawa Government, composed of a majority of Protestants, and before laying down their arms they were desirous to make the Federal Government accept their terms. They asked, amongst other things, the continuation of separate schools as in Quebec and in Ontario. The Federal Government made that promise to them.

The same assurance was given to them by the Governor General in the name of the Queen. And Lord Carnarvon, the Colonial Minister in London, telegraphed to the Dominion Government, in the name of the Queen, to grant their demand.

A clause was therefore agreed upon as follows:

"The rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic population was enjoying before the union, either by law or by practice, shall be preserved to them after the union."

This quotation is made from memory, but it certainly gives the meaning of the clause in question. Peace was then restored, and the first phase of the history of that country ended by its union with the Canada Confederation.

SECOND PHASE.

Immediately after the union the Federal Government constituted into a province under the name of "Province of Manitoba" a portion of the territory that it had bought, and gave it for the administration of its local affairs a legislature composed of a Lieutenant-Governor and two Houses, as in the old provinces.

At its first session that Legislature commenced to make law in conformity with the Union Act, as understood by everybody, and gave legal existence to a system of separate schools.

Two Boards of Administration were established, the one Protestant and the other Catholic, each one having charge of the school affairs of its creed. The Catholics had to maintain their schools, and received annually, out of the public moneys, a sum which was in proportion to the number of children frequenting these schools. This system, so just and so satisfactory to both Catholics and Protestants, remained in operation until 1890.

During those twenty years of separate schools, Protestant immigration was more numerous than Catholic immigration. Protestants having thus become powerful in the Legislature of Manitoba, and most of them being foreigners newly arrived in the country, and being, therefore, little acquainted with the negotiations which had taken place at the time of the union, thought they could simplify that school administration, and enacted a law abolishing the Catholic schools, and establishing Common Schools, with only one board of administration, exclusively composed of Protestants. It was an audacious violation, by the right of the stronger, of the most solemn compact and the most sacred rights. In their trials the Catholics applied to the Federal Parliament, and asked the disallowance of that unjust law. The Federal Parliament, by an unanimous resolution, advised the Catholics rather to apply to the courts, in order to have the law from which they were suffering declared unconstitutional, the cost of those appeals to the courts of justice to be defrayed by the Federal Government.

The Catholics appealed in the first instance to the Court of Manitoba, which declared the law in question to be constitutional. They appealed from this judgment to the Supreme Court of Canada, composed of seven members, the majority of whom were Protestants. This court unanimously held the law to be unconstitutional. The Manitoba Government then appealed from that judgment to the Privy Council of the Queen sitting in London. That Council, which is the guardian of British interests, considered that it was more advantageous for the peace of the Empire to affirm the autonomy of the province of

Manitoba than to maintain the rights of the Catholics. It, therefore, reversed the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, and declared to be constitutional the obnoxious law passed by the Legislature of Manitoba. To reach that conclusion the Privy Council affected not to understand the force of the circumstantial evidence furnished by the negotiations which had taken place at the time of the union, and by the solemn assurances given by the Crown. It claimed to consider itself bound by the letter of the Act of the union, which says that : " The rights and privileges which the inhabitants enjoyed by law or practice before the union should be preserved to them."

Then, says the Privy Council, under the regime of the Hudson's Bay Company, there was no school law, there was only a practice which consisted in the Catholics having their schools, which they supported by their own money, as the Protestants supported theirs. The present law of Manitoba leaves the Catholics in the enjoyment of the right which they had by practice before the union to create Catholic schools at their own expense. Therefore, it does not violate the compact of union is not unconstitutional.

That reasoning is so lame that it is impossible to believe that men of such intellectual strength as the noble lords could have advanced it in good faith.

Before the union, indeed, the Catholics supported their schools, but were not taxed to support Protestant schools, whereas under this new law the Catholics, while sustaining their own schools, are obliged to pay for the support of the Protestant schools, which the Privy Council is pleased to call neutral schools. The principal reason of the judgment is, therefore, false.

This judgment was a cause of astonishment for all the Dominion of Canada. The Federal Government was dumbfounded by it. All the public men of Canada well know that the Catholics of Manitoba are subjected to a crying act of injustice. But what can effectively be done for them after this judgment ? The friends of order and justice all over the country were putting this question to themselves, when another audacious blow was struck by the Legislature of Manitoba.

By the deplorable law of 1890, all schools became common. The Catholics lost the property in their school-houses, their Catholic Bureau of Administration and fifteen thousand dollars which they had in their treasury. However, as the Catholics are generally grouped into parishes, the school officials of each parish elected by those interested men were found to be Catholic, which gave a Catholic character to the schools within their jurisdiction. This was a remnant of self-government on which they set much value. By a law passed in 1893, the Legislature forbids all religious teaching in the schools, and permits only the reading of a passage from the Bible at the opening of the classes. This law contains other vexatious clauses on the subject of school books and of the qualifications to be required from teachers. There was no other alternative for the Catholics but to send their children to the neutral, but in reality Protestant, schools, or to build new school-houses, and to engage and pay teachers, and at the same time to be taxed for the support of Protestant schools. With a courage beyond all praise, they decided upon this last alternative.

In the meanwhile, Mgr. Taché presented a new petition to the Federal Government. But this time, he believed he had special grounds for urging all the Bishops of Canada to join with him. The first reason which occurred to him was that the fanatics and some unbelievers in Canada had evidently chosen the province of Manitoba to commence a struggle against Catholic teaching. After having triumphed in Manitoba, they would move the struggle into another province. It was important that it would be known that the Bishops were on their guard. The second reason was that many Protestants, and even Catholics, after the judgment of the Privy Council, were saying that the Catholics of Manitoba had no reason to consider themselves injured. The Legislature having given them good common schools they should be satisfied ; it was said that in the provinces where a system of separate schools did not exist there was not much fuss made about it ; that neither the people nor the Bishops were complaining ; that besides, the Church got along very well with neutral schools as was proved in the United States. Now, by calling on the Bishops to join with him in petitioning the Government to remedy the evils of which the Catholics of Manitoba were complaining, the Catholics of all the provinces would be aroused against the anti-Catholic agitators, and it would become evident that, in the opinion of the Episcopate of the Dominion, the Catholics were right in believing themselves injured, and in making complaints, and that the church was not so easily satisfied with neutral schools as was claimed.

Mgr. Taché then prepared a petition very strongly drawn up, in which he demanded of the Federal Government to adopt remedial measures for the wrongs of the Catholics, and he requested Mgr. Emard, Bishop of Valleyfield, and Mgr. Larocque, Bishop of Sherbrooke, to solicit the signatures of all the Bishops in favour of this document. The mission of these prelates was thoroughly successful. All the Bishops, to the number of twenty-eight, willingly gave their signatures.

But the Federal Government, on its part, after receiving the appeal of Mgr. Taché, inquired of the Supreme Court of Canada if it would be constitutional for it to intervene in the Manitoba school question. The Supreme Court answered in the negative. The Government then brought the opinion of the Supreme Court before the Privy Council of London, where the question is still pending, that is to say, the question whether the Federal Government can constitutionally intervene in favour of the Catholics of Manitoba after the judgment of the Privy Council, which has been mentioned above.

While the Government was taking this question before the courts, the petition of Mgr. Taché was signed and reached Ottawa. In response to this petition, the Federal Government decided to make an energetic representation to the Government of Manitoba.

They communicated to it, therefore, the letter of the Bishops with firm and dignified comments, which ought to have made it perfectly clear to the Government of Manitoba that the complaints of the Bishops were founded in reason, and that it should find means to remedy the just grounds of complaint of the Catholics.

The Government of Manitoba haughtily replied that it would change its legislation in nothing. So matters stand.

It is, therefore, beyond controversy :

1. That the Catholics had their Catholic schools before the union ;

2. That the Federal Government, the Governor General and the Colonial Minister in the name of the Crown, had promised them that they should have, after the union, separate schools, as in the Province of Quebec ;

3. That the Act of the union secured them this right by a special clause ;

4. That during the twenty years following the union the Legislature of Manitoba, interpreting

the clause of the Act of union, relating to schools, according to the intention of its framers, had given the Catholics separate schools ;

5. That the same Legislature arbitrarily deprived them of this right by the laws of 1890 and 1893 ;

6. That if this violation of a most incontestable right is not remedied, this anti-Catholic movement against separate schools will perhaps extend to other provinces, and place Catholic interests in danger ;

7. That it is important that the Bishops should not permit their noble petition to become a dead letter, but that they should, on the contrary, continue to vindicate their rights by a common course of action, in order to show to the anti-Catholic agitators, and to the faithful who may have been misled, that it is the sentiment of the Episcopate that the Catholics of Manitoba have been deprived of a clear and sacred right, and that the Catholics should keep themselves on the alert to prevent the same attempt in the other provinces.

Now, I am asked if the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda can usefully intervene to assist in the settlement of this important question.

It is certain that the Sacred Congregation can contribute assistance of great value to the Bishops by giving them its support. As stated above, it has been sought to create the impression that the Catholics of Manitoba were complaining without cause, and that the church would be well satisfied with the common schools of Manitoba, just as it is satisfied with the public schools of the United States. This opinion, which it has been sought to create among the public, would fall to the ground in the face of a support given to the Bishops by the Propaganda.

But in what way can this Sacred Congregation accomplish this intervention ?

It might, perhaps, through the intervention of His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan, represent, among other things, to the Colonial Minister in London, that his predecessor, Lord Carnarvon, had given, in his own name, and in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, the assurance to the Catholics of Manitoba that they would have their separate schools, that, consequently, the Crown is bound in honour to fulfil these solemn promises, if it does not wish to alienate the heart of the Catholics of Canada. An intimation of this nature might have a good effect in reference to the judgment, which the Privy Council will render within a few months upon the question, which the Canadian Government has submitted to it.

At the same time, this Sacred Congregation might address to all the Bishops of Canada congratulations upon the act so noble and truly episcopal, which they have accomplished by their petition to the Government in favour of the persecuted Catholics of Manitoba, and express the hope that they will continue by common action to demand the equitable settlement of this question. Besides the fact that such a letter would be calculated to create a favourable opinion on the question, and unite Catholics in the vindication of their violated rights, it would greatly strengthen the hands of the future Archbishop of St. Boniface, upon whose shoulders the Holy See is about to place the burden of a succession difficult to be borne.

I have the honour to be,
With profound veneration,
Your Eminence's humble servant,
ELPHEGE,
Bishop of Nicolet.

Mr. HUGHES.

The most eminent prefect at once placed himself in communication with Cardinal Vaughan, and it may be that his intervention has contributed, on his part, to create in the English official world an opinion favourable to the Catholics of Manitoba.

However that may be, His Eminence wrote me on the 18th March that "He had seized the occasion of the favourable judgment of the Privy Council to send a circular letter to all the Bishops of Canada, trusting much to the zeal and prudence of these prelates to secure a happy issue for so serious a business."

I communicate to you this important document, which should render more and more dear to us the cause of our Manitoba brethren.

With an affectionate devotion,

ELPHEGE,
Bishop of Nicolet.

2. Is it the intention of the Government to direct the attention of the Government of Great Britain and Ireland to the foregoing article ? 3. Is it the intention of the Government to endeavour to ascertain how far Bishop Gravel, "The Sacred Congregation for the propagation of the Faith," and Cardinal Vaughan were successful in the endeavour improperly to influence the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of Great Britain and Ireland ?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. The attention of the Government has not been drawn to the communications published on the Order paper. 2. It is not the intention of the Government to direct the attention of the Government of Great Britain and Ireland to the said article. 3. No.

DELAYED RETURN.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say that I had a question on the paper the other day in reference to the Exchange bank, and at your request, or at the request of the Government, it stood. I will repeat it to-day from the other list.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman had thought better of the question, and had dropped it, therefore I have not my answer here. If he will put it on again, I will be prepared to answer him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, I did not take it off.

Mr. FOSTER. If whoever took it off, will put it on again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman allowed that question to stand at the request of the Government, it is not proper that it should have been dropped from the paper, and the Minister ought to have been prepared to answer.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, my hon. friend need not get up and get at me because it was dropped. It was not my fault.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, but I will get at you.

Mr. SPEAKER. The fault was in the Printing Bureau. The question will be put on the paper for to-morrow.

SEIZURES OF CANADIAN SEALERS BY RUSSIAN WAR SHIPS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to call the attention of the Government to some seizures of British Canadian ships that were made in 1892 by Russian war ships in that part of Behring Sea that is supposed to belong to Russia. I specially refer to the schooners "Carmelite" and "McGowan." They were ships owned by British Canadians, and were seized, as alleged, by the officers some forty miles from land, on an allegation that they had broken the Russian regulations with respect to fur seal fishing within three miles of land. I am informed that information as to the improper seizures was regularly laid before the Canadian Government, and I understand they took action with regard to it. That action, I suppose, was to lay the information before the Imperial Government with a view to having pressure brought to bear to secure compensation. The information placed in my hands is to the effect that the loss to the owners reached at least $50,000, and they seem, as is explained to me, to be without any information as to what action the Imperial Government took as to the seizure of those two ships. I need not repeat the information given to me, but if it is approximately correct, there has been a very gross outrage committed, and one would imagine that, unless the facts are in controversy, there would be no difficulty in obtaining from the Russian Government that compensation which in such a case should be given. I would ask the Government if they are in a position to give any information on the matter?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have had a good deal to do with that subject, and it is very fresh in my mind. The circumstances are as distressing and sad as circumstances of that kind can possibly be, because the delay in reaching any adjustment of these claims, which the Canadian Government from an ex parte examination considered to be fair and equitable, has been so disastrous that I am quite aware the hon. gentleman is well informed when he says the consequences of the delay are bearing heavily upon people who committed no offence, did no wrong and contravened no law, national or international. The Canadian Government received in due course the proofs of the claim on the part of these vessels, as well as on behalf of other vessels which were unfortunately molested and seized by the Russian authorities, and the result was, in short, this: that after delay the Russian Government undertook to make an examination into the facts on their own part, that is to say, by means of an ex parte commission issued on the authority of the Russian Government only. The place where the seizures occurred being a great distance off, the delay necessarily followed. The result of the investigation was to clear about four ships, if my memory serves me, even according to the Russian commissioners' report, that is to say they gave those vessels the benefit of the doubt; there was sufficient proof to convince even the Russian commissioners in that one-sided investigation that at least four of those ships had been improperly seized. The other ships, they reported had gone into Russian waters and violated the Russian hunting laws. That occurred long ago. The Canadian Government pressed continuously and constantly the British authorities to expedite some method of adjustment. They pressed, for instance, that the amount of damages in the case of vessels that were acknowledged to have been seized unlawfully should be considered without delay. They represented how hard it had borne on the owners and all concerned, and they pressed for a commission to investigate the facts in regard to the other vessels that were affected; and recently finding that the British Government were dealing with the seal fisheries Bill, so far as the Russian portions of the waters were affected, taking power to continue the agreement regarding the zone around the Commander Islands and matters of that kind for the protection of the fur seal in those waters, the Canadian Government hastened to press upon the attention of Her Majesty's Government their views that no concessions ought to be made to Russia under the circumstances unless there was reason to believe that some conclusion would be shortly reached as regards the settlement of those claims for damages, and again called attention to the loss that had occurred through that delay, and presented various other points that had been pressed upon the attention of Her Majesty's Government in respect to some stringent clauses that obtained in the legislation which was expiring on 1st July next. Many of those points were met, and Her Majesty's Government informed the Canadian Government—and I feel I am warranted in making this statement—that they were satisfied that the negotiations in connection with the matter of damages was proceeding, that it was proceeding in a satisfactory manner notwithstanding the delay which had occurred, and that an endeavour would be made in this legislation to meet the wishes of the Canadian Government in respect to some of the provisions of the Bill. I observe from the newspapers that the clause contained in the old Bill, whereby vessels seized came into court with a presumption of guilt against them, has been dropped. Other changes have also been made. But the only definite information up to date in regard to the adjustment and

settlement of these claims is that these negotiations with the Russian Government are proceeding. I may call the attention of the House, and it is only fair to Her Majesty's Government to make this statement, to some of the difficulties that occur in even presenting the case of the sealers in a matter of this kind. The crews scatter, they are here to-day and away to-morrow, they are sealing one season and they are off around the world on other business altogether as sailors the next; and in regard to some information which the Colonial Office desired—I do not think as regards the vessels the seizure of which was not justified, but with regard to other vessels whose claims were being pressed—only recently such information had been obtained by the owners, and that information was considered by the Colonial Office as very important to have in their possession before pressing for a commission of inquiry into those claims. But everything we could do on this side of the water to press this matter has been done. The owners have repeatedly placed themselves in communication with me and have detailed the hardship of the case, which no one on this side of the water denies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman remember if the vessels to which I have called attention, the "Carmelite" and "McGowan," were two of those vessels that were admitted to have been seized improperly?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I can speak specifically with regard to the "McGowan," but I would not like to speak definitely as to the other. There were four other cases.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the date of the communication from the Imperial Government stating that the matter was proceeding?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A few days ago. It was in connection with the Bill which is being hurried through both Houses of Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So no good purpose would be served probably by bringing this matter up again in this House? The facts that have been laid before me appear to have been exceedingly strong. But, if a very late communication has been received stating that it is now being pressed by the Imperial Government, and if there appears to be any ground at all for believing that the compensation with respect to these seizures which are acknowledged to be erroneous, is likely to be granted, it might not be desirable for me to pursue the matter further. In any other view of the case, it would be necessary, I think, in the interests of these people to place the matter before the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would hesitate to advise the hon. gentleman as to any course. Far be it from me to say that he could do nothing to press this matter upon the attention of Her Majesty's Government. In forcing this case prominently before the attention of that Government I would gladly welcome assistance from him or from any other hon. gentleman in the House. The discussion of the question might have a very good effect, in showing the public interest in the question, outside of what might be called the departmental interest.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will kindly take it as notice that I will, at an early day, on going into Supply, bring the matter before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to inquire of the Minister of Justice, whether, so far as he knows, any British vessel has been assigned for patrol duty in the Behring Sea for the present season?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not able to give a definite answer to the hon. gentleman, because these papers have not passed under my particular attention this season. The usual course was for the British Government and the United States Government to exchange lists of vessels told off for that duty. I am not aware that that course has been followed this season, although that paper may have passed through Council in the ordinary way to the Marine Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that with due regard to the interest of the Canadian sealers, the Government would do well to request the British Government to have a moderate number of British men-of-war patrolling Behring Sea while these disputes are going on. I have a strong impression that the presence of some British gunboats in that region would exert a very wholesome moral effect on both Russians and Americans, and that it is only due to our people that there should be in the neighbourhood some British authorities to whom they could appeal. I do not want in the slightest degree to bring about any collision, but the hon. gentleman will remember, I do not doubt, that under somewhat similar conditions, the Americans were in the habit of keeping one or two cruisers in the vicinity of our cruisers, simply that evidence might be fairly collected and obtained and that their Government would be kept well advised.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I appreciate what the hon. gentleman has referred to, but there may be a reason why the sealers have not been particularly anxious for Her Majesty's ships coming to their assistance this season, because the principal work they performed last year, was to receive at the hands of the United States vessels two ships that had been seized by the United States authorities contrary to all re-

gulations, and which were afterwards released when brought into port.

Mr. PRIOR. The information stated by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is quite correct. The matter has received the attention of the British Columbia members, and we have kept in touch with the Minister of Justice on the subject. Great hardships are being perpetrated on the sealers, as the hon. member stated, by the delay that has occurred, and from all we can hear from the Government they cannot get any satisfaction from the Imperial Government, although the matter has been pressed upon them time and time again. Not only the two ships mentioned by the Minister of Justice, but other ships have also been badly treated, as we consider, by the Imperial authorities. We have the assurance of the Minister of Justice that everything is being done that possibly can be done in the case. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I can also say that the British Columbia members do think that the Imperial Government should send men-of-war into the Behring Sea to look after the interests of the Canadian sealers. Why they have not done so, I do not know. We certainly think they should show some interest in patrolling these waters and in looking after the interests of the Canadian sealers.

REPLY TO REMEDIAL ORDER.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who leads the House whether the answer to the Remedial Order has yet been received or not from the Manitoba Government?

Mr. FOSTER. It has not yet been received.

DISMISSAL OF MR. LOISELLE.

Mr. BRODEUR. When will the papers be brought down concerning the dismissal of Mr. Loiselle?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman has not received them yet, he shall receive them before very long.

Mr. LAURIER. I take this opportunity of reminding the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that in the meantime the item for Post Office stands.

COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANIES, NOVA SCOTIA.

House proceeded to the further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Flint for:

Copies of all petitions and correspondence between the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, or any of its promoters or directors, and the Government, in relation to the company's undertaking. Also, for copies of all correspondence between E. Franklin Clements, J. D. Rolston, Frederick Bard or other promoters of the South Shore Railway Company of Nova Scotia, or any of the directors of the said company and the Government up to date of proceedings in the courts of Nova Scotia to wind up the said company. Also, copies of all petitions, agreements and correspondence between the said company and the Government, with reference to the obtaining of a charter for a new company from the Dominion Parliament, and relating to the undertaking of the said company or the undertaking of the company proposed to be incorporated.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). When the House adjourned on Monday at six o'clock, I was answering the hon. gentleman who spoke in favour of the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). Inasmuch as this question had then received the attention of the House for a very considerable time, and since has been threshed out, very completely in another place to-day, I shall not occupy the time of the House at any length now. I think I was able to show to the House that the South Shore Railway Company was incorporated in 1892, and that the Coast Railway Company was not incorporated until April, 1893, that the South Shore Company not only expended a very large amount of money in making the necessary surveys for their road, but that they expended a large sum in grading some sixteen or seventeen miles from Yarmouth towards Shelburne. I showed that this was done bona fide, and in accordance with the instructions and with the approbation of the provincial engineer of Nova Scotia, whose report speaks of the road, as built by the South Shore Company, in the most favourable manner. I think I was able to answer also the statement that this company had become bankrupt by showing that the proceedings which had been attempted in the courts to put this company into liquidation had been withdrawn, and that the company had been reorganized, and that the directors and persons interested in the company were men of considerable wealth and good standing, and were in a position to complete their undertaking. In addition to the correspondence which I was able to lay before the House the other day, I have considerably more which I will not inflict upon the House at the present time. But one peculiar matter happened as late as the first of this month, which I think it would be well for me to bring before the House. I will read a portion of a letter I received a short time ago:

New York, 1st June, 1895.

N. W. White, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Mr. Tunis G. Bergen sent to Mr. H. G. Alexander, and Mr. Alexander forwarded to me a copy of your telegram to Mr. Bergen, in which you say: "Are you, as president of the South Shore Railway Company, prepared to execute a bond with the Government of Canada for the faithful completion of this undertaking?"

Of course, I am at a loss to understand the purport of this inquiry. I forwarded the communi-

cation of Mr. Bergen to Mr. D. H. Andrews, No. 70 Kilby Street, Boston, Mass., who is at this time the president of the South Shore Railway Company.

Very truly yours,
J. D. WILLIAMSON,
Financial agent.

I would say that I never received any such telegram as that mentioned in this letter, and I at once replied to the letter by a telegraphic despatch saying that I never received any such telegram, and asking that a copy of it should be sent to me. A copy of the telegram was subsequently sent to me, as it is as follows :—

31st May, 1895.

To G. Bergen,
55 Liberty Street, New York.

Are you, as president of the South Shore Railway Company, prepared to execute a bond with the Government of Canada for the faithful completion of the undertaking ?

(Signed) N. G. WHITE,
Russell House.

Now, Sir, my initials happen to be N. W. White, and I was naturally anxious to find out who N. G. White was. I have looked over the register, and I have not been able to find that any such person was at the Russell House at that time. I have also inquired of Mr. Nunn, who represents the Coast Railway Company, and he assured me that so far as he knew, there was no N. G. White interested in either of these companies, and I can only say that in my long acquaintance with the individuals interested in both of these companies, I have never heard of Mr. N. G. White. The telegram, too, is rather a singular one. In the first place, the Dominion Government have never asked for any such bond from anybody : as far as I know, they have never proposed to ask for any such bond. But it is a fact that the local government of Nova Scotia did ask for a bond from the Coast Line Company, the company which is opposing the South Shore Company in their effort to obtain an Act of incorporation here. That fact induced me to think it possible that some gentleman connected with the Coast Line Company knowing that such a demand had been made from his company, had come to the conclusion that the Dominion Government might be asking the president of the South Shore Company for a similar bond. What the object of this peculiar despatch was I do not pretend to say ; but the fact that it asks for information which it might be desirable for some parties to obtain, makes me anxious to know the source from which it emanated. I hope some light may be thrown upon the matter here. I would be very glad indeed if any of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this motion could give me any information in regard to the origin of this telegram.

Mr. FLINT. I do not propose to occupy the time of the House in discussing the motion which stands in my name, because the subject with which it deals is under review in another place, where it can be thoroughly threshed out, and in all probability it will be before the House again in another form, when all the points raised will have to be discussed at considerable length. Therefore, I trust that the Government will allow the motion to pass without any special observations from me upon it. I did not hear very clearly all of the address which has just been delivered by the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White), nor the terms of the letter and telegram to which he has referred. I take it that the hon. member complains that some person has been using his name, or a name intended to be taken as his, in some communication in regard to this question. If that is the case, I would, of course, deprecate any such course as strongly as the hon. gentleman could possibly do. Of course, the matter is one of which I had no knowledge whatever until the hon. gentleman brought it forward. I did not catch the purport of the telegram : but I simply desire to say that I would concur in any condemnation of conduct of that kind that the hon. gentleman might see fit to make. Now, I wish to refer briefly to the long correspondence which the hon. member for Shelburne read the other day. I was waiting with a great deal of anxiety and interest to catch, if possible, the drift of the correspondence, and to see what bearing it had upon the question before the House, and I must confess that I was unable to do so. It appears to be a long correspondence which passed between Thomas Robertson, Esq., and a man named Mansfield, in regard to the promotion of a two-foot gauge railway, an undertaking concerning which those gentlemen subsequently fell out, and concerning which there was some litigation ; and Mansfield handed the correspondence over to the hon. member for Shelburne and his friends, to do with it what they saw fit. I could see nothing in the correspondence at all bearing upon the controversy now before the House, and it seems to me that the hon. gentleman might just as well have read some of my friend Robertson's love letters, for all it had to do with the subject we are discussing. Of course the impression given by this correspondence to hon. gentlemen not thoroughly familiar with the subject would be that Mr. Robertson was endeavouring to secure the construction of a railway of a two-foot gauge. But this is abandoned ; it was a project which merely existed in gentlemen's minds, which they were in hopes of bringing to fruition, but which fell through, partly because the local government put their foot upon it and intimated that they possibly could not assist it from provincial funds, and partly because the people of the country through which the line was to pass thought it would not suit their purposes. But subsequently a broader gauge was agreed upon,

and negotiations were entered into for a still broader gauge. This was also changed into the standard gauge. So, as I said in my opening remarks, the question of one gauge or the other cannot arise in this discussion. Sometimes the Coast Railway is called the narrow gauge road to distinguish it from the other, because for a period of seven months it was a narrow gauge railway. But at present the company have a charter authorizing them to build a standard gauge railway. They have an agreement with the local government permitting of modifications in the contract and plans to enable them to build a standard gauge railway, and the only question now fairly and properly before Parliament and the committee is as to the details and the powers sought by the South Shore Railway Company. This company is in a peculiar position with reference to the Coast Railway Company, with reference to the Southern Railway Company, with reference to its own creditors and shareholders, and with reference to the Government. Upon all these points I am prepared to challenge the opinion of the House. If these papers bear out the points, which I think they will, this House should not encourage the revival of the charter to the South Shore Railway Company. At any rate, before the Bill can be intelligently and fairly discussed, this correspondence ought to be in our hands. I would respectfully urge on the Government to allow the motion to pass and bring down the correspondence as early as possible.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that these papers might be useful for the consideration of the question. It is regrettable that although the hon. gentleman has charge of this motion, and is evidently in the confidence of those people who now have the contract with the Nova Scotia Government regarding the construction of the so-called narrow gauge railway, could not contribute for the benefit of the House some information which would be of considerable importance in the direction of his own views, because the hon. gentleman does not conceal the fact that his sympathies are entirely with the so-called narrow gauge people. The hon. gentleman admitted frankly to me, the last time this motion was under discussion, that he had no evidence, other than the information which some parties connected with the narrow gauge gave him, that the local government was willing to substitute for the existing contract a contract for a standard gauge railway. I hope that the hon. gentleman will be able to secure from the people for whom he speaks, before a further discussion of this subject takes place, not what they understand the local government will do, but the only evidence which would be satisfactory as to the intention of the local government, namely, an Order in Council. For this House will be astonished to learn that the local government have been able to obtain from the legislature of Nova Scotia a most extraordinary power. I do not think that a similar power is given to the government or the executive of any other part of Canada or in any other country. But by virtue of an Act passed by that House, the executive is able, out of session, to appropriate the money of the province of Nova Scotia for the construction of railways, and apparently, if the hon. gentleman's information be right, can change without legislation a narrow gauge to a broad gauge, or make an entirely different arrangement with the company than now obtains.

Mr. FORBES. If the hon. gentleman will pardon me, he is a little in error about the power of the local government to change the terms of the contract. The terms of the original charter gave this company the right to build a narrow gauge line of three feet, but the Act passed in amendment to that last session gave the company the right to change that narrow gauge to a broad gauge and to make further changes subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. That has been done. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council has signified his assent to the change to a broad gauge.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is a little confused in his explanation. I do not understand on what authority he states an Order in Council has been issued. He has but confirmed the general proposition which I made, that the executive of Nova Scotia has the extraordinary power vested in it of dealing with these matters outside of the session and independent of the legislature of the province. I do not say that we may not have some information, but all we have now before us is a contract to build a narrow gauge railway, and no one disputes that in addition to that contract, a bond, with a very heavy penalty, was given by which the parties contracting to build this railway undertake that a narrow gauge railway shall be built. That bond and contract are outstanding. No hon. gentleman has said that either of them has been cancelled.

Mr. FORBES. They will be varied.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is not the place to hear, for the first time, of the intention of the local government of Nova Scotia regarding this road. But the very confidential relations existing between the promoters of this narrow gauge system, the reference to telegrams, the reference to what the executive propose to do in the next "Gazette," confirms the views that have been pressed on my mind that this is a political railway pure and simple, so far as the local government of Nova Scotia is concerned, and there are prominent Liberals in the province—I have in my

mind the names of one or two now—who do not sympathize with this political railway. We know that the head and front of it is Mr. Robertson, who was never known to be connected with any business of this kind until an election was pending in the county of Shelburne, and we know he was named as president, with a government subsidy in his pocket to carry the elections. That, coupled with the statement of the hon. gentleman regarding what the local government intend to do, confirms the idea that, whether wittingly or unwittingly, many of the men who are interested now in the narrow gauge system are simply furthering the political purposes of the local government. But to show that is not altogether the view taken by the Liberals in the province, but only by those who are deeply and immediately interested in the politics of the county of Shelburne, as represented by Mr. Robertson, I may call attention to the opinion of the Halifax Board of Trade, and to a resolution moved there which I do not think has been referred to. It was moved by a prominent Liberal, the nominee at present of the Liberal party in connection with the federal election. I refer to Mr. Dwyer. Mr. Dwyer, who is a man of undoubted standing in the city of Halifax, a Reformer, and the present nominee of the Liberal party for the next federal election, moved in May, 1894, the resolution which I shall read and which will show hon. members on both sides of the Chair something of the history of the wrangling and unfortunate differences that have occurred between these two companies. I do not hesitate to say that, while this Government has been committed to the South Shore Railway Company, while this Government is willing to give them all legitimate assistance, seeing that Parliament without dissent voted for them by the name of the South Shore Railway Company substantial aid, the desire that this Government has in view is the construction of a railway through these counties so as to benefit the counties concerned. That is our primary desire, and towards that end we have done all that we properly could do. Even when there was a prospect of settling the differences between these companies, the Government gave no deaf ear to requests that they should further the negotiations, though it was a delicate task to interfere. I refer particularly to my colleague in the representation of Nova Scotia in the Cabinet and myself. But, apparently, the companies are further apart than ever. The manner in which this motion has been pressed shows that the representatives of the Coast Railway can have but one object now in view, and that object is to frustrate if they can, to obstruct as long as they can, the granting to the South Shore Railway Company the powers necessary to enable them to carry out the construction of a standard gauge railway through these counties to which Parliament has voted assistance. I have followed this subject sufficiently to know of difficulties that were placed in their way by the local government of Nova Scotia. I regret to know, for instance, that in the performance of duties that were merely formal under the legislation granted, the work of this company has been delayed. For instance, one member of the Government was appointed under the statute to act in connection with the selection of arbitrators for the taking of lands. I regret to know that advantage was taken of that fact by the gentlemen appointed under that statute, and that thereby not only did delays occur, but difficulties were created which tended in a large measure to bring about the crisis to which reference has been made in this debate. And these people, very properly, I think, come to this Parliament and say: You have given us a federal subsidy, which is the best indication that you desire to see a standard gauge railway built through these counties. We have encountered difficulties through the action of the provincial government, which is closely identified with the Opposition political railway; and we want power from this legislature whereby we may be independent of all such difficulties. And it is to show that there are Liberals in Nova Scotia who take a broad view of this question and who are anxious to see a standard gauge road built through these counties that I pass away from the immediate locality where the feeling is bitter and largely political to the city of Halifax and refer to the resolution moved by Mr. Dwyer in May, 1894, in the Halifax Board of Trade. The following is the resolution:—

Whereas, a standard gauge railroad from Yarmouth to Shelburne is much more desirable than a narrow gauge, the former in addition to being much more serviceable, would be a practical part accomplishment of the much desired through South Shore system from Halifax to Yarmouth, while the latter would be a certain and almost insuperable obstacle in the way;

And whereas, this board is advised that the South Shore Railway Company has made an offer to our provincial government to build and equip a standard railroad from Yarmouth to Shelburne, commencing work immediately and completing this year if the usual subsidy be granted, and to give every reasonable proof of its resources and security for honest accomplishment;

And whereas, the Coast Railway Company, who are the promoters of the said narrow gauge, after having before it, as we are advised, for over a year, an offer of a subsidy in aid of its proposed narrow gauge, has been unable to get itself into a financial position to enter into a contract with the Government for the construction of the said railway;

1. Therefore, resolved, that the said Coast Railway Company has been allowed all the time it should have in order to prove its ability and to enter into said contract.

2. That the provincial government be urged to investigate the ability of the said South Shore Railway Company, and if their representations are found to be correct, that the usual subsidy be granted in aid of the construction of

a standard gauge railway from Yarmouth to Shelburne.

3. That the Dominion Government also be requested to grant the usual subsidy to said standard road.

4. That a committee be appointed to consider the references submitted by the South Shore Railway Company, and to investigate its financial ability.

5. That a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the Hon. W. S. Fielding, provincial secretary for the province of Nova Scotia, and to the Hon. J. G. Haggart, Minister of Railways, Ottawa.

This resolution carried in May, 1894, runs along the lines of action taken by the federal legislation; and, at that time, I know from the representations of the narrow gauge people that they were confident that their scheme of the narrow gauge system would be the best, and were anxious to have this Government adopt their scheme, and attended here at Ottawa in order to press that subject upon the attention of the executive. Choice was made between them, one advocating a standard gauge and the other advocating—I have no doubt with the best intention of carrying on their work—the narrow gauge line. I said openly then, and I say now, that one of the great objections I had to the narrow gauge people and their company, outside of the question of the gauge altogether, was the use being made of the company before mentioned, who obtained their subsidy from the local government and won a county for that government in the local election, the president sitting in that House using his influence for this company, both political and commercially. Now, we subsidized the standard gauge company. After knowing unmistakably what the opinion of the member for Halifax regarding it, after we knew the views of the member for Shelburne who has spoken, after we had the views both of our political friends and political opponents in the other counties, and, I think, in the absence of the slightest word of opposition on the part of the member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint)—I am speaking in his presence, and if I am wrong he will correct me—the proposition of the Government to grant a subsidy to the South Shore Railway Company, giving it by name in the statute, was adopted. Therefore this change that has taken place on the part of the hon. gentleman has taken place mainly on the ground that the narrow gauge people will change their system and adopt the standard gauge, and that they have not as yet met with the difficulties that have been put in the way of the south shore people. But I think if he has sympathy with those locally interested in the South Shore Railway Company, he would do well not to withdraw it from that company. If they can be rescued from their financial difficulties, if they can complete the contract with this Government and earn the subsidies, so much the better for all the local creditors to which reference has been made. I understand, however, that their financial difficulties and debts have been greatly exaggerated. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) told us something of an extraordinary action on the part of a local firm of solicitors, where they had proceeded to advertise a judgment without making a demand for the money, and when the money, in fact, was being tendered to them in full of the debt and costs. This shows how acute has become the rivalry and the struggle between these companies. I find that at present the South Shore Railway Company, as they had every reason to suppose they had the unanimous sympathy of this House in connection with the aid voted last session of Parliament, completely graded 14 miles of the line, and have a few miles additional partly graded. The heaviest culverts on the section are all completed, and also some of the heavy bridge masonry at Tusket River. The company have expended, according to their representations, $170,000, of which $145,000 is represented by work already constructed. There is now a very full construction plant on the line, including machinery of the most modern type, and 200 mules imported especially for the work. Under these circumstances, while I would join with any hon. gentleman from my province in regarding first the main object we have in view, the construction of a railway, I have yet to learn why any fair or reasonable sympathy should be withdrawn from this South Shore Railway Company. I think they should be given an opportunity, not only to rescue themselves, but to carry to completion the work which they honestly begun, and upon which they seem to have made considerable progress. I reserve to myself, of course, the freest right in coming to a conclusion in reference to the subjects that have been raised in this debate, in advance of all the papers and all the information we can get. But that the result of this discussion should be to impede in any way the applicants now asking for a federal charter to carry on this work that was subsidized by the Federal Parliament, I have heard no good or valid reason.

Mr. GILLIES. I desire to move the following amendment to the motion of my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint):

That this motion do include all petitions and correspondence to and with the Minister of Railways, or other members of the Government of Canada, for and on behalf of the Cape Breton Railway Extension Company, for a subsidy to the railway from Canso to Louisbourg, via St. Peters, and also for and on behalf of the Boston and Nova Scotia Coal and Railway Company for a subsidy to a railway from Orangedale to Broad Cove, in the county of Inverness; and also, all correspondence in connection with the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company.

The House will see that this amendment deals with a territory somewhat different

from that of which we have been talking for some time. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the territory with which my amendment deals is a far more important one than either of the counties, or the combined counties, of Shelburne and Queen's, important though they are, I suppose, in the estimation of the hon. gentleman who represents them in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member can hardly go outside of the lines of the motion which is before the House. After reading his amendment, I find it is not relevant to the motion before the House, and I shall be obliged to rule it out of order. Consequently the hon. member must confine his remarks to the motion that is before the House.

Mr. GILLIES. With the consent of the House, perhaps I can have it added to the original motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, it is out of order.

Mr. GILLIES. Well, I will speak to the motion, and as I was saying, the territory to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is a very important one, and the line of railway with which I wish to deal goes through a very important section of the province of Nova Scotia. The district from Canso to Louisbourg is a very important one, diversified as it is by many industries that are known to exist there. If we start at the Strait of Canso and go down to the eastern portion of Cape Breton to the port of Louisbourg, every foot of territory through which we pass is underlaid with the very valuable and economic minerals that are known to exist in Nova Scotia. If we take the large district of the River Inhabitants with its fisheries, its agricultural interests and thickly settled as it is by a very industrious class of people, and it is adjoining the important district of West Bay peopled with a hardy industrious class. There is the large and commercially important community of Isle Madame, peopled by men second to no other section of the Dominion in their enterprise, in their prosecution of the fishing industry in which they are so largely and vitally interested; then there are the large and progressive districts of River Bourgeois, St. Peter's, L'Ardoise, Red Islands, Grand River, Loch Lomond, Frambois and Fourchie. These districts, that I have mentioned, together with that of Isle Madame, comprise the county of Richmond, and, Mr. Speaker, I feel proud to be able to say here from my place in Parliament, as the representative of that county in the Parliament of Canada that a more industrious, law-abiding, loyal, God-fearing people are not to be found within the boundaries of wide Canada than the sixteen thousand that dwell within the confines of Richmond. The natural resources of this county are known to be enormously great. The fishery of the county, in the year 1894, as returned by the report of the Minister of Marine, amounted in value to neary five hundred thousand dollars, and this in the face of the fact that the industry was conducted under difficulties and would be increased to an incalculable and indefinite extent if the conveniences of a railway were available so as to enable the people to engage in and ship their fish the year round. Under such conditions hon. gentlemen will perceive the advantages that would redound to that section of the Dominion and really to the whole eastern portion of the Dominion by the construction of a railway through the county of Richmond to Louisbourg. A branch line of ten or eleven miles will connect this trunk line with the town of Arichat from which a steamer will make connections every morning and evening with Canso, thus giving that important section of Guysboro' County practically railway connection as all its passenger, mail and freight traffic will connect with the railway at Arichat. Then we come to the boundary of the county of Cape Breton, and from there to the port of Louisbourg we have the large and important districts of Salmon River, Grand Mira, Big Pond, East Bay, Gabarouse, Catalone, Main-a-dieu and Louisbourg, together with the intervening country that lies between those southern districts and the harbour of Sydney, and the adjoining waters of the Bras d'Or Lake, all of which would be tributary to this road when built. Now, an examination of the Geological Reports that are on file in this library, shows that this district is underlaid with coal, iron, manganese, and all the valuable and economic minerals that are known to exist so extensively in Canada. Now, this district contains a population of something like 40,000, and as it is 90 miles in extent, there is a population of nearly 500 to every mile of railway. In this territory there is not a single inch of railway, and the House will easily see how hampered these people are, and how greatly the development of the country must be hindered and retarded while they are allowed to remain without a railway. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways, who I am glad to see now in his seat, is familiar with all those facts, for in my several interviews with him I did not fail to press them upon him, and I am pleased to be in a position to say that he, as well as his colleagues in the Government, regard the completion of the measure as I have endeavoured to detail to this House in a favourable manner. And the measure of encouragement that I always received from the Government when advocating the construction of this railway was most gratifying to me and the people that I represent. We are aware of the progressiveness and liberality displayed by this Government in aiding the construction of a railway through Cape Breton in 1887, and now benefiting a large population, and accommodating exten-

sive industries. The Government at that time, in its wisdom and justice, decided to extend the Intercolonial to the island of Cape Breton, which was then built at an outlay of $3,500,000. Nor was this money in any way misspent, nor was it a bad investment for the country. I deliberately state to this House, and I think my statement will be corroborated by the Minister of Railways, that of all the I. C. R. from Point Lévis to Sydney, no portion of it, excepting, probably, the short link between Truro and Pictou, pays better than the section running through the island of Cape Breton. Not only is it a convenience to the travelling public, not only does it form an outlet for our coal when the coast becomes bound by ice in winter, and not only does it afford an easy avenue whereby our merchants can renew their stocks during the winter season, and thereby avoid carrying such large supplies as they were formerly compelled, But it has besides added to the development of Cape Breton, and, at the same time, has proved an excellent paying investment for the Dominion. Under these circumstances, not only was the Government justified in extending that road, as I have indicated, but I deliberately affirm that they would have been derelict in their duty to that very important portion of the Dominion if they had left it a single day longer unbuilt. I am simply stating to the House the fact that the road was built through Cape Breton by the Dominion Government to show that this Government has always been ready and willing to do fair justice to the island of Cape Breton, and whatever justice has been shown to the island, has been shown by this Government, and not by the local government of Nova Scotia. Perhaps the House is not fully aware of the great, and, perhaps, unparalleled and really unprecedented powers which the local government of Nova Scotia have taken in investing themselves with powers to enter into contracts with, and to subsidize any company that may build railways in the province. Hon. gentlemen will search the statutes in vain of any other British province or colony to find such an Act as was passed by the local legislature in 1886, giving the government the power, the exclusive power, to deal unlimitedly in the way of subsidizing any company that would come before them to build a railway in any part of the province. They passed the Act known as chapter 1 of the Acts of 1886, which, as I have stated, vested in them unlimited and exclusive powers to deal with any company, and to incorporate any company without the intervention of the local legislature, and afterwards to subsidize it to the extent of $3,200 per mile.

Mr. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that under that Act the government have power to incorporate a company?

Mr. GILLIES. Yes, certainly, and if the hon. gentleman had read the Act he would not have asked the question. As I was saying, the local government took power to themselves under this Act to deal with any company that would come before it prepared to build railways in any part of Nova Scotia, and to subsidize any such company to the extent of $3,200 per mile.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, does not wish to state anything that is not correct. I think the hon. gentleman misapprehended my question. I understood him to say that the executive of Nova Scotia took to themselves powers to incorporate a company and then to subsidize them.

Mr. GILLIES. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN. Without an Act of the legislature?

Mr. GILLIES. Yes. I understood the hon. gentleman's question very well, and I answered it as I intended.

Mr. BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will point out the section.

Mr. GILLIES. Yes, I will later on, but I would rather at present proceed in my own way. When I was interrupted I had stated that the local government, under this Act of 1886 had taken to themselves the power, which I have said was never taken by any government in any British colony, so far as I have been able to ascertain, to subsidize unlimitedly and reservedly, and at its own will and guided by its own caprice, any company to the extent of $3,200 per mile. However, be that legislation good or bad, I am not now going to say, but I will go so far as to say that it is most extraordinary legislation, and has been sought to be taken advantage of very frequently by companies coming before the legislature of Nova Scotia, and claiming subsidies under this Act for railways all over the province. The House will readily see what immense power this places in the hands of the government of Nova Scotia, either for weal or woe, for the benefit of the province if used to promote its interests, and to the advantage of the government if they chose to use it in their behalf, and no doubt it was used to their advantage on all sides and on all possible occasions. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Act of 1886 was divided into two parts, the first part being designated as the first part, and dealing with this matter to which I brought the notice of the House. I will read its principal provisions to the House in order that hon. gentlemen may judge of the wide powers which the government assumed to itself under this Act. The Act says:

Be it, therefore, further enacted by the Governor, Council and Assembly, as follows:—

For the purpose of assisting in the construction of a line of railway through the Island of Cape Breton, from the Strait of Canso to Sydney or Louisbourg, the Governor in Council may grant to

any company or body corporate, or to any persons to be incorporated, as hereinafter provided, the following subsidies and concessions :—

(a). A cash subsidy of three thousand two hundred dollars per mile, not exceeding in the whole two hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars.

(b). A land subsidy of two thousand acres per mile, not exceeding in the whole one hundred and sixty thousand acres, such lands to be taken in the counties through which the railway shall run, and not to be given to the company until the completion of the whole contracted for.

(c). A right of way, gratis, in accordance with the provisions of chapter seventy of the Revised Statutes, third series.

(d). The exemption from municipal taxation of the railway and all its stations and station grounds, rolling stock and appurtenances required for constructing and working such railway.

The House will see that these are very extensive privileges and subsidies conferred upon any company that would build a line of railway between Canso and Louisbourg. They were applied specially to the line of railway between Canso and Louisbourg. Then section 5 dealt generally, and said :

The Governor in Council may grant to any company offering to construct any line of railway in the province of Nova Scotia, not already subsidized by the province, a cash subsidy, not exceeding three thousand two hundred dollars per mile, and a land subsidy not exceeding two thousand acres per mile. Provided, that such subsidy shall not in any case be granted until the company offering to construct the railway shall have furnished to the Governor in Council satisfactory evidence that it has at its disposal, either from grants provided by the Parliament of Canada, or from private capital, or from both, funds sufficient, with the subsidies authorized by this part of this Act, to complete such railway, and shall have given ample security for such completion.

Mr. BORDEN. That is not unlimited.

Mr. GILLIES. It is entirely unlimited as to the number of companies the local government will have power to subsidize, and unlimited as to the discretionary power given to the local government by this Act in determining and deciding as to the capabilities of any company coming before them seeking a subsidy and unlimited as to the number of miles they are at liberty to subsidize all over the province without the vote, sanction or even knowledge of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. BORDEN. Yet the Liberal party is charged with being opposed to railways.

Mr. GILLIES. Certainly, they have been opposed to railways whenever and wherever their construction would not suit themselves. This Act, without any further legislation on the part of the local assembly at all, gives unlimited powers to the local government to deal unreservedly and unrestrictedly with any company that came before them seeking a subsidy. In pursuance of the power conferred upon the local government by that Act, a company applied to them for a subsidy as specified under the first part of section 3 of the Act. This company was incorporated by an Act of their own legislature to build from Canso to Louisbourg, and the devotees of the local government in every part of the island of Cape Breton went around pointing to this statute and saying to the people : Here the local government of Nova Scotia has done everything possible for Cape Breton in the way of subsidies so as to build a road from the Straits of Canso to Louisbourg specifically. The minions of the local government would always point to this subsidizing statute and say : Now, there is the local subsidy all ready for any company, but where is your Dominion subsidy ? Let us see now what your Dominion Government will do in the way of subsidizing roads ; let them manifest their good intentions towards your island by subsidizing other railways than the main line they have already constructed from the Straits to Sydney. The local government and their friends always dangled this dazzling paper subsidy that they never expected would be asked for, before the eyes of the people, and while holding it up used to shout and boast. Here is the local subsidy all ready for any company coming forward to build. Can you say as much for the Dominion Government ? These were the kind of statements that were made before the people of Cape Breton by the supporters of the Nova Scotia Government. I felt sure that the Government at Ottawa would entertain any business-like proposition that might be put before them on behalf of railway extension in Cape Breton, and would deal with it in a fairly liberal spirit. I always told the people that if any company would put a bona fide proposition before the Ottawa Government for the construction of a road from the Straits of Canso to Louisbourg, with a branch into Arichat, or from the Straits of Canso north through the county of Inverness, I felt quite sure that the Federal Government would meet such a company in a business-like and liberal manner. Well, what happened ? In 1893 a proposition was made to the local government by a company incorporated under the name of the Cape Breton Railway Extension Company, asking for a subsidy to build from the Straits of Canso to Louisbourg. The local government said : Oh, yes, we will do that at once for you, your subsidy at Halifax is awaiting you ; but let us see what the friends of the Liberal Conservative party will do at Ottawa. Although I had not the direct warrant of the Ottawa Government for saying so, yet I understood that they would deal in a generous spirit with the application of the company, and I arrogated to myself to say to the representatives of that company, that at the next session of Parliament a subsidy for the construction of a road from Hawkesbury to Louisbourg would be provided for in a manner satisfactory to the company. But I was

almost laughed at and scoffed at by the friends of the Nova Scotia Government for saying that the Dominion Government would go so far as to subsidize other lines in Cape Breton at so short time after having completed the main line through the island. In fact the local government and their friends dreaded that the Dominion Government would deal in so generous a manner with Cape Breton. However, on behalf of that company, I made an application to the Department of Railways at the last session of Parliament, and I am glad to be able to state here that I was met in the business-like and liberal spirit that I told my people down in Cape Breton I would meet. A subsidy was provided for the first section of the road from Hawkesbury to St. Peter's, being thirty miles of the ninety miles proposed, and a written undertaking was given the company by the members of the Government that the balance of the subsidy for the whole system would be forthcoming as required by that company. This was in last September when I came to Ottawa with the representatives of the company and got the contract for the subsidy between themselves and the Ottawa Government signed, and therefore everything between the company and the Ottawa Government for the construction and completion of this road from Canso to Louisbourg via St. Peter's was completed to the entire satisfaction of the company. The company then went down to the province of Nova Scotia and asked the local government for the subsidy specified by this Act. At this time it so happened that the local elections had taken place a few months previously, and the county of Cape Breton had returned two members in opposition to the Fielding Government, the county of Richmond one, the county of Inverness two, and the county of Victoria one. The government of Nova Scotia were in pretty bad humour with the island of Cape Breton, and so they resorted to their old tactics of humbug, and they regularly humbugged that company out of its subsidy and dilly-dallied with them from the time they made their application in last September until last January or February, and would give the subsidy as far as St. Peter's and would hold out no hope for the balance of the subsidy for the rest of the system. A by-election in the meantime was going on in the county of Richmond, and the prospect of this subsidy was held out by the local government candidate and his friends as a great bait to the people. They said: If you do not elect a candidate of the local government now in power, how can you expect to get a subsidy for the Cape Breton Extension Railway Company. The fact was, and I say it deliberately, in consequence of that deception practised upon the people, and in consequence of these promises, and fearing that the local subsidy would be lost, the government captured that seat for the local government by a very short majority. But I venture the prediction that they will not enjoy it very long. However, this delay completely put the company off their track, their negotiations for the financing of the road were entirely deranged, and from that day to this matters have been in such a condition that the company have been unable to go on with the road. The fault of that lies entirely with the local government of Nova Scotia. They would make no agreement with the company until after the by-election that was being run in Richmond in the latter part of last December, using the hope of this subsidy all the while as a leverage for their brilliant candidate, and when they had won the seat, they coolly tell the company: We will only give you a contract for a subsidy to St. Peter's. But, Sir, it is no new thing for the government of Nova Scotia to hold out such projects as baits to the people, for the purpose of influencing elections in their own favour. In the general local elections held in 1890, the county of Cape Breton sent two gentlemen to support the Fielding Government. When the general elections for the Dominion came on in 1891, one of those gentlemen resigned his seat in the local House in order to contest the county of Cape Breton for this House with my hon. friend, the senior member for that county; but the Grit nominee was left at home, and my hon. friend came back to resume his duties here. In the local election which was held immediately afterwards, the gentleman who had resigned his seat in the local legislature to become a federal candidate, went back for re-election for the local House, and how did we find the Grit press of Nova Scotia acting on that occasion? I will simply quote from one paper, the "Island Reporter," of Sidney, which is a Grit paper published in the county of Cape Breton, and which has a fairly extensive circulation, among the faithful there. That paper is said to be edited and controlled by the leader of the local government in the legislative council—a gentleman who was a candidate in the Grit interest in the federal elections of 1887, who, on that occasion was defeated, who was then put in the comfortable position of a legislative councillor in Halifax, who resigned that position in 1891 to contest the county of Cape Breton again, and who, after his defeat on that occasion, was again restored to that asylum in which my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) at one time basked and enjoyed himself. This gentleman, in 1891, commented in his paper upon the local election that was then in progress in the county of Cape Breton; and I want my hon. friends to mark well the unholy doctrines laid down by the Grit leaders and the Grit press in my province.

Mr. MULOCK. What has that to do with this question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, then, I will take the point of order. Mr. Speaker, what has the policy of the Grit party in some other part of this Dominion to do with the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth ?

Mr. GILLIES. My hon. friend will see in a moment.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume the hon. member is using illustrations to illustrate his argument.

Mr. GILLIES. The "Island Reporter" said this :

> Mr. McPherson has proved himself the choice of the people in May, when local issues were involved. He has done nothing since to forfeit the confidence of the electors reposed in him then. The Government has done nothing since to forfeit confidence ; on the other hand, Mr. Fielding has manifested every desire to do justice to Cape Breton in railway and other matters. To elect Mr. McCormack on 7th April would mean that no local subsidy be granted to the Louisbourg railway, that our roads and bridges be allowed to go to waste and decay, and that Mr. Fielding's wise policy of redressing the miners' grievances should be abandoned to suit the whims, splenetic wanderings and inconsistencies of Dr. McKay.

These are the doctrines held and propagated by the Grit press of Nova Scotia. Now, I will quote from the election manifesto of a candidate for the legislative assembly of Nova Scotia, the hon. gentleman who now represents Hants in that House, issued by him in April, 1891. This is what he said :

> For himself, he was a straight out-and-out supporter of the local government, as led by the Hon. W. S. Fielding. He reviewed the course of the Government and dwelt on the importance of sending a supporter from this county at the present time, as we were asking a very important railway subsidy, and it would be injudicious to administer a slap in the face to a government that we expected favours from.

These quotations serve to show what an exceedingly immaculate aggregation of individuals we have governing the province of Nova Scotia at Halifax, and the manner in which they are using this Railway Act to coerce, cajole and afterwards deceive the people. But I have not yet finished what I have to say in this connection. The leader of the local government of Nova Scotia is a gentleman for whom I have considerable respect ; I have never hesitated to say that anywhere. When I say that I mean it entirely in a personal sense ; and I will say this, that if Mr. Fielding were surrounded by better influences, I have not the slightest doubt that he would be a very much better public man. Now, what did he say in his place in the House of Assembly in 1890 ? He was dealing with a Bill which he had introduced as a Government measure, making provision for certain county and other municipal machinery. This Bill it was said put too much power in the hands of members supporting the local government, and Mr. Fielding, referring to that question, said :

> We would not put in an Act of Parliament a provision that officers in the county of Richmond should be subjected to the advice of a member of that county supporting the Government, but we would act upon it all the same. One of the principles of party politics is that "to the victors belong the spoils," that is, providing we can agree what the spoils are.

This is a doctrine which I would be very sorry indeed to find a Liberal-Conservative Government entertaining or practising ; and I hope that while I have the honour of a seat in this Parliament, I shall be found ready on every occasion to raise my voice against any such doctrine if any attempt should ever be made to put it in practice. Now, Sir, badly as the counties of Richmond and Cape Breton have been served by the local government at Halifax, the county of my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) has fared no better. With that portion of the island, however, it is not necessary for me to deal, because my hon. friend, who has occupied a seat in this House so acceptably to his people for many years, is quite able to deal with that portion of the island of Cape Breton. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House of Commons, for the attention given my remarks here to-day. I am quite aware that the discussion of questions of largely a local character cannot be as interesting to gentlemen coming from far off provinces of the Dominion as they are to those members representing the very constituencies affected, but I make no apology for the discussion of this question ; it is an important one and concerns my county most vitally, and I desired that the House should be seized of the reasons that I urged upon the Government why this road should be taken up by them and subsidized as was done. I hold that every legitimate effort must be put forth to secure the construction of the whole system through to Louisbourg, with the branch upon Isle Madame ; less than this will fall short of the requirements of the section of country with which I have been dealing this afternoon, and will be a disappointment to the people of Cape Breton. With the completion of this system an era of commercial prosperity will dawn upon that island, from which the great manufacturing centres and the distant portions of the Dominion will benefit to a degree that cannot to be foretold.

Mr. FRASER. I beg leave to draw the attention of the House to a very important matter that has not been touched on by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies). I refer to the railway now proposed to be built from South Africa all the way up to Egypt. It is well known that the British Government have obtained the right to territory in South Africa which will enable them to build a railway all through their own territory until they reach the Soudan, thus not only giving them the command of the trade of that region, but great

strategical advantages in the case of war. There was no allusion made to that by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KENNY. Is that a narrow gauge road?

Mr. FRASER. It has just as much to do with a narrow gauge railway as the whole question discussed about the island of Cape Breton. I understood the Speaker to rule the amendment out of order. What have we to do with all this discussion about Cape Breton? The House will be glad to know that there is a reason in the hon. gentleman's mind, and that is he wanted to make a speech for his constituents, because he has signally failed in his promise to get a road built through their district.

Mr. GILLIES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that I promised any one to get that road built?

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman boasted that he had obtained a subsidy for thirty miles, and had obtained a promise from the Government for favourable consideration with regard to the balance. Does any one believe he would be silent on that question if he had the subsidy?

Mr. GILLIES. Even the hon. gentleman will understand that it is impossible to build a railway out of a subsidy.

Mr. FRASER. Decidedly, and, therefore, there is no company. If the subsidy will not build the railway, I suppose, as there is no company, it will never be built. If you get enough subsidy, you will get a company, but there is no company in this case.

Mr. GILLIES. There is a company, and I will give you the names.

Mr. FRASER. It is no good or it would build the road. There is a subsidy for thirty miles voted by this Government for that particular road, and there is a promise of a balance of the subsidy from the Government. Why is the road not carried out?

Mr. GILLIES. Because the local government refused to subsidize it.

Mr. FRASER. The local government has never refused, and will never refuse to grant a subsidy, subject to this provision:

Provided that such subsidy shall not in any case be granted until the company offering to construct the railway, shall have furnished to the Governor in Council satisfactory evidence that it has at its disposal, either from grants provided by the Parliament of Canada, or from private capital, or from both, funds sufficient, with the subsidies authorized by this part of the Act, to complete such railway, and shall have given ample security for such completion.

They cannot do that.

Mr. GILLIES. Yes they can.

Mr. CAMERON. What is the satisfactory evidence?

Mr. FRASER. That is a question for the Governor in Council. Suppose, for example, there was a bond required, and the hon. member for Inverness would go on that bond, that, no doubt, would be satisfactory evidence. He would so consider it. I could give a hundred cases of satisfactory evidence. I want to call attention to another point. Does the hon. member for Richmond say that this Act authorizes the government, by its own act, when Parliament is not sitting, to incorporate any company, and give it a subsidy?

Mr. GILLIES. Certainly.

Mr. FRASER. We will see. The clause reads as follows:—

The Governor in Council may grant to any company offering to construct any line of railway in the province of Nova Scotia——

Where are the provisions for incorporating the company? The hon. gentleman, I suppose, refers to part second, which authorizes the government, under a particular agreement, to buy out three companies already in existence; and the hon. gentleman says that applies to other companies.

Mr. GILLIES. No.

Mr. FRASER. Surely, as a lawyer, he cannot have read the Act. There is not a word in the Act authorizing the government to incorporate a company, except under the Joint Stock Companies Act. If the hon. gentleman were more anxious to give the facts than to make a speech for his county, he would see that he is not stating what is the fact in that connection. There is not a word in that chapter which authorizes the government, on its own motion, to put a company into operation. Part second deals with the government being able, under a certain agreement to take over the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, the Western Counties Railway, and the Windsor Branch Railway, but it only refers to those three companies. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman points out that the present government have the right to put in operation a company, of its own motion, he is not stating the fact, so far as that chapter is concerned. The government never did take such power into its own hands.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman does, as he very often does, talk beyond the record. In reply to his statement, I refer him to section 7, and I will read it to the House, especially for the hon. gentleman's information. It is in the first part of the Act:

If satisfactory proposals for the construction of the railways mentioned in this part be made to the Governor in Council by persons who are not incorporated, the Governor in Council may grant to such person, under such corporate name as he shall deem expedient, a charter——

Mr. FRASER. Certainly.

—conferring upon them, in whole or in part, the franchises, powers and privileges granted under

any existing laws of this province to any company, as respects the construction or operation of lines of railway or steamships, and such charter, when published in the "Royal Gazette," by order of the Governor in Council, shall have force and effect as if it were an Act of the Legislature of Nova Scotia.

I would retort upon the hon. gentleman that he cannot, as a lawyer, have read through the Act, and I would ask him to withdraw the statement which he made. Every lawyer will understand what a blunder the hon. gentleman has made.

Mr. FRASER. I repeat the same statement, that except by an Act of Parliament, or under the Joint Stock Companies Act, and this is equivalent to it——

Mr. GILLIES. Not at all, this is a special Act.

Mr. FRASER. When satisfactory proposals have been made to the government, then the government, through the "Royal Gazette," can take the same method of doing it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FRASER. I had that in my mind all the time. If the hon. gentleman had read that, he would have seen that when satisfactory proposals are made to the government for the construction of a railway, and the Government are satisfied that the company can construct it, then, after giving notice through the "Royal Gazette"—exactly as they would in the Joint Stock Companies Act—that can be done. So far as that is concerned, any company which has made satisfactory proposals can, on its charter being published in the "Royal Gazette," have the thing done exactly as it can be done under the Joint Stock Companies Act. I was not referring to that——

Mr. GILLIES. You did not know it.

Mr. FRASER. What I called the hon. gentleman's attention to was simply that they could not put any company into operation, of their own motion, and I say they cannot. When the government are satisfied that the parties have made a bona fide proposal, and have the ability to build the road, as under that section 5, then they can put that into operation.

Mr. GILLIES. It is section 7 I refer to.

Mr. FRASER. Then the government will grant a subsidy under the conditions of section 5. The company must show that they are able to build the road. As to putting any and every company into operation simply by an act of the government, they cannot do it. There is no such thing known, and no proposition has been made to carry out such a thing. So far as the road in Cape Breton is concerned I have not a word to say. I wish them to get all the subsidies they can. I find no fault either with the Dominion or provincial Government so far as that is concerned. But I think it shows bad taste on the part of the hon. gentleman to attempt to make capital against the local government for granting subsidies while he upholds the Dominion Government for having granted subsidies. I submit that the local government has made it possible for any company that will show its bona fides to construct a road, by this grant of $3,200 per mile, and that by this step the government has shown its desire to encourage railways in Nova Scotia. And how many companies have taken advantage of that? Very few. Why? Because the government insist that the company shall show that they have the money and are able to build the road they propose. But it is different here. We incorporate companies here and grant subsidies without any respect at all to whether or not they have the ability to build the road. For example, take the matter immediately under discussion—the South Shore Railway Company, and take the Bill that was before the Railway Committee to-day to incorporate that company. Here we have a company that clearly have not the ability to build the road. They have not shown that they are able to do what they ask this Parliament to authorize them to do.

Mr. GILLIES. What company do you refer to?

Mr. FRASER. The company seeking incorporation to build the South Shore road. I will admit what the hon. gentleman from Richmond (Mr. Gillies) says, and I sympathize with him that the road in Cape Breton should have been where he wants one built now. He was for that line.

Mr. CAMERON. No.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. member for Richmond will not say that. I leave the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) and the hon. member for Richmond to settle that question.

Mr. CAMERON. That was settled long ago.

Mr. FRASER. Yes; they settled it by agreeing to differ.

Mr. CAMERON. Not at all.

Mr. FRASER. There is not a man in Richmond County, I believe, but is satisfied that the southern road was the correct one.

Mr. CAMERON. Oh, no.

Mr. FRASER. Am I to understand that the hon. member for Inverness has won over the hon. member for Richmond to believe that the correct road was chosen?

Mr. CAMERON. He was not here then.

Mr. FRASER. But he is here now.

Mr. GILLIES. You have said that I am not in favour of the present road.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. member for Inverness wishes to make it appear that you are in favour of the northern route.

Mr. GILLIES. Not at all.

Mr. FRASER. Then my statement is correct—they settled it by agreeing to differ. I agree with the hon. member for Richmond that the other route was the correct one. I agree also that it would have been better for Cape Breton to have built by the southern route and then have another line through the county of Inverness, and I believe the people of Cape Breton will say so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FRASER. I know the hon. senior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) will oppose that——

Mr. McDOUGALL. Certainly.

Mr. FRASER—for reasons that I do not stop now to consider. But the other line was the correct one. But there is not a possibility in the near future of having this line built. This Parliament has wisely, owing to the state of its finances, come to a standstill in the voting of subsidies. In the county of Inverness there were two or three lines they were wanting to build, and, one way or another, they have not got a road yet. At one time they took up one and at another time another. But the question immediately before the House is not that of the railway in Cape Breton, but relates to the southern railway, and the motion is one for papers. Let us confine ourselves to that. What are the statements made ? One of the statements made and not contradicted is that this company had become a bankrupt company. They may not have been declared bankrupt as a form of law ; we have no bankruptcy law by which they could be thrown into bankruptcy. But when a company cannot meet its liabilities and pays only 30 or 33 cents on the dollar, it is bankrupt ; therefore all papers called for should be brought down, in order that Parliament may be informed what condition that company is in. There has been a good deal of discussion on the question, but I do not think there has been too much, in view of the fact that the counties of Yarmouth, Shelburne and Queen's are interested in having this railway built. These are important counties on the southern shore of Nova Scotia ; and now that they have within their reach the completion of a railway to afford accommodation to their people, it is no wonder that they are appearing before this Parliament and that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) has called for these papers in order that Parliament may be informed as to the facts. We have the extraordinary spectacle of the county of Yarmouth by its municipality, the county of Shelburne by its municipality and the county of Queen's by its municipality have come here asking that one of these roads shall be favourably considered and the other shall not. Of course we have in opposition to these, the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White). And while one cannot help feeling that the member for the county may be perhaps the best exponent of the views of the county, still it does detract from his authority when we find the municipality of the very county he represents coming here and asking that the very opposite from that which he wishes shall be done. The hon. member for Shelburne may have better reasons on his side than the municipality, still one is——

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). There is no petition from the municipality of Shelburne against the road.

Mr. FRASER. Certainly there is. Here is the petition from the municipal council of Shelburne, signed by J. E. Lloyd——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read, read.

Mr. FRASER. W. A. McDonald, A. F. Harlow, James Bower, Philip E. C. Bower, James A. McKay, Ed. Greenwood.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). These are the Grit councillors, and only the Grit councillors.

Mr. FRASER. Of course we are not to listen to this petition, though it is signed by the warden, because he is a Grit.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). It is not official.

Mr. FRASER. Though this is signed by the warden as warden, still it is not official—that is something new. The argument is that because he happens to be a Grit his petition is worthless. But it comes here as the official portion of the warden and municipal councillors of the county of Shelburne.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; I do not pretend to say that it is worthless because these men are Grits. I corrected the statement of the hon. member that this is signed by the warden and councillors. It would appear from his statement that this was from the whole municipal council. I call attention to the fact that it is only the petition of these persons and they describe themselves as warden and councillors. But it is not official. There is no seal.

Mr. FRASER. But that does not appear on the face of the petition. It appears that this is the petition of the warden and municipal council of the municipality of Shelburne, and they give their names and set out what they want. Now, the hon. member for Shelburne may be better authority than these ; I am not going to say that in such a case the member for the county is not the better authority. All I say is that we must look to these things. Which of them do the counties want ? Which is the better ? I do not know how many councillors there are in the municipality of Shelburne. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell me.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I know four of them, there are four or five others.

Mr. FRASER. There is a majority, any way, and there is no counter proposition from the minority. Neither do the minority appear by petition or otherwise, before this House or before the committee, to ask anything different from what the warden has asked.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). They sent largely signed petitions to the boards of trade of Halifax and Yarmouth.

Mr. FRASER. The way to come to this Parliament is through the county of Shelburne, not to go all the way round by Halifax. When did they send the petitions there?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). In 1894.

Mr. FRASER. There was no resolution moved by the Yarmouth Board of Trade, so far as I know, later than 1893.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). It was in 1894.

Mr. FRASER. The only one was in 1893. There is no other for 1894, and it was previous to that. Now that explains the whole thing. Really, have the municipal councillors of the municipality of Shelburne to go all the way to Halifax to make their wants known? It is something very curious. I would suppose they would make their wants known through their representative, or by petitioning Parliament. I do not know as he had lost his brains. At any rate they have not lost confidence in him. Is it not curious that they have to go all the way to Halifax to be heard by the board of trade at Halifax, before they can make their wants known?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). They have no representative at the board of trade, and they have one here.

Mr. FRASER. Precisely, they should send their petition where they have their representative. I will leave the House to decide which is the more correct way, to act through their representative, or to send all the way to Halifax. But they want a broad gauge road. The board of trade has nothing to do with it, except that Halifax, being a central city, of course, is interested in the trade of all the counties. But the city of Halifax, while entitled to a good deal of consideration, ought not to be the authority to determine this question. The people of the counties of Shelburne, Yarmouth and Queen's are the people to decide this question. Now, I have so far failed to hear a single word from any representative party or from any representative body of men in the counties of Yarmouth, Shelburne or Queen's against the prayer of these petitions. That is the curious thing. Surely those counties understand their own business. How does it come that not one of them has been heard? How is it that not one of them has come here to say: This southern road is all wrong, and we wish you would give us the other? How does it happen that it is only the promoters of this Bill who are here answering to this motion to-day, or who have already answered? It is a curious thing to me. One would suppose that in a matter affecting the whole province of Nova Scotia, we would pay a great deal more attention to the Parliament of that province, or the Parliament of Canada, than we would to individuals in that province; because we are bound to assume that that Parliament is acting in the interests of the whole province, or we are bound to assume that the municipal authorities of the counties and towns through which this railway is passing, are acting in the interests of those counties and towns, and therefore anything they say is entitled to more weight as indicating the position of matters in those municipalities, than anything else that can be said. The hon. member will see that he is in antagonism to the boards that govern in the towns and counties through which that line passes—at least, I have heard nothing to the contrary. Now, that being the case, I think this Parliament ought to consider very carefully any step it takes. We cannot expect to have parallel railways passing through counties like Yarmouth, Shelburne and Queen's. They never can expect more than one railway, and they must be well satisfied if they receive one railway, just as the shore county I have the honour to represent, and the shore part of the county of Halifax would be very glad if they received one railway. We ought, therefore, to draw the line there, and to say that the company going on and doing the work, shall receive from this Parliament reasonable support. I am not going to discuss other roads outside of that. I am not going to discuss Cape Breton, or any other section outside of my own county. I have done so again and again, not with that profit that comes of hard labour, but I have learned from my experience in this Parliament, that in whatever state I am, therewith to be content. I do not think that in the present state of things the other company proposing to build the southern road in the island of Cape Breton, has within themselves the ability to accomplish that undertaking. If you only leave a margin—and I am talking now in the presence of men who have built railways—what will be the result? The road will be built, and then it will not be properly worked. You must insist that only men of means shall undertake to build a railway, and you must insist upon that, not only in view of the fact that the road itself ought to be well built, but in order to insure that the road shall be well run afterward. Building a road is one thing, and running it is something else. Therefore, we ought not for one moment to put anything in the way of a bona fide company that is attempt-

ing to build a road, neither should we attempt to increase the number of companies. I am sure that the Government do not want to increase the number of companies. I am sure that by the time they have given a subsidy to every company in Canada where a road should be built, they will find that the exchequer is sufficiently depleted. I know well that the Minister of Finance has no idea of giving a subsidy to companies that are going to build parallel lines. I do not think he wants to do it, if he could. This country cannot afford it. Therefore, we should insist that when a road receives the sanction of this Parliament, we should be satisfied that its promoters have the ability to carry out what they have undertaken. Labourers unpaid! Just the same trouble that came before us the other day in a case where the labourers were not paid. I think one hon. gentleman stated that there are 200 mules in the county of Yarmouth. Not one. They came, and they were shipped away again. There is not a single one in the province of Nova Scotia. We have to cross the border before we reach them. But these came from Boston, they are Yankee mules, and I believe that with the exception of one sick mule that was detained in quarantine there, every mule has been sent back to Boston. Not one of them is ready to work there to-day, because they have all been taken away; and the plant, I believe—I am speaking subject to correction—has all gone too.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Not all.

Mr. FRASER. Well, all except a trifling quantity that is not worth talking about, and that cannot go, because the sheriff has charge of it.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Those suits are all settled. The claims have all been paid and the suits withdrawn, as you will find out by looking at the Yarmouth papers.

Mr. FRASER. I say that the only part of that plant that is there now, remains because it had to remain.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). It came there, and was there when the execution was issued.

Mr. FRASER. What is the value of all the plant there now?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I cannot tell you.

Mr. FRASER. Is it worth $5,000?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I cannot say.

Mr. FRASER. $1,000?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I am not a judge.

Mr. FRASER. No: and I do not think the hon. gentleman will say it is worth $500. Most all of it has been sent away, mules and all. I think the hon. gentleman said that he made inquiries and that the mules were there and kicking, but I find they have been exported back to the place from whence they came, to the United States.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). That is not so. The mules were brought from Baltimore, and the plant was brought from Baltimore. The mules and a portion of the plant have been taking across the line and are now engaged in a work there, which will soon be completed, and then they will be brought back to Yarmouth to complete this road.

Mr FRASER. The only mistake I made was in stating they were foreign mules instead of Boston mules. At all events, the plant cannot be utilized. So this House should act carefully in any course it adopts. I am very anxious that railways should be built in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, if they are going to prove successful, but I do not want subsidies voted by this Parliament given to companies that will not construct roads. We must not vote the money of the people, I repeat, unless a road is going to be built, and we certainly cannot afford to vote any money where there is a contest between rival companies and where the money may be lost. We in Nova Scotia have received a fair share of railway subsidies, and there are still roads to be built; but the subsidies, with the exception of that given to the Short Line, have all been granted to roads that were absolutely necessary. I am not going to discuss that question now at length, but we must not forget that every dollar which is voted to a province for a line that does not become a success lessens the future chance of that province obtaining money for enterprises that will undoubtedly prove beneficial, and when we come to ask aid for such enterprises we have not the same opportunity of obtaining it. The Minister of Finance thinks, no doubt, that if his friends spoke as frankly as I have done, we would not have so much trouble. But to subsidize a railway company when another company is building a similar line is not to act in the best interests of the people of Nova Scotia. I support the motion made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), and trust the papers will be brought down at an early day. The Government will understand that a company is now proceeding with construction, and I hope they will do nothing to interfere with the rights of that company, which is honestly carrying out the contract and building the road.

Mr. CAMERON. I desire to make some observations in answer to the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser). I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that there should not be an increase in the number of companies chartered over any particular ground in any part of this Dominion. Unfortunately, the cause of this trouble has been that a second charter has been granted over

the same ground. If that had not been the case I assume this difficulty would not have existed. But as the charter was originally granted for the South Shore Railway, I hold the rights and interests of that company should be protected by this Parliament. These western counties railway matters occupy a very unfortunate position; there cannot be any doubt that they are very much mixed up, and, unquestionably, the reason is that a second charter was granted over the ground covered by a previous charter. We find by the report of the provincial government engineer of Nova Scotia that:

The South Shore Railway Company, Limited, was incorporated under chapter 130 of the Acts of 1892, to build, own, equip and operate a line of railway of 4 feet 8½ inch gauge, from a point on the Yarmouth harbour, Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, or on the Western Counties Railway, through the townships of Yarmouth and Argyle, in the county of Yarmouth, thence through the western districts of Shelburne County, touching Barrington, and thence to Shelburne, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, in accordance with chapter 53 of Revised Statutes, fifth series, referring to plans and surveys.

Section 28 of the Act of incorporation provides that the portion of the company's railway lying between the town of Yarmouth and the town of Barrington shall be begun and completed within four years after the passing of the Act, or reasonable progress towards the completion, satisfactory to the Governor in Council, shall be made within two years by the company, to ensure such completion.

Under the provisions of this section, the South Shore Railway Company had two years given them to begin the construction of that road. They commenced the surveys in good faith, and before the time elapsed unfortunately for the railway system of the western counties, the local legislature granted a second charter over the same ground, to which the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) so seriously objects.

Mr. BORDEN. When the South Shore Company began their surveys was it for a road that was to be a narrow gauge or one of a standard gauge?

Mr. CAMERON. It is immaterial to the question at issue. The position I take is that a second charter should not have been granted over the same ground.

Mr. BORDEN. Answer the question.

Mr. CAMERON:

The company's Act of Incorporation was passed on the 30th day of April, 1892, but no practical effort towards construction on the line of railway was observable until the first week in February, 1894, when the work of surveying commenced.

The first plans of surveys and books of reference submitted by the South Shore Railway Company, under the provisions of chapter 53 of Revised Statutes, were deposited for certification of the Commissioner of Public Works on the 5th day of April, 1894, for a distance of ten miles, from Yarmouth to Tusket River, and on the 7th day of April a second section of ten miles from thence to Argyle was in like manner submitted. Owing to some technical irregularities in the plans and reference books and to the alignment of the first ten miles materially interfering with the lines of location of the Coast Railway Company's plans, that had been previously submitted, the necessary endorsement by certificate had to be postponed, pending a further revision of surveys, corrections and amended alignment. Up to the present time certificates for surveys and books of reference for a continuous line of railway from Yarmouth to Lower Woods Harbour Head, covering a distance of 40 miles, have been given by the Commissioner of Public Works.

About the 1st of October last, work of construction commenced and has been since that time expeditiously and continuously proceeded with. We have heard no complaints respecting payments for materials or for labour in connection with the works of the South Shore Railway.

The history of the introduction and procedure of the South Shore Railway Company and of the Coast Railway Company may be summarized thus:

In the winter of 1889 and the spring of 1890, the provincial government had a preliminary survey made for a railway to run along the western shore from Yarmouth to Lockeport, touching Tusket, Argyle, Pubnico, Wood's Harbour, Barrington, Clyde and Shelburne, plans and profiles of which were prepared and a report thereon published in my annual report for 1890.

Subsequently, during the session of 1892, a charter was applied for by the South Shore Railway Company, which was granted under the conditions already named, and passed on the 30th day of April, 1892. It will be seen by the preceding remarks, that from April, 1892, to February, 1894, a period of one year and nine months, no work was begun or active steps taken towards construction, so far as could be noticed.

During this period of inaction, the Coast Railway Company was formed and obtained a charter in the session of 1893, to build a narrow gauge railway to follow the shore along the route of the preliminary survey of 1889-90, touching the points already mentioned.

Both lines follow pretty closely the same course as the Government survey of 1889-90 followed.

The Coast Railway Company, during 1893 and until February, 1894, had the field to itself and had a party making a location survey on the first six miles from Yarmouth during the fall of 1893.

In the meantime, the South Shore Railway Company seemed to awake from its lethargy, new hands took the helm and placed strong survey parties in the field in February, 1894.

The location lines of both companies run closely together, side by side, they cross and recross, following the same valleys in seeking easy alignment. Expensive bridges are being built over the Salmon and Tusket rivers, within sight of each other, and this order of procedure seems to intensify as the works progress. The struggle for life and survival of the fittest is in this instance very fully exemplified.

Even now, at the present stage, if the two companies could only come to some agreement whereby the interests of both could be mutually and agreeably arranged a good adjustment might be effected. For although a large sum must be lost to both parties, expended on unproductive work, still if an amicable understanding could be now arranged, the loss would not be so much as might be apparent. In some sections such as that between Yarmouth and Arcadia where but one line, the narrow gauge one in this instance, has been graded, the work might with some al-

terations of curvature be utilized for the adoption of the standard gauge, and so on. Of course when the lines run counter and work has been performed on both of them, such saving could not be effected.

The reason why the South Shore Railway Company seemed to have been dormant for a couple of years was simply because that company had not received any encouragement from the local or Dominion governments. In 1894 they received some encouragement from the Ottawa Government, and they had clause 5 of the Nova Scotia Act of 1886 to give them the assurance that the local government would meet their demands when they were in a position to make them. But, unfortunately, this condition of things was brought about by granting a second charter over the same ground. I contend that the party who receives the first charter and who receives substantial aid from either the local or Dominion Government, is the one that should be maintained, and particularly so as they had undertaken at the beginning the construction of a standard gauge road, which is the only one that this House should sanction. If the other company is now forced to adopt a standard gauge, it is because the action of this Parliament, and the action of the South Shore Railway Company forced them to do it.

Mr. BORDEN. The South Shore was a narrow gauge at first.

Mr. CAMERON. That does not matter, because it were not subsidized, and would not be subsidized by this Parliament as a narrow gauge road. That is a good reason why, at this juncture, their rights should be maintained here. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a proper time for me to call the attention of the House to a parallel case, with a view, if possible, to remedy the evils which have been brought about by granting dual charters over the same ground. In 1887 the Nova Scotia legislature granted two charters over the same ground in the county I have the honour to represent, and I call the attention of the House to these facts with a view of averting any such calamity either in the west or in the east. Both of these charters I refer to were granted at the same session of the local legislature of Nova Scotia. It is well known to the public here and elsewhere, that I had been opposed to the granting of a second charter, because I believe then, and I believe now, that it is the very best course possible to pursue to frustrate railway construction in any section of this Dominion. The same objection I had against the granting of the second charter over the same ground in the county of Inverness, influences me now to stand by the company that received the original charter in this case. It is well known that in Nova Scotia particularly, no company will undertake the construction of a road unless they have secured that substantial aid from the Dominion and provincial legislatures, which in Nova Scotia is provided for by the statute, and in the Dominion is provided for in the usual conditions of granting subsidies to railway companies throughout the Dominion. In 1887, as I have said, two rival companies were chartered by the local legislature. The two rival charters ran concurrently through both branches of the legislature, and they passed the legislative council within five minutes of each other, and received the assent of the Lieutenant-Governor at the same time. The names of these companies were, first, the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company; and second, the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company. Shortly after the passage of these charters, I received a letter from the promoter of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, dated 4th May, 1887, and which reads as follows:—

Mabou, 4th May, 1887.

My dear Sir,—I have just returned from Port Hood, where the municipal council is in session.

My object in waiting on these gentlemen was to secure legislation in our railway enterprise. We have asked and got the council to vote a guarantee of 4 per cent interest on $100,000 for twenty years, which is a good beginning. I think the only opposition to the vote was Hon. John McNeil and Duncan, from Judique. The most of the councillors take the idea with enthusiasm.

The Hon. John had resolutions from the American company, asking free right of way and immunity from taxation, the county to do the fencing, and, I think, something else, but he had no one to back him but Duncan, and did not get a vote on them at all. We think we have a good show of $5,000 per mile from the local and the coal royalties for twenty years and Crown lands; the rest we depend on you getting out of the Dominion Government, viz., the $3,200 per mile. These subsidies will secure the road.

We are taking Dr. McLennan into the company and are reserving an equal share for you. I do not know yet who the other members of the company may be, but I am determined to keep up the Tory side of the concern.

Our charter covers all Inverness and Victoria, and in our guarantee from the county we define the line from some point on the main trunk to Broad Cove coal mines, thence to Cheticamp and Margaree, with a branch to Port Hood.

My principal object in writing you now is to ask your influence in getting a survey of those lines by the Dominion Government this summer. We think that you may be able to obtain this, which would be quite an item out of the way of a company. I think, if we get this thing in order, we will shatter the Hon. Dan.'s prospects for the next election, if that is not already done. Please let me know what you think of this thing, at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,

(Signed) JOHN McKEEN.

In answer to that letter I wrote, on the 28th May, as follows:—

Ottawa, 28th May, 1887.

My dear Sir,—I find that you will have a special meeting of Council to subsidize railway companies. Pass a resolution allowing no right of way or subsidy to any company that cannot secure

a cash subsidy of $3,200 in its act of incorporation from the local legislature, etc.

Yours truly,
H. CAMERON.

About the same time, I received a telegram from the promoter of the other railway company, the Hon. Willian Ross, of Halifax, which reads as follows :—

Halifax, N.S., 18th May.

McKam here. Full power from New York. Incorporated company to complete arrangements with you and the local government. Only municipal concession asked is right of way and tax exemption. Council meeting, Port Hood, Friday. Other companies requiring municipal bonds for four per cent interest on $100,000 for twenty years. Will you wire the Council to present this writing.

W. ROSS.

I received a letter of the same date, assigning reasons why the municipal bonus should not be given to that company, and it proved to my mind, conclusively, that the effect, if not the object, of granting these two charters over that ground was to prevent the construction of the railway, as I will show further on.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 119) respecting the South Shore Railway Committee (from the Senate).—(Mr. Gillmor.)

Bill (No. 132) to revive and amend the Acts to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. Martin.)

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 34) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FRASER. I move to amend the Bill by adding the following clause :—

The company shall remain liable for all debts due for the construction of the railway of the said company, and, if such debts are due to contractors, shall cause all just claims for labour, board and building material, in respect of such construction, to be paid by such contractors or their assigns or assignees, and, in default thereof, shall be directly liable to all persons having such claims.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I have not agreed to that clause and prefer to hear what the Government say with regard to it before proposing any amendment.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am sorry my hon. colleague, the Minister of Railways, is not here as he would be in a better position to discuss this question than I. It seems to me that this is a transfer of contract from one company to another. I do not see how we can interfere between the two in order to hold the second company responsible for the debts contracted by the first company. The courts are open to the two companies for the purpose of settling their rights, and those parties to whom either company is indebted have their recourse to the ordinary tribunals.

Mr. COATSWORTH. As some statements were made the other night with reference to this company, I would like to place the matter right before the House, so far as the company is concerned. I was quite taken by surprise by the petition read by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser). I had no personal knowledge of the facts, and I assured the committee at the time—although some of the papers have not given me credit for doing so—that I was quite anxious the workmen should be paid and that I felt certain the company was equally anxious. I immediately communicated with the company, and received this telegram in reply from its solicitor :

Have always been desirous of paying workmen and boarding-house keepers, and wished to do so even three months ago, but assignees of Bracey Brothers and creditors holding orders upon us, payable out of final estimates, objected and would not consent to our doing so. Bank of Hamilton holds assignment from Bracey Brothers of their contract, and all moneys payable under it, as security for about $13,000 advanced by the bank. We wish to pay the workmen and boarding-house keepers now, if we can be protected ; or will pay the whole amount payable to contractors into court. Think, however, the workmen will fare better if money left in our hands, as we shall contend that they are entitled to be paid in full. Our clients have already paid over $21,000 directly to labourers, on progress estimates of Bracey Brothers, and have also paid over $54,000 on their own pay-rolls for labour on the line between Brantford and Hamilton.

I think this shows the great desire of the company to have these workmen paid. I am authorized to offer this amendment to the proposition of the hon. gentleman. I think that his amendment, which he had of necessity to draw up hastily the other night, is not quite in the form it ought to be. I would propose this amendment in its place :

The company is hereby authorized and empowered to retain, from time time, out of moneys due, or to become due, to any of its contractors, a sufficient sum to pay and shall, immediately after the passing of this Act, be liable to pay out of such moneys all bona fide claims for wages now due by such contractors, or by such sub-contractors, to any labourers or workmen for personal services actually performed in respect of the construction of said railway, and also all bona fide claims against such contractors, or sub-contractors, for boarding the said labourers and workmen, while so employed in respect of the construction of the said railway ; and the payment by the company of such claims, or any part thereof, shall be a discharge to them, to the extent of such payment, of any claims against them by any contractor or any person claiming by, through or

under him, and shall also discharge any contractor to the extent aforesaid from any claim by any sub-contractor or any person claiming by, through or under him, and who may be primarily liable to pay such claims or any of them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that retrospective? Does it cover past claims?

Mr. COATSWORTH. All claims now due out of money now due to the contractors. There are sufficient funds in the hands of the company to pay all these claims. The company are willing and anxious to pay them, and are willing to become liable to pay them immediately after the passing of the Act, provided Parliament authorizes them to pay out of these moneys so that they will not be called upon to pay the money over again to the contractors. That is the position they want to be put in and it is the object sought to be gained by this amendment that they shall be entitled to retain these moneys, and that they shall be liable to pay them to the workmen and boarding-house keepers immediately after the passing of the Act; and that that payment shall be a discharge from any liability to the contractor or sub-contractor.

Mr. MULOCK. Wherein does your amendment differ from that of the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser)?

Mr. COATSWORTH. The amendment of the hon. member for Guysboro' commences: "The company shall remain liable for all debts due for the construction of the railway of the said company." They are not liable for these debts at all, you see.

Mr. FRASER. If I were allowed a word of explanation the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth), I think, would understand. The same explanation would be a reply to the hon. Postmaster General. Instead of taking the amendment I had first prepared myself—and which was hurriedly prepared—knowing the value of precedent in these matters, I looked up the case of the North-west Central Railway in which case Parliament had passed a clause for the same purpose as now proposed, and I took that clause exactly as it read.

Mr. COATSWORTH. But they were primarily liable.

Mr. FRASER. I know that. But I took this clause in order that I might have authority for what I did. It reads:

The company shall remain liable——

It can only remain liable for any debt until that debt is discharged——

Mr. MULOCK. Is it quite clear that there is enough money owing to satisfy these claims?

Mr. COATSWORTH. We say there is enough money due to satisfy the claims of the workmen and boarding-house keeper; and, as an evidence of our good faith, we have in our amendment stated that we shall be liable to pay them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But only to the limit of the amount that may be due by you to the sub-contractors.

Mr. COATSWORTH. It provides that we shall be liable, out of the moneys——

Mr. MULOCK. Ah, "out of the moneys."

Mr. COATSWORTH. I was a little doubtful on that point, and telegraphed them to know exactly the effect. They say that the final estimate will be sufficient to pay the amounts due for wages and to boarding-house keepers.

Mr. MULOCK. Eliminate that qualification.

Mr. FRASER. I am not anxious about the form of words, provided there is enough to liquidate the claim. The claim with regard to the North-west Central, to which I refer, is to be found in chap. 74 of the Acts passed in 1886:

The company shall remain liable for all debts due for construction of the railway, and, if such debts are due to the contractors——

As in this case:

—shall cause all just claim for labour, board and building material, in respect of such construction, to be paid by such contractors, and, in default thereof, shall be directly liable——

That is the company shall be liable——

—to the persons having such claims.

In the case before us the contractors failed, and it should read:

Or their assignees, and, in default thereof, shall be liable——

And so on. That would cover it.

Mr. COATSWORTH. No; it does not cover it at all.

Mr. FRASER. In what way?

Mr. COATSWORTH. It does not authorize the company to pay the claims out of these moneys.

Mr. FRASER. So far as that is concerned I do not object to the wording of the hon. gentleman's resolution, if it goes far enough.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If I understand the hon. gentleman's amendment it is large enough to cover claims due as well as those to become due. But I want to call attention to the fact that it restricts its application to two classes.

Mr. COATSWORTH. That is the intention—that is all that it claims.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let us see what it does and what it does not do. It provides that the company may out of the moneys, if any, which are due by them to the sub-contractors, retain sufficient to pay two classes

of creditors—the labourers who have actually put their labour upon the road, and the boarding-house keepers. It covers no other claim than these.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not acquainted with the facts, but I understand that it is alleged there are large claims by others——

Mr. COATSWORTH. We do not deal with those.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If these are the only two classes that are intended to be covered, I think it does cover them, and I think it covers past due claims; but the objection still remains that it limits their liabilities to the amount that they may happen to owe to these sub-contractors——

Mr. COATSWORTH. That is the intention.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And if they do not owe anything to the sub-contractors, then they are not bound to pay anything to the men.

Mr. McKAY. I would like to read a letter I have received from the assignee of Bracey Bros., which affords some information on this point. He says:

> I have little doubt, upon a fair estimate being made by the engineer that sufficient would be coming to me to pay all the claims; but, as the engineer is the employee of the construction company who are making all the profit out of the contracts, I do not expect very liberal treatment.

That means that the engineer who passes upon the contract is the engineer of the construction company, and he does not expect that engineer to treat the sub-contractor very liberally. There is a penalty clause under which Bracey Bros. bind themselves to forfeit $500 a day if the contract between them and the construction company—which is really the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Company—is not finished by the 5th December last. The assignee is afraid that the engineer may exact that $500 a day penalty and leave but very little coming to the sub-contractors. So, if this amendment covers only the money which remains in the hands of the company as due to the sub-contractors, after that is all paid, it may be there will still be a large amount due to labourers and boarding-house keepers.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As I understand the amendment of the hon. member for East Toronto, it proposes to make the company responsible for the amount due to the men for labour and the amount due to the boarding-house keepers, even if there is not enough money coming to the sub-contractor to settle those claims.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If not, then the amendment does not amount to anything.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) for, as the hon. member for Hamilton says, Bracey Bros. gave a bond to the construction company—which is really the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Company—to pay $500 a day for every day they were behind in completing the contract after 5th December; and, as it is not yet completed, if that penalty clause is enforced, the whole liability will probably be wiped out. So, unless the company is made liable in some other way to pay for the labour and board and material, the fact is that the labourers and those who furnished the supplies and the boarding-house keepers will probably get nothing.

Mr. COATSWORTH. We are dealing here entirely with ex parte statements. The hon. gentleman has stated that there are amounts due to the men and to the boarding-house keepers. We admit that. And we say that there are enough moneys in hand to pay these things. And we say that our statement should be accepted.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will you put it in the Bill?

Mr. COATSWORTH. We have stated here that we are willing that the company shall be liable to pay these moneys. We do not want to equivocate: the only reason why we want it put as I have suggsted is that we want it distinctly understood that we are not to pay twice, that we are not liable to pay these moneys to the men, and, then afterwards to pay them to the contractors as well. I assure the hon. gentleman I am not equivocating in the slightest degree. I read the telegram to him this afternoon that there are plenty of funds to pay these things. I have the telegrams here, and any hon. gentleman may see them, showing that there are plenty of funds to meet these claims. We are willing to pay them, and we are anxious to pay them, because it will save the credit of the company. We want the amendment put in that way, so it will be clear that out of those moneys we are entitled to pay.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You say you pay out of the moneys due to the contractors, but what if there is no money due to the contractors?

Mr. COATSWORTH. But I am sure there is.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. member was to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Guysboro'——

Mr. COATSWORTH. No, I won't do it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If you accepted that amendment it would protect you in the payments, and enable you to deduct them from the sums due to your sub-contractors. Would not that meet the whole case?—because you say you are perfectly willing to become liable to those labourers and boarding-house keepers. Then declare that in so many words.

Mr. COATSWORTH. The hon. member for North York makes a suggestion. I will read the amendment:

The company is hereby authorized and empowered to retain from time to time out of moneys due or to become due to any contractors, a sufficient sum to pay, and shall immediately after the passing of this Act, be liable to pay out of such moneys.

Now, the hon. member for North York makes this proposition:

In so far as said moneys will allow, and as to any deficiency, shall be personally liable out of the company's own funds to pay all bona fide claims.

Now, I think that puts it beyond doubt. We are willing to accept that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The object we all have in view is that these labourers should be paid, and the hon. gentleman, from the precise information which he has given, and which he holds from the company, and the hon. member for North York, who has also looked into this matter, are agreed; and so far as the Government are concerned, I think there can be no objection to that amendment. I think it fully covers what the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) has in view in moving his amendment. I think that the amendment of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) even goes beyond the amendment of the hon. member for Guysboro'. I have no objection to this amendment, and I think it fully meets the case.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There is another point. They used a great deal of timber in the construction of the railway from Hamilton to Brantford, that was got out by labour, and a large amount is due for that timber. Ought not that to be included also with the wages and board? I think so. It is labour to all intents and purposes.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I have no authority to do that. There was nothing said about timber the other night. The great point made the other night was this: Here are any number of workmen who have not got their wages. Now, we agreed on that point, we say we will pay wages, and we will pay the boarding-house keepers, and that is all we were asked to do.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). With respect to the question as to how you will interpret the term, "board," there is this practical difficulty. The Bracey Bros., in the adjustment of their account, obtained pretty large supplies that were used to mitigate the expenditure for board. They gave to their teamsters and men orders for supplies for the maintenance of those teams and men, while employed on that work. Is the term "board" sufficient to cover that claim, or do you interpret this as a commercial transaction? These supplies were used for the maintenance of the teams and men, and would simply have made the board bill larger had they not been obtained in that form. I think it is perhaps fair to include that class of claim.

An hon. MEMBER. No doubt board covers that. Supplies for the team would simply have increased the board bill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is clear this class of claim would not be covered, because the amendment is strictly limited to claims for actual board.

Mr. McMULLEN. When my hon. friend from Guysboro' brought this question up the other day in the Railway Committee, Mr. Osler was there, and in reply to his demand then, on behalf of the labourers, Mr. Osler stated there were a number of garnishee creditors who had taken action against the Bracey Bros. How is this going to affect them? Will this Bill deprive those people of the rights they have under the actions they have taken?

Mr. COATSWORTH. I do not understand that exactly.

Mr. FRASER. If it is a bona fide claim, it must be paid, as I understand. But in reply to the hon. member for Toronto, I may say that the petition does not refer to teams. It says "in respect of said work done and materials supplied." That is the petition I presented, which I read from "Hansard." Now, would not these words meet the case: "And all moneys so paid shall be pro tanto a discharge to such contractors as between them and their subcontractors"? That would give the hon. member all he would want. I do not want to press for too much. I am very glad that the company are coming forward in this way.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the company is acting very fairly.

Mr. FRASER. I want to get as much as possible, but I don't want to be too exacting.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I could not go any further with the amendment.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We understand, then, your amendment includes payment of these bills for supplies that went for the maintenance of the men and helped to pay the board bills and the keep of the horses that were employed?

Mr. COATSWORTH. If they come within the scope of the amendment.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You say they do come within the scope of the amendment.

Mr. COATSWORTH. No, I do not say anything about it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Don't you think it would be just and honest to put that in? These claims do not amount to much, perhaps $2,000 would cover the whole. I think, in justice to the boarding-house keepers who fed the men that did the work on the road, and who fed the teams, that might be put in.

Mr. COATSWORTH. If the boarding-house keepers are paid out of that account for their supplies.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). These were purchased, I think, by Bracey Bros. themselves, and supplied in that form by order, so that those who furnished them are creditors of Bracey Bros., practically.

Mr. COATSWORTH. If they are claims for board, they will come within the amendment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That will generally be considered satisfactory, but there is one thing more we should do. Both sides, so far as there are sides, agree that these claims should be paid. Our right to enact this provision is, however, more than doubtful.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That appears to be the consensus of opinion. But Parliament should make its declaration practical by providing that the Act should not come into force until these claims have been paid.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then we are only playing with the question, for we are passing legislation which we know will be non-effective. What is the sense of deceiving the labourers? If we have not the power to make this declaration, except we insert the provision I have mentioned, why should we pass it? I object to Parliament making itself a laughing-stock. Let us make this Act effective, and do not let us go through the farce of passing it in such a form as is suggested, when the lawyers of the House declare that it will not be effective. We do not want to play with the labourers, and have them come here and declare that we have been playing a false game, passing legislation which we knew was non-effective. Some provision should be inserted to make that declaration on which both sides are agreed effective, and that can be done by providing that the Act shall not come into force until these payments have been made.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is quite evident that the Bill will not get through in the allotted time to-night. A very satisfactory arrangement is going to be made between the parties, and the company appears to be willing to pay these debts, to some extent at least. The only way in which this arrangement can be carried is to refer the Bill back to the committee and have a sub-committee draft clauses so as to give effect to what is now proposed. That is the only solution of the difficulty. It is evident from the disagreement existing among the lawyers that it is not clearly understood what the effect of the clause will be, and the last statement made by an hon. member (Mr. Davies) is that we are deceiving ourselves as well as the parties in our measures for applying relief. The discussion shows the importance of amending the Railway Act, as was suggested some years ago. Sir [illegible] Tupper, when Minister of Railways, promised to have the Act amended so that payments for wages and materials furnished should constitute a first lien on the assets of the company. No doubt many grievances occur. Labourers and people furnishing supplies suffered very seriously owing to the system of sub-letting contracts to irresponsible parties, and I would impress upon the Government the desirability of taking this subject into consideration, and amending the Act so that we may avoid in the future occurrences such as this. I am perfectly satisfied that the good sense of the committee will see that the course I have suggested is the only solution of the present difficulty, and it should be adopted for this reason, among other reasons, because the Bill will come up in the other House, and if not satisfactory will be referred back. I therefore move that the committee rise and report progress.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his motion. We have arrived, I think, at a very satisfactory solution. The object of all hon. members who have taken part in this debate is to protect the workmen. The hon. member who has expressed the view of the company has done so very frankly and openly, and he stated that the company were anxious to pay for the labour that had gone into the road. But he said, what every business man would understand, that the company did not wish to pay money to the labourers and have to pay it again to sub-contractors, and the amendment suggested by the hon. member protects the labourers to the fullest possible extent. I have read the amendment and listened very attentively to the discussion which has been the outcome of these two amendments, and while it may be important to consider whether the Railway Act should not be amended, do not let us at this late period of the session delay this Bill, when it really provides for exactly what every hon. member has in view, the protection of the labourers. The hon. member for York and the hon. member for Toronto have gone over this amendment and have agreed to it. I call the attention of the committee to the fact that this Bill must go before the Senate. I think the amendment meets the case completely, and I would ask that the Bill be disposed of. The time of Parlia-

ment is so precious at this the end of the session that all parties should join together to avoid delays where possible. I am quite prepared to vote in favour of the amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not wish to press my motion. I am in favour of the Bill and anxious that it should become law, and my only object is to facilitate its passage. If it is found, when the Bill is in the Senate, that the position taken by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is the correct one, the Bill will no doubt be sent back to this House.

Mr. CURRAN. I think all will agree that this Parliament should not interfere in the way first suggested. The only manner in which we can meet the present case and make our action effective is by adopting the amendment introduced at the suggestion of the hon. member for York. The question now is, does that go far enough? The amendment says, speaking of the moneys in the hands of the assignee: "In so far as said moneys will allow we have no control over these moneys." I think if we went a little further, and provided that in the event of their being no funds legally available in the hands of the assignee, the company shall be personally liable for the deficiency, the case would be met. We are legislating in a matter we cannot control here, except to a certain extent, but we wish to meet this matter and make the company practically liable. My hon. friend (Mr. Coatsworth) says they only want to make the company liable primarily as regards any deficiency, but I think my hon. friend will agree with most of us, that this Parliament cannot control that first part of the moneys to which he refers, leaving a balance to be paid. Under the laws of Ontario I suppose that these funds are to be distributed in a certain way. We cannot say here, that "A," "B" or "C" shall stand aside until the labourers and boarding-house keepers shall be paid. Such legislation would not be worth a finger snap; it would be ultra vires, as the money and assets now in the hands of the assignee are absolutely under the control of the legislation of the local legislature. If the hon. gentleman wants to protect the company from paying twice, he is taking a wrong way of doing it, because our action would not relieve them from the claim of any other creditors who might come forward and formulate their demands under the laws of Ontario.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend (Mr. Coatsworth) knows I am anxious this Bill should pass through in the best possible manner, and the best possible way, in my opinion, is to refer it back to the committee.

Mr. COATSWORTH. If it were earlier in the session I would adopt the hon. gentleman's suggestion. The Bill has to go through the Senate and if there are any suggestions they can be made there.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If my hon. friend wishes I will withdraw the motion, but I am satisfied he will lose by it.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Coatsworth) willing that a clause should be added declaring that the privilege conceded to this company by this Bill shall not come into operation until the debts are discharged?

Mr. COATSWORTH. No. If hon. gentlemen on the other side will agree to assist us in carrying out the arrangement proposed, I am satisfied to have the Bill go back to the committee for the purpose of putting it in such a shape as will be binding on both parties.

Some hon. MEMBERS. All right.

Mr. MACLEAN (York) moved that the following clause be added to the Bill:

But nothing in this Act contained, or in the Railway Act or amendments thereof, shall allow any rate of fare for way passengers greater than 2 cents per mile to be charged, or taken over the track or tracks of the said Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.

He said: Two nights ago in speaking on this question I endeavoured to show that the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo road was a Vanderbilt line. I also showed that the New York Central, the great Vanderbilt line, carrying more passengers than any other railroad in America, found it profitable to charge a 2 cent rate.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It seems to me if the Bill is now referred back to the committee, the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to move his amendment when it comes back to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill cannot be referred back until we get out of committee.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When the Bill comes back the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of explaining his amendment.

Mr. MULOCK. If it is the intention of the committee to keep good-faith with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) the committee can rise before the hour for private Bills has expired, and then when the Speaker is in the Chair a motion to that effect can be made.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the committee rose.

COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANIES, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, before you left the Chair at six o'clock I was referring to correspondence which I had received from the promoters of the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, and the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company. I read a letter from John McKeen, president of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, ridiculing the Inverness and Richmond Company as possessing no means to

proceed with the work. I might also quote several letters from the president of the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, to prove that the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company was unworthy of the confidence of the people. The battle of rival companies has been fought along these lines before the municipal council of Inverness from 1887 up to the present time. On 11th June, 1887, I received a telegram from one of the promoters of the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, as follows :—

Halifax, 10th June, 1887.

Provincial Council meet in ten days. Will have contract signed there. Will you have subsidy voted before Parliament closes ? You are interested $5,000.

(Signed) L. G. McKAM.

In answer to this telegram I sent the following on the same day :—

Ottawa, 11th June, 1887.

L. G. McKam, Esq., Halifax.

Shall accept no interest in any company. If you secure necessary legislation or contract from local government, am informed your company will have no difficulty securing usual subsidy of $3,200 per mile here.

(Signed) H. CAMERON.

I quote these letters and telegrams to show the rivalry which existed between these two companies in the county of Inverness, as well as that which exists now in the western counties of Nova Scotia ; and my object is, if possible, to get some solution by which the rivalries between these companies shall hereafter be discontinued. After I received these telegrams and other evidence of the contentions between these two companies, I applied to the late Sir John Macdonald, who was then Minister of Railways, for a subsidy from this Parliament to one of the companies which were chartered to build railways all over the county of Inverness, as represented by Mr. McKeen, who was president of one company, and by Mr. Ross, who was president of the other. My letter was addressed to the Minister of Railways on the 18th of June, 1887. To this letter I received the following reply :

Earnscliffe, Ottawa, 1st July, 1887.

My dear Cameron,—You ask me, in your letter of the 18th ultimo, whether, if a company be formed to construct a railway in Inverness which would be a feeder to the Government line, I can give any assurance that the Government would grant a subsidy of $3,200 per mile. All I can say is, that when the time comes, the claims of the railway company will receive every consideration. One cannot foresee what may be the financial position of the country a year hence. There can only be a certain sum granted annually, and all parts of the Dominion must have a share. Cape Breton and Nova Scotia have been specially favoured lately, and the Government may find itself compelled next session to help other provinces. However, we shall see, when you come up next session.

Believe me, yours faithfully.

JOHN A. MACDONALD.

H. Cameron, Esq., M.D., M.P.,
Mabou, N.S.

Mr. CAMERON.

After receiving this letter, I communicated it to the railway companies interested. Still, the rivalry between the companies continued to wax warm. I find that in December, 1887, a promise was given to the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, one of the companies chartered by the local legislature, as follows :—

Halifax, 21st December, 1887.

Sir,—Referring to the application of your company for a subsidy for a railway from a point in the district of Margaree to Mabou, Port Hood and a point near Port Hawkesbury, about 84 3-5th miles, I beg to say, that the members of the Government have considered the matter, that they view the proposed enterprise with approval, and that they are ready to advise the granting of a subsidy of $3,200 per mile, upon satisfactory evidence of the ability of your company to complete the undertaking.

In the absence of a Dominion subsidy, it is more difficult than it otherwise would be to satisfy our Government of a company's resources for carrying on such a work. If you obtain a Dominion subsidy at the approaching session of the Dominion Parliament, as you say you confidently expect, there will not be much difficulty in arranging the security. We are making inquiry respecting the parties whose names you submit, and the information we have received leads us to believe that they, with the addition of others you have verbally offered, will suffice. If you fail to receive a Dominion subsidy, we shall still be willing to advise a subsidy from the province, but in that case the requirements in the way of security will be larger.

No lands have yet been granted to any of the companies applying under the Act of 1886, and I am unable to make any statement to you with repect to land subsidy.

I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

W. S. FIELDING,
Provincial Secretary.

Frank B. Allen, Esq.,
Secretary Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co.

From the moment this letter was placed in my hands, I determined to use all my influence here and elsewhere to secure a subsidy for that company. Because it would be absurd to have a local subsidy granted to one company unless a Dominion subsidy, if granted at all, would be given to the same company. I have tried to avoid if possible the condition of things which now exists in the western counties of Nova Scotia. In that case the Dominion Government granted a subsidy to one company of $3,200 per mile on the completion of every ten-mile section, and the local government granted a subsidy on a condition which I am not prepared to state. But I say it was absolute folly for the advocates of a railway in the western counties, after they found that the Dominion Government recognized one company, and that company to some extent had secured concessions from the local House and promises as well, to divert their energies from assisting the same company in securing a subsidy from the local legislature. This letter from Premier Fielding might have been given to both companies. As a matter of fact, it was not necessary to give any company such a letter

as this, because the Railway Act passed by the local legislature of Nova Scotia in 1886 practically gave the same assurance to every company that would be chartered by Nova Scotia or the Dominion over that or any other line. It did not make any difference whether they were running parallel or whether there was one or more charters for that purpose. This promise might have been given to all of them, and it would have had the same effect; but as this promise—guarantee as it was then called—was given to the Inverness and Richmond Company, from that time to a later period, to which I shall refer hereafter, I was determined that the Dominion Parliament should grant the same subsidy simply because this was the company recognized by the local government at the time. Unfortunately for the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, we find that in 1888 a quarrel arose between its promoters just in the same way as a quarrel exists now between the promoters of the Western Counties Railway Company, in one case at least, and I believe in both cases. That was a very unfortunate condition of things, but they reorganized in 1888 under a new management, and the new organiaztion was registered in the shire town of Port Hood as required by law. I was only the further convinced that if we obtained railways in Inverness it would only be by bringing our forces together and securing subsidies from both Dominion and local Parliaments for the same company, as otherwise the enterprise would fall through. In 1888, simply because I was assured that if I had a Dominion subsidy for that company or even the promise of it, the local government would sign a contract to the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, I made an appeal, through the members of the Government from Nova Scotia, to this Government to secure, if not a subsidy, at least the promise of it. On the 10th July, 1888, I received the following letter from the Minister representing Nova Scotia. The letter is dated from the office of the Minister of Justice at Ottawa:—

My dear Mr. Tupper,—As Mr. Pope had left for Cookshire when I received from you the inclosed letter from Dr. Cameron, I sent it on to him, and now send you the reply. The reply does not give Dr. Cameron the information he wants, but I think the answer he should make the company is to the following purport:—The Government cannot give any assurance of a subsidy at present, as the answer will depend, first, on the feasibility and usefulness of the route proposed, and, second, on the means of the company to carry on the undertaking. Neither of those points has as yet been considered by the Government. It would be useless to consider the second until the first had been ascertained; and, so far, it would appear that the company have not the means, certainly without the local subsidy they have not. The Government cannot be expected to pledge subsidies at this season of the year, except in very rare cases and cases which have been fully recognized as having special claims on Parliament. It does not do so before the session, for the reason that it cannot settle its railway policy, from year to year, without a knowledge of the demands which are to be made on the treasury and a knowledge of the financial condition of the country, all of which can only be ascertained after the financial year is well advanced.

Yours truly,
J. S. D. THOMPSON.

Having failed to secure even a promise of subsidy from the Dominion Government at that time, I felt that the company had to rely upon the usual guarantee given by the Parliament of Canada to subsidize any company which would show its bona fides and show that it was able to go on with the enterprise. But unfortunately for this company, in 1888 there was another break up, and the company as it existed and as registered in the registry office at Port Hood was again transferred to another company. The principle stockholders of it were Messrs. Oakes, Wheaton and Gray, and they applied for subsidies from this Parliament in 1888 and 1889. In both cases and times I aided them with all the power at my control. My applications for a subsidy for those companies have been here brought down before the House, which were made in 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891 and 1892. All my applications were, from the outset, in favour of a subsidy to the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, not because I had any personal friends in that company, but simply because that company was recognized, as it appeared to me, by the local government of Nova Scotia, and because a promise was made to that company of a subsidy on the terms of the Railway Act of 1886. But as I have said, I had but little confidence in that promise, because it was only a promise which could have been made to every company, not only operating in that county, but operating elsewhere as well. As I have shown by the letter of Mr. John McKeen, it appears that he was promised not only a subsidy of $3,200 per mile from the local government, but of $5,000 per mile, and also a reduction of the royalty on coal in the district in which he intended to build his road. So it appears from the correspondence now before the House that the local government gave a promise to both companies, notwithstanding the fact that they had charters to build a railway practically over the same ground. I am not in a position to say that both railway companies, which rival each other in the western counties, have been promised any such thing by the local government, but I am in a position to say that the Railway Act of 1886 promised each company a subsidy if it fulfilled the conditions imposed upon it by the legislation then and now in force. So that the hope of securing a subsidy from the local government on the terms of that statute and the hope of securing a Dominion subsidy of $3,200 per mile from this Parliament, on the usual conditions, was a reasonable hope for the South Shore Railway Company when it was in-

corporated in 1892. At this juncture, I may tell the House, I used all the influence I possessed before the municipal council of Inverness and on every occasion, to induce the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company and the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company to amalgamate and so to manage their affairs that, if they had any capital to invest, it might be all the more profitably employed by working together in securing the construction of the road. The line contemplated in the county of Inverness at that time was from Hawkesbury to Cheticamp, with a branch to Orangedale. Both charters passed through the legislature of Nova Scotia in 1887, as explained by Mr. McKeen and by Mr. Ross, covering the whole ground, so that if the companies amalgamated in 1887, 1888, 1889 or 1890, they might construct the whole system to greater advantage to themselves than by pulling against each other in the municipal council, in the local house, and here as well. I failed, however. In 1889, before the municipal council, the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company pleaded for a subvention of $100,000 successfully; and I urged that both companies should amalgamate. I was not heeded. After that, I advised both companies to construct the line from Hawkesbury to Cheticamp, and the Dominion Government would, in my opinion, construct the branch between Whycocomah and the main line along the shore. I urged it upon the people, upon the company and upon this House as well, as many of my hon. friends recollect, that this course should be pursued. On these lines I wrote a letter to the——

Mr. FORBES. I rise to a point of order. The resolution before the House has reference to the South Shore and Coast Railway Companies, and I fail to see the connection between this subject and that the hon. gentleman is discussing.

Mr. CAMERON. I think you will find, by the time I am through, that there is a strong similarity between these cases. I am going to suggest a course which you should pursue in order to reconcile your differences.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will please confine himself as closely as possible to the question.

Mr. CAMERON. That is my intention. As you will no doubt observe, Mr. Speaker, the rivalry which exists between the South Shore Railway Company and the Coast Line Railway Company existed in Inverness at a prior date, and it is my intention, if possible, to call the attention of this House and the country to the only remedy which, in my opinion, is available in order to teach such rival companies common sense. And, in order that I may do that, it is necessary for me to point out to the South Shore Railway Company and the Coast Railway Company the reasons why their predecessors in Inverness failed up to the present time, and that will be an object lesson to them and to the hon. gentlemen who are pressing their claims here, from which they will, I presume, find some remedy for the ills which now exist in the southern counties of Nova Scotia, which ills preceded theirs a long time in the county of Inverness. In fact, in former times, we found the easiest way to prevent expenditure on railways was by chartering railway companies and knocking their heads together. If an enemy could secure two, three or four charters over the same ground, and let them knock their heads together, it would save the provincial legislature, and possibly the Dominion Parliament, the expenditure of public moneys upon railways in districts covered by these charters. We had considerable experience in Cape Breton at knocking heads together; and it was not until the representatives of Cape Breton, in 1883 and 1884, came to the conclusion that they would be no longer knocked against each other, and adopted a common sense line, which was acceptable to a large majority of the people, that we secured a railway anywhere. In 1893, I may say for the information of my hon. friends opposite, I wrote a letter to the Premier of Canada, and he answered me in this way. The object of my writing to him was to get the Government to construct the branch line from Orangedale to the main line along the shore, and to get the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company and the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company to amalgamate and thus secure for us the construction of a shore line from Hawkesbury to Cheticamp. I was not particular whether the branch was built by the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, or by the Government; but I was determined, if I had any influence with them or with the Government here and in Nova Scotia, to have only two railway systems on that side of the Island of Cape Breton, namely, the Government line and the railway company line. I felt that if the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company and the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company would build the shore line from Hawkesbury to Cheticamp and the branch from the point of junction through Mabou to Whycocomah, the railway interests of Inverness would be subserved. Then the Government would build the branch from Orangedale to Mabou, because it would be a paying concern. For that reason, I addressed a letter to the Premier, the late Sir John Macdonald, to which I received the following reply

Earnscliffe, Ottawa, 22nd Nov., 1890.

My dear Sir,—I have yours of the 19th inst., asking me to let you know if there is any chance of a vote for a branch of the Cape Breton Railway to Whycocomah. The question of subsidies to railways will not be taken up until just before the meeting of Parliament.

It is altogether premature to discuss such subjects at present.

Believe me, yours faithfully,
JOHN A. MACDONALD.

H. Cameron, Esq., M.P.,
Mabou, C.B.

I addressed a letter also to the late Sir John Thompson, to which I received a reply as follows :—

Office of the Minister of Justice,
Ottawa, 21st Jan., 1891.

My dear Mr. Cameron.—What you say as regards the building of a branch from Orangedale to Whycocomah seems very reasonable, and if you can establish your case by showing the traffic to be as large as you mention in your letter, I will do all I reasonably can to help you to get this branch.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN S. D. THOMPSON.

H. Cameron, Esq., M.P.,
Mabou, N.S.

About that time we had a public meeting at Whycocomah, Inverness. My hon. friend the senior member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), will agree with me that a more delightful place to address a public meeting could not be found in this Dominion ; and he will agree with me also that in no place in this Dominion can he get so good a hearing as in the district of Whycocomah. And not only he, but any person who can address a public meeting intelligently will get a calm, patient and intelligent hearing. In 1891, the warden of the county of Inverness convened a meeting at that delightful spot, and, with others, called upon me on 3rd February, 1891, to go there and explain my position in regard to railway enterprises in Inverness. I desire to call the attention of my western county friends particularly to this fact, because it may enable them to solve their difficulties :

Ernscliffe, Ottawa, 10th Feb., 1891.

My dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 8th instant on the subject of the construction of a line of railway from Orangedale to Broad Cove in Inverness. From your description of the line, it is evidently one having great merits, and the moment the general election is over, I shall bring the matter before my colleagues with every desire to meet your views. At present my colleagues are all scattered, looking after their elections. I sincerely trust that you will be elected, and thus have an opportunity of pressing the construction of this line with your usual energy and perseverence upon the Government.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) JOHN A. MACDONALD.

This was in answer to a letter which I wrote on the date of a meeting in Whycocomah, which was called by my opponents.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When was the letter written ?

Mr. CAMERON. The letter was written on the 3rd February, 1891.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I call attention to the fact that the hon. member is now dealing with historical facts of a period antecedent to the granting of the first local charter, and in respect of a local railway more than 300 miles away from the one under discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am listening carefully to the hon. member for Inverness, and I gather from his remarks that he is endeavouring to argue that the South Shore and Coast Railway Companies should unite, and illustrating that by detailing certain difficulties that arose in relation to the railways in the county of Inverness.

Mr. CAMERON. I want to show my hon. friends opposite, and particularly the Western County Railway gentlemen, that this is a parallel case, and that this is the only way in which the difficulty can be settled. They will profit by our experience, as I have no doubt we shall profit by theirs. In order to put the case plainly to them, I desire to call attention to another letter which I received from the late Sir John Thompson. It has reference to the construction of the branch line by government :

Office of the Minister of Justice,
Ottawa, 18th July, 1892.

Dear Dr. Cameron,—Referring to your letter of the 4th instant, I beg to state that it was my intention to recommend to the Government that a railway subsidy be granted for the whole distance between Orangedale and Broad Cove.

This has reference to another point which will appear more appropriately to the position of my hon. friends opposite. Unfortunately, in 1892 a great difficulty arose between the two rival companies in the county of Inverness, and in order to enable our friends to profit by experience, I shall point out the manner in which we got over that difficulty. I want them to understand distinctly that, notwithstanding that they are in the soup yet, we practically got out of it, and it is for the purpose of showing to them the best way out of these difficulties that I have referred to this case at all. The rival companies appealed to Parliament in 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, and 1892, for a subsidy. I pressed for a subsidy for the company, which was recognized partially by the local government, and if they could only reconcile the difficulty in a manner which I intend to suggest to my hon. friends opposite before I close, I fancy that we would have been a little further advanced. In 1892 there was a subsidy granted for the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company on the main line. I may state here that in 1890 this Parliament recognized the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company to the extent of granting a subsidy on the shore line, but, unfortunately, on account of the rivalry that existed between both companies, for reasons which I cannot here explain, the government decided to give the subsidies to the company

on the branch first, possibly because I was pressing strongly to have that branch constructed by government itself; and it would appear almost unreasonable that while the company promised to construct that branch line for a subsidy from this Parliament of $3,200 per mile, we could hope to get the government to undertake that branch as a government work. Be that as it may, the Dominion Government recognized the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company first on the shore line, then on the branch line, at their own request, and simply with the view of securing the construction of the whole railway system for the county of Inverness under one railway company, which would be advantageous, not only to the company itself, but to the residents of the county who were interested in the construction of a railway. In 1892, a subsidy was granted for the branch line, and the company having asked for the subsidy, with my full consent and with my co-operation, and having asked for a subsidy from Hawkesbury to Broad Cove, with a branch to Orangedale as well, I was a little surprised when the railway subsidies was brought before the House to learn that instead of having a subsidy from Hawkesbury to Broad Cove, as I hoped to have, and as I applied for on behalf of the company, we only had a subsidy for a twenty-five mile line. I addressed a letter immediately to the Minister of Justice calling his attention to the fact that we only had a subsidy for a part of the line. I have already read the first part of his answer, and he continued as follows:—

* * * and, in consenting to the vote which was made for twenty-five miles, the Government were under the impression that they were subsidizing the whole length. The figures which I used in presenting the matter to my colleagues had been furnished me by the Railway Department and represented the distance as twenty-five miles. I believe the mistake occurred by the officer who prepared these figures being misled by the fact that the railway from Port Hood northward, as laid down in the plans of the railway company, approached ten miles nearer to Orangedale than the coast, and he gave me the distance from Orangedale to the projected railway line from Port Hood northward instead of from Orangedale to the coast. I have no doubt whatever that at the first available opportunity the Government will cheerfully give a subsidy for the remainder of the line to the coast.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) JOHN S. D. THOMPSON.

I am happy to say that in response to the assurance then given, the Government did subsidize the balance of the line to the coast. Unfortunately, again, at this particular stage there was another quarrel between the railway companies that did not exist in the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, to which I have been referring up to the present time. Now commenced the rivalry between members of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, and, as it is a matter of history which was formerly before the public, I desire to call attention to the prominent facts in connection with it, with the view of enabling the South Shore Railway Company and the Coast Railway Company in the western counties of Nova Scotia, to reconcile their difficulties on the same line. This matter came up on a Bill before the Senate in 1891, and as it is concisely put by my hon. and learned friend Senator Miller, I desire to quote from his speech:

Mr. John McKeen, the president of this last road, of which I am now speaking, is a man of substance and character in the county of Inverness. He has been warden of that county for many years, and only gave up that representative position because he did not desire to continue any longer in it. His brother represents the county of Cape Breton in the House of Commons. Mr. John McKeen, imagining that Mr. Paint was carrying out the instructions from the company up here in Ottawa, communicated with his brother in the House of Commons, and his brother helped his Bill through the other chamber, and Mr. Hugh Cameron, M.P., for Inverness, fancying also that Mr. Paint was carrying out the wishes of the company that had employed him to get a Dominion charter for them over their road, also supported him. No one opposed the Bill, because the company having a local charter, no one thought worth while to interfere with them getting a Dominion charter. But Mr. Paint is trying to get a fraudulent charter, giving a majority of the directors to himself and his friends, by which he can euchre the old directors of the old property. Mr. Paint, finding that this Bill was opposed in the Commons, wrote—I will give Mr. Paint as witness to speak against himself—to Mr. John McKeen, in Inverness, asking for his assistance to carry the Bill through the Senate. Mr. McKeen is one of the four corporators of the old company that Mr. Paint had included in the new charter. He called this gentleman as a witness, and Mr. McKeen must be looked upon as a friendly witness. He is the gentleman that Mr. Paint appealed to for assistance and countenance. When Mr. John McKeen heard of the deception that had been practised he telegraphed at once to the member representing Inverness, as follows:—

4th July.

H. Cameron, Esq., M.P.

Our company will certainly oppose Paint's getting Dominion charter. We meet 15th instant.

That is the first sound that Mr. McKeen gives that his eyes were open to the deception being practiced on him, and here is the correspondence afterwards between Mr. Paint and Mr. McKeen:

Ottawa, 1st August, 1891.

John McKeen, Esq., Mabou.

Dear Sir,—I herewith inclose you a copy of the Dominion and local charter of the Inverness and Victoria Railway and Mining Company.

Dr. Cameron, M.P., after much hesitancy, finally, with modifications, yielding his opposition in the House of Commons and Railway Committee, but has since renewed it, I regret to say, through Miller in the Senate. I cannot be mistaken, as he himself told me, "that he would burst it in the Senate." Miller, yesterday, fought against

its second reading, saying as a reason that he expected to receive information that would enable him to give it the six months' hoist. I trust you will not aid in its defeat, as your name is in the Dominion charter, and, if it passes, we all will be in a much better position. Your brother here, I judge, did what he could to aid its passage, as he was present at the committees.

I would like you to support my hand by a telegraph. Fear nobody ; act yourself.

Yours, &c.,
HENRY N. PAINT.

He was the promoter of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, and I have this correspondence from Mr. McKeen in regard to his letter :

Mabou, 5th August, 1891.

H. N. Paint, Esq., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I am just in receipt of yours, 1st August, also copy of charter now before the House of Commons, Ottawa. In reply, I beg to say that, at a full meeting of the directors of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, held at Hastings on Saturday 1st instant, at which I presided as president of the company, the directors were, for the first time, made aware that you were applying for a Dominion charter under a name different from ours, and the unanimously expressed opinion was, that you had acted in bad faith toward the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company. No action inimicable to your designs was taken by us, simply because we were under the impression that you had changed your application so as to allow the Dominion charter to pass to the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, as it now exists. The copy of the charter now before me shows that we were under a false impression regarding your application. I have no doubt, had we this paper before us at our meeting on Saturday last, we would have taken active steps to oppose its further progress in its present shape. As it was, a resolution was passed, asking me to procure a copy of the charter from Dr. Cameron, M.P., with other particulars regarding it, with a view to protecting our interests. Speaking for myself, I may say, that I am not satisfied with the course you have been pursuing towards the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, and I must ask you to withdraw my name from the application you are now pressing in favour of the Inverness and Victoria Railway and Mining Company. If a Dominion charter is a good thing to have in connection with our local charter, why not have applied for it with the same names as in the local, is the query now in the minds of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company ?

Yours truly,
JOHN McKEEN.

About the same time, Mr. McKeen wrote the following letter to me :—

Clayton, Mabou, 5th August, 1891.

My dear Sir,—The last mail brought me a letter and copy of Dominion and local charter of Inverness and Victoria Railway Company. Our company had a meeting at Hastings last Saturday. We were then informed that Mr. Paint had been applying for a Dominion charter over our ground under a different name from ours. A general feeling of indignation was manifested at what was considered Mr. Paint's bad faith with the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, and action would have been taken at the time opposing Mr. Paint's scheme, were it not that I, under the impression gathered from your letter, informed our directors that Mr. Paint's application had been changed, and the charter was now being procured in the name of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company. I find, however, by the copy of charter sent me by Mr. Paint, that this is not the case, but that the charter is being applied for under a new name, and, I may say, a new company. I am writing Mr. Paint to-day, asking the withdrawal of my name from his application, and trust the Dominion Parliament will not allow the charter to pass without giving the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, who now hold the ground, an opportunity to at least protest.

I am satisfied the other names of our company, &c., in Paint's application, would also be withdrawn, were they informed of the nature of the application.

Yours truly,
JOHN McKEEN.

As soon as I received this letter, I wrote to Senator Miller, who was defending the rights of the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, as follows :—

Ottawa, 10th August, 1891.

My dear Senator Miller,—While Bill No. 136, intituled, "An Act to incorporate the Inverness and Victoria Railway and Mining Company (Limited)," was passing its stages through the House of Commons, I was led to believe by the promoter, Henry N. Paint, that he was acting in the interest of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company (Limited), which was incorporated by the local legislature of Nova Scotia in 1877. Since that Bill passed the House of Commons, I received some correspondence from John McKeen, Esq., president of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company (Limited), which I herewith inclose, and which exposes the deception.

In the circumstances, I may assure you, that there is not a member from the Island of Cape Breton in the House of Commons that would now support the Bill.

Yours truly,
H. CAMERON,
Inverness.

So the difficulties which exist now in the Western Counties are very much the same as existed in the eastern county of Inverness. But, owing to this great misfortune to the Inverness and Victoria, and the misfortune which followed the Inverness and Richmond up to this time, when they secured a subsidy from Orangedale to Broad Cove, as well as any other company that would undertake the construction of the road, there was only one way in which I thought they could get over the difficulty, and that was by amalgamating both companies, and obtaining an Act of the local legislature of Nova Scotia. Some of the promoters of the Inverness and Victoria road determined to incorporate another company that would absorb practically the Inverness and Victoria, shunting Mr. Henry N. Paint and his associates. In 1893 a company entitled the Boston and Nova Scotia Mining Company was incorporated by the local legislature of Nova Scotia, and this is practically the same company as the Inverness and Victoria. I have ample information in my possession to that effect,

but as hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to have me terminate my short address, I will not read all the evidence I have in my possession. The House may take it as a fact that the Boston and Nova Scotia Mining Company is practically the Inverness and Victoria Company under a different name, the only difference being that Mr. Paint and his associates are excluded from that corporation. So we come down to 1892. At that period, the Dominion Parliament granted a subsidy of $3,200 per mile for a branch from Orangedale for twenty-five miles, and obtained an assurance on the authority of the late Minister of Justice that the balance of the subsidy would be granted as soon as the opportunity should present itself. In 1892, owing to the granting of the subsidy to the Inverness and Richmond Railway for the branch line, they made a survey. Here the cases are becoming exactly parallel, and this I desire my hon. friends opposite to distinctly understand. In 1892 the South Shore Railway Company was incorporated by the local legislature and in 1892 also, the Inverness and Richmond Railway secured a Dominion subsidy over their branch line, which was a part of the system of railways in the county of Inverness. As soon as the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company finished their survey on the branch from Orangedale to Broad Cove in 1892, in accordance with their charter they applied for a subsidy from the local government. It was not necessary for them to apply for a subsidy from the Dominion Parliament, because at that time, a subsidy was passed unanimously by this Parliament for that purpose. The application made to the local legislature was dated Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1892, and reads as follows :—

Halifax, N.S., 27th December, 1892.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Premier, &c., Nova Scotia.

Sir,—Application is hereby made for the granting by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, Limited, of a cash subsidy of $3,200 per mile for the construction and equipment of a line of railway from a point at or near Orangedale station, on the Cape Breton Railway, to Broad Cove, a distance of about 35 miles.

The company has at its disposal funds sufficient, with cash subsidies from the governments of Nova Scotia and Canada, to complete the said railway.

A subsidy to the amount of $80,000 in aid of this railway was authorized by the Parliament of Canada in the session of 1892, in the following terms, viz. :—"To the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company (or any other company undertaking the work), for 25 miles of their railway, from a point on the Cape Breton Railway, at or near Orangedale, to Broad Cove, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, in lieu of the subsidy of $50,000 granted to the said railway company by 53 Victoria, chapter 2, and on the same conditions, not exceeding in the whole $80,000."

A survey of the line of railway between Orangedale and Broad Cove has been made on behalf of the said railway company, and the sketch hereto appended shows approximately the route followed, with table of distances.

The sketch also shows the approximate route of the railway between Port Hood and Hillsboro' (on the Orangedale branch), which the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company will undertake to construct and equip, when sufficient subsidies are available for the work.

The Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, Limited, is prepared to furnish security for the due execution of its undertakings.

We are, sir, your obedient servants,
(Signed) B. M. DAVIDSON,
President Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., Ltd.

With this letter was another letter from certain gentlemen who are well known to my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) and whom he will acknowledge are men of character, and means, and ability, and able to build a road in that portion of the country or anywhere else they would undertake it. It reads as follows :—

New Glasgow, N.S., 27th Dec., 1892.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Premier, &c., Nova Scotia.

Sir,—Having reference to the application of the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, Limited, dated this day, for a cash subsidy of $3,200 per mile in aid of a railway from Orangedale to Broad Cove, I beg to state that the following persons will join with me in a bond to Her Majesty for the due completion of 25 miles of the railway by the said company when the provincial subsidy for that distance is granted.

When Dominion and provincial subsidies are available for the balance of the line, they will join in a similar bond for the due completion of the same (including Port Hood section).

I am, sir, your most obedient servant,
(Signed) DONALD GRANT.

N.B. Names of persons joining with me in the above-mentioned bonds :

Mathew H. Fitzpatrick, contractor, New Glasgow.
George McDougall, gentleman, New Glasgow.
Graham Fraser, manufacturer, New Glasgow.
Daniel McGregor, contractor, Brookville, Pictou.
John McIntosh, contractor, Stellarton.

I need only give the names of these gentlemen in Nova Scotia to show that they were men able to complete any undertaking they bound themselves to. In the correspondence of the local government of Nova Scotia, I find to my astonishment that the first person who raised an objection to granting the subsidy was a gentleman who is a stockholder and was a director in the company. He addressed a letter to Premier Fielding as follows :—

Port Hastings, 9th January, 1893.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Provincial Secretary.

Dear Sir,—I am informed the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company are making propositions to enter into a contract with the Government for the construction of a road from Broad Cove to Orangedale, without saying a word as to their right to such contract. I think, as one of their creditors, I have a right to ask that the Government see that the debts already contract-

ed in the county by the company be paid before proceeding any further.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) GEO. LAURENCE.

My hon. friends opposite will see that the similarity in the condition of things in the western counties and in Inverness up to the present time is very peculiar, and any lesson they may wish to learn from the experience we have had I shall cheerfully place before them. But what seems very extraordinary is, that while the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company never received even a formal acknowledgment to their application for a subsidy from the government of Nova Scotia, the letter sent to them by G. C. Lawrence, Esq., received an immediate official reply, as follows :—

Halifax, 12th January, 1893.

Sir,—I am instructed to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 9th instant, in relation to the Inverness and Richmond Railway.

Your obedient servant,
(Signed) H. CROSSKILL,
D. P. Secretary.

Geo. C. Laurence, Esq., Port Hastings.

At this time I find that there is another gentleman on the scene who I understand was ready to throw in his lot with other railway magnates and who was willing to invest his capital in this enterprise. I find that another application was made to the provincial secretary of Nova Scotia for a subsidy over the same ground in a letter dated Halifax, 10th January, 1893, as follows :—

Halifax, 10th January, 1893.

Hon. Provincial Secretary, Halifax.

Dear Sir—I beg leave to inform you that I and my associates will apply to your Government for a subsidy, as contemplated by chapter 1st, Acts of 1886, from Orangedale to Broad Cove in the Island of Cape Breton.

We will perfect our application so soon as we can make such arrangements as will meet the requirements of the Act, which, we trust, will be early in the ensuing summer. And we trust your Government will grant us that assistance authorized by the said Act.

I have the honour to be
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) D. M. DICKIE.

Any person who hears the name of that gentleman in Nova Scotia and who knows the illustrious family to whom he belongs, and the capital at their disposal, will at a glance come to the conclusion, that any railway they would promote, would be sure to be terminated satisfactorily to all concerned. Although there was no formal acknowledgment to the application of the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company I find that this application was immediately answered as follows :—

Halifax, 12th January, 1893.

Dear Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 10th instant, in re subsidy for railway from Orangedale to Broad Cove in the Island of Cape Breton.

Your obedient servant,
(Signed) H. CROSSKILL,
D. P. Secretary.

D. M. Dickie, Esq., Canning.

Now, I wish you to understand, Mr. Speaker, that up to the present time there was no such company as the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway Company. The reason why the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway Company was chartered in 1893, after these applications were before the local government, was, in my opinion, with the view of frustrating the completion of that branch line, or with the view of adding greater difficulties to the many which previously existed. I find that there was another application, even before this company was chartered, as follows :—

Halifax, N.S., 6th April, 1893.

Hon. W. S. Fielding.
Provincial Secretary.

Dear Sir,—We hereby apply for the usual provincial subsidy for a line of railway from Broad Cove, Inverness County, C.B., to a point on the Intercolonial Railway near Orangedale in the same county, a distance of about 34 miles, and also a subsidy for a line of railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway near Point Tupper to Cariboo Cove, a distance of about 4 miles.

We are about to organize a company to undertake this work, and in a few days we will be prepared to enter into the usual contract in the name of the company.

We are prepared to satisfy your government of our financial ability to complete this work in accordance with the Statute, and, as a guarantee of our good faith upon this point, we will only require the payment of the provincial subsidy upon the thorough completion of the entire lines which we propose constructing.

On behalf of ourselves and co-corporators,

We are yours truly,
WM. J. FRASER.
R. P. FRASER.
PAT. O'MULLIN.
A. C. ROSS.
WM. J. FRASER.

Now, if anything further is necessary to convince the Parliament of Canada of the wisdom of constructing this branch line by government, it is the fact that within a few weeks we had no less than four companies applying for the local subsidy for that road. Only for the rivalry which existed between the companies, this road would have been built long ago. Only for the companies that were fighting over it, it would have been built before this time by the government, because it is a piece of road which would be a valuable feeder to the Intercolonial Railway, which would be a better paying section of the Intercolonial than any other section on the island of Cape Breton, although I am well aware that every section there pays remarkably well. The following letter was also addressed to the Premier of Nova Scotia :—

Halifax, N.S., 17th April, 1893.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Provincial Secretary.

Sir,—The Board of Directors of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company (Limited) beg leave to submit to your honourable government as follows :—

We hold and control 12 square miles of coal areas in the county of Inverness, estimated to contain more than one hundred and fifty million tons of coal.

We are the incorporators named in the Bill now being passed through the legislature, entitled, "The Boston and Nova Scotia Coal Company, Limited," under which Act of Incorporation we propose to develop and operate these coal properties.

Owing to the want of a harbour within a reasonable distance, there is no means of shipping our coal without constructing a line of railway from our mine to some shipping place or places.

Therefore, we propose the immediate construction of a line of railway from Broad Cove to Orangedale, on the Intercolonial Railway, with a branch to Mabou Harbour, and also a branch of about 4 miles connecting the Intercolonial Railway and Cariboo Cove in Richmond County, at which places we propose constructing a pier for winter and summer shipments.

We beg now to ask that an assurance will be given us, that, on the completion of the grading and bridging of one-half of the proposed railway and branches your government will pay us such proportion of the subsidy as will represent, proportionately, the cost of the whole work on completion of the road, and, upon the completion of the grading and bridging of the entire line and branches and equipment of the road, to pay to our corporation the balance of the subsidy of thirty-two hundred dollars ($3,200) per mile.

This subsidy is necessary to enable our company to build this railroad, and, before entering into any contract for its construction, it is essential that we should be assured of receiving this aid by way of subsidy from your government.

To open up and put in the necessary mining plant and facilities and building to enable the company to handle any considerable output, will absorb quite an amount of capital, and in view of the fact that said operations will contribute to the revenues of the province, your petitioners will expect the favourable consideration of your honourable government to this application for the provincial railway subsidy.

We are yours respectfully,

JOHN W. CANDLER.
WM. J. FRASER.
A. C. ROSS.
R. P. FRASER.
JOHN McKEEN.

Wtih this application a certificate of character was filed as follows :—

The Bank of Toronto,
St. Catharines, 12th August, 1893.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Premier Nova Scotia, Halifax, N.S.

Dear Sir,—It affords me very great pleasure to recommend to you the firm of Messrs. Garson, Purcer & Co., of this city.

They are contractors of some considerable experience, and thoroughly up to the times in all that appertains to the successful execution of contracts of all kinds and descriptions.

Besides being thoroughly reliable and trustworthy, they have good financial backing, and you may place every reliance upon them in any transactions whatsoever.

Yours truly,

(Signed) G. W. HODGETTS,
Manager.

Shortly afterwards, another application was made by the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway Company, which, in the meantime, was incorporated by the legislature of Nova Scotia. This application reads as follows :—

Halifax, N.S., 14th August, 1893.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Provincial Secretary.

Dear Sir,—We, the Boston and Nova Scotia Coal Company, Limited, hereby apply for the usual provincial subsidy for a line of railway from Broad Cove mines, in Inverness County, to a point on the Intercolonial Railway near Orangedale, in the said county, a distance of about 35 miles. We have organized the company under the charter granted by the legislature at the last session. We have completed the surveys and located the line, and are prepared to file the plans with the provincial engineer. The right of way we have obtained under an agreement with the county of Inverness, and are now cutting out the right of way.

We have contracted for the construction and equipment of the entire line with responsible parties under the condition, that when the railway is completed and equipped, the usual subsidy of thirty-two hundred dollars per mile shall be paid by the Government of Nova Scotia to our company. In view of the early construction of the railway, it is important we should have the assurance of your government at this meeting of the Executive of the payment of the subsidy on completion of the work, as before mentioned.

Respectfully yours,

Boston and Nova Scotia Coal Company, by

JOHN W. CANDLER.
President.
JOHN McKEEN,
Vice-President.
A. C. ROSS,
Secretary.

Here we have, in a few short months, applications to the local government—first, from the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company ; second, from a company represented by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Dickey ; third, from a compony represented by capitalists from Halifax ; fourth, by a company named the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company ; and fifth, by the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway Company. Section 5 of the Railway Act of 1886 provided that each company would get a subsidy of $3,200 per mile on giving assurance that it had means at its disposal to finish the road. If there is anything in the world to make that lobster clause appear ridiculous in the mind of any person of common sense, the very fact that all these companies have applied to the government of Nova Scotia within that short period of time is sufficient to do it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is there ridiculous about a lobster clause ?

Mr. CAMERON. My illustrious friend from Bothwell does not understand the term as well as we do down by the sea, and he does not know the delicacy of the fish which moves backward when he is anxious to go forward. Now, here is a letter which I find in answer to all the applications made to the local government. It is dated in 1893. That was after the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway Company absorbed the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, and all the other companies that preceded it.

Provincial Secretary's Office,
Halifax, 17th August, 1893.

Dear Sir,—Referring to the application of your company for a subsidy for a railway from Broad Cove coal mines to a point on the Intercolonial Railway near Orangedale, in the county of Inverness, a distance of about 35 miles, I beg to say that the members of the Government have considered the matter, that they view the proposed enterprise with approval, and that they are ready to advise the granting of a subsidy of three thousand two hundred dollars ($3,200) per mile, upon evidence of the ability of your company to complete the enterprise.

This letter is not to be regarded as a standing offer to your company, but is written on the assumption that you are ready to proceed immediately with the work.

We shall be glad to meet you this afternoon and discuss the conditions of a contract.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) W. S. FIELDING.

Hon. J. W. Candler,
President Boston and Nova Scotia Coal Co.,
Halifax.

Now, I find that another letter was addressed by the president of the company to the Premier of Nova Scotia, dated Halifax, 17th August, 1893 :

Halifax, N.S., 17th August, 1893.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Provincial Secretary, Halifax, N.S.

Dear Sir,—I have received your letter of this date, informing us that the members of the Government are prepared to advise the granting to the Boston and Nova Scotia Coal Company, Limited, a subsidy of three thousand two hundred dollars ($3,200) per mile for our proposed railway from the Broad Cove coal mines to Orangedale.

The company are prepared to arrange and complete the contract and necessary agreements.

Very respectfuly yours,
(Sgd.) Boston and Nova Scotia Coal Co., Ltd., by
JOHN W. CANDLER.
President.

I find that another letter was addressed to the same gentleman, dated Halifax, 17th August, 1893 :

Halifax, N.S., 17th August, 1893.

To Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Provincial Secretary.

My dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this date.

The directors of our company take pleasure in meeting you at any hour you will appoint this afternoon.

Very respectfully yours,
(Signed) JOHN W. CANDLER,
President.

Again, I have an official letter from the provincial secretary to the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway Company, which reads as follows :—

Provincial Secretary's Office,
Halifax, 17th August, 1893.

Dear Sir,—Referring to my letter of this date and the interview of this afternoon between the Government and the directors of your company, I beg to say that the members of the Government are prepared to advise the granting to your company of a subsidy of three thousand two hundred dollars ($3,200) per mile for the proposed railway, on the following conditions :—

1. You are to produce satisfactory evidence that your company have been organized and the requisite amount of capital paid up. Copies of the stock-list and other papers in connection with the organization, verified by statutable declaration, will be required for this purpose.

2. The railway to run from the Broad Cove coal mines, in Inverness County, to a point on the Intercolonial Railway at or near Orangedale, in the said county, the distance not to exceed thirty-five (35) miles.

3. A bond for the fulfilment of the company's contract to be given in a sum equal to twice the amount of the subsidy. Such bond to be signed by the directors individually, and also by the members of the firm of Garson, Purcer & Company, the contractors who, you have informed us, have engaged to construct the railway.

4. The contract to be made in the customary form, under the provisions of sections 5 and 6 of chapter 1 of the Acts of 1886. Provided, however, that the company shall not claim payment of subsidy in the manner therein set forth, but that they shall only be entitled to receive the subsidy when they shall have complied with the following conditions :—

(a). They shall have fully completed and equipped and put into operation the said railway.

(b). They shall have opened and bona fide worked a coal mine or coal mines at Broad Cove and equipped the same with approved plant and machinery sufficient for the production of two hundred and fifty thousand tons of coal per annum, and shall have furnished to the Government satisfactory evidence that they (the company) have expended on such plant, machinery and equipment of the mine at least one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000).

5. The work of constructing the railway to be commenced within one month from the signing of the contract, and to be continuously and vigorously prosecuted, and the line to be completed and put into operation on or before the 1st of September, 1895.

I have to repeat the remark in my letter of this date, that this is not to be regarded as a standing offer open at any future time. If your company are not in a position to make a contract immediately and proceed with the work, this offer must be regarded as cancelled.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) W. S. FIELDING,
Provincial Secretary.

Hon. J. W. Candler,
President Boston and Nova Scotia Coal Co.

So this was the final answer of the local government to the president of the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway Company. I desire to call the attention of my hon. friends opposite, particularly from the western counties of Nova Scotia, to the fact that whereas section 5 of the Railway Act of

1886 provides for a subsidy of $3,200 per mile to any company which will undertake to construct the road, payable on the completion of every ten-mile section, the terms of this promise were of such a character that it was utterly impossible for any company to fulfil them. Any person who will read them must come to the conclusion that the local government of Nova Scotia might as well have asked the Boston and Nova Scotia Company to build a ladder from the north pole to the moon before they would secure a dollar for their railway enterprise, and besides building an extension ladder from the north pole to the moon, they would have to put their mine in a position to ship 250,000 tons of coal per year from it. It was practically impossible for any company to fulfil those conditions, and no company having an earnest desire to build the road would ever have accepted them. In order to bring the comparison a little further down, I desire to show the effect of trifling with a very important enterprise by section 5 of the Nova Scotia Railway Act of 1886. I read from the railway report of the local engineer from Nova Scotia the upshot of the negotiations which existed before the local government of Nova Scotia in 1892-93, when the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company and several other companies, including the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, made applications for a subsidy, before the railway company, to which a subsidy was granted, was chartered by the local legislature. The engineer reports as follows :—

The Boston and Nova Scotia Coal Company, Limited, on the second day of September, 1893, entered into an agreement with the Government of Nova Scotia, whereby they are to receive a subvention of three thousand two hundred dollars per mile for the construction, equipment and operation of a line of railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway at or near Orangedale Station, in the county of Inverness, to Broad Cove, in said county, the distance not to exceed thirty-five and one-half miles.

Surveys and books of reference were submitted by the company on the 7th day of July, 1893, and certified by the Commissioner of Public Works on the 23rd day of September following. Under the provisions of the contract, plans and profiles of location, general plans of bridge superstructure, and of culverts and cattle-guards, were submitted for approval on the 12th day of October, 1893, and were approved, after being amended, on the 10th day of November following.

The company, under the contract, was to commence the work of constructing the railway on or before the 16th day of October, 1893, and to continuously and vigorously prosecute the same and to complete such railway and put it into operation on or before the 1st day of September, 1895, and to also, on or before the said day of September, 1895, open and work a bona fide coal mine, or coal mines, at Broad Cove, and equip the same with approved plant and machinery sufficient for the production of two hundred and fifty thousand tons of coal per annum, time to be declared to be material and the essence of the contract, and, in default of such commencement and such vigorous prosecution or of such completion as aforesaid, the company to forfeit all right, claim or demand to any and every part of the subsidy to be paid.

Hon. gentlemen opposite will see that the terms of the contract require the completion of that road before the 1st of September next, and also the expenditure of $100,000 on the coal mines at Broad Cove, and of more money if it was necessary to place the mine in a position to ship 250,000 tons of coal a year, before they could get one dollar of the provincial subsidy; and they were also required to have all that finished before 1st September, 1895, or a little over a year after the contract was signed. This was practically impossible. They asked for bread, and the local government gave them a stone. My hon. friends opposite say that this was just what the company asked for. The correspondence which I have read proves conclusively that no company asked for any such stringent condition as that; and I unhesitatingly say that no company, contemplating the building of that road would ever have accepted those terms. Now, I come to the point of similarity, exact similarity, between these two cases. In 1892 the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company applied for a Dominion subsidy through me. I received a letter from the president, as follows :—

Mabou, C.B., 22nd March, 1892.

H. Cameron, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

My dear Sir.—Inclosed please find the application of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company for a Federal subsidy of $3,200 per mile for the construction of road from Broad Cove mines to Orangedale, with a branch to Mabou and Port Hood. I hope you will see your way clear to assist the application to the extent of your influence with the Government, which I know is not small.

Yours very truly,
JOHN McKEEN.
President I. & V. Ry. Co.

This, I may observe, was after the said president of the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company realized that their promoter here, Mr. Paint, was pursuing a cut-throat game which would enable himself to ride rough-shod over all the companies which had charters from the local legislature for that line. To that letter I sent the following reply :—

Ottawa, 30th March, 1892.

My dear Sir,—I have your favour of the 22nd, with petition from the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, asking for subsidy over 50 miles of their line of railway, which I transmitted to the department. There are two speculators here for the past week or ten days, who represent the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company. They may visit Inverness soon and interview parties concerned, with the view of reconciling existing evil contentions. Henry N. Paint is not here yet, but his letters are here as thick as leaves in ancient Valambrosa, in reference to his charter. Well, I am sorry to say that in such an atmosphere of unseemly contentions, with which Parliament has become so familiar for the

past five years, I feel almost ashamed of the ridicule which such conduct perpetuates in the House. Yet I have, as usual, applied for a subsidy for a line of railway, unless the Government will undertake the Orangedale branch, as I desire.

Yours truly,

H. CAMERON.

John McKeen, Esq.,
President, Inverness and Victoria Co., Ltd.

Now, Sir, I have here evidence ample to prove the rivalry between these companies. I think I have produced, also, ample evidence to show that the cases, particularly since 1892 were parallel cases. The rivalry which existed between these two companies I desired earnestly to reconcile, not only before the companies were chartered in 1887, but at every stage up to the present time; and I feel that the reason why that enterprise failed was simply that my advice was not taken. And I think that if the advice which I intend to give to my hon. friends opposite is accepted, their enterprise will be put on a firm footing, as well as ours. In 1894 the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway Company, which absorbed the Inverness and Victoria Railway Company, and all other little companies that stood in its way up to that time, secured a contract from the local government on impossible conditions in 1893, and secured a contract as well from the government here to construct a line from Orangedale to Broad Cove, a subsidy of $3,200 per mile being granted by this Government on the completion of ten-mile sections. I felt that there was nothing left for me to do but to aid the company I so vigorously supported up to the present time to secure a subsidy for their line. They made an application to me, which I forwarded to the Minister of Railways, and to this I received the following reply, in 1894:—

Department of Railways and Canals,
Minister's Office, Ottawa, 11th June, 1894.

My dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of to-day's date, covering a petition from the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, asking for a subsidy of $3,200 per mile for a line of railway from Hawkesbury to Broad Cove, a distance of about 50 miles.

The only reply I am able to give you at present is, that I will submit the matter for the consideration of my colleagues when the question of subsidies to railways is being dealt with by Council.

Faithfully yours,
JOHN HAGGART.

H. Cameron, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

I am happy to say that, as a result of the application of that company, in 1894, a subsidy for part of their branch line of railway from Hawkesbury to Cheticamp was granted, and assurance also was given to the company that, on the completion of the first section of the line the balance of the subsidy would be granted as fast as the requirements of the company demanded. Now, the position of rival railway companies in Inverness is simply this: The local government signs an absurd contract with the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway Company guaranteeing a subsidy to the company on the completion of the road, and on the expenditure of at least $100,000 on the development of their coal mine at Broad Cove, and if that was not sufficient, the expenditure of enough money to place that mine in a condition to ship 250,000 tons of coal a year. The same company secured a contract from the Minister of Railways representing the Dominion Government guaranteeing $3,200 per mile to the said company on the completion of every ten-mile section. This is in accordance with the usual conditions on which subsidies are granted by this Parliament to railway enterprises of that kind. The local subsidy was not granted in accordance with section 5 of the Railway Act of 1886; it was not made in accordance with the application of any company during 1892 or 1893; it was not granted in accordance with the written demands of the company itself; but it was granted on conditions which, to my mind, proved conclusively that the object was not the construction of that road. But, whether or not, the facts remain that the line is subsidized, the contracts are given, and the company is bound to finish the road, as the local engineer says. The company, under the contract, was to commence constructing the railway on or before the 6th October, 1893, and to continuously and vigorously prosecute the same and to build such railway, and put it in operation on or before 1st September, 1895. Now, Sir, coming to the particular case under discussion and designing to give the companies interested in the western counties railway a salutory lesson by what happened in the county of Inverness, I desire to call the attention to some material facts. First, the South Shore Railway Company was incorporated in April, 1892; second, the Coast Railway Company was incorporated a year afterwards. Now, this was the point at which those interested in railways in the western countiess should have interposed their power with the local government, if they had any. If there was any way calculated to frustrate or prevent the construction of that road, the incorporation of the Coast Railway Company in 1893 was the best calculated to secure that end. Now, I find that surveys were commenced simultaneously in the fall of 1893 by both companies.

Mr. MULOCK. No, you don't find that.

Mr. CAMERON. Never mind, it is a question of fact about which hon. gentlemen differ. I have taken the facts as I have received them in discussions heretofore. The fact remains, however, that one company was chartered by the local legislature in 1892; the fact remains that section 5 of the railway Act of Nova Scotia promised

that company $3,200 per mile on the completion of every ten mile section, and guaranteeing also, if they showed their bona fides, 2,000 acres per mile to the company undertaking that work. When the Coast Railway Company was chartered in 1893, they came face to face with those facts, and they secured that charter with their eyes open. I have a good deal of sympathy with the incorporators of 1893, but I have greater smypathy with the incorporators of 1892, who expended a great deal of time and money in order to place their enterprise on a sound basis. They were encouraged to pursue that course in pursuance of the requirement of the Railway Act of 1886, passed by the local legislature of Nova Scotia. These railway companies commenced their surveys about the same time, in April, 1894. The Coast Railway Company filed plans for the first seven miles, and three days later, the South Shore, for 20 miles. There was no local contract signed for either company up to that time. The Coast Railway Company proceeded thus far with their eyes open, knowing that up to that time at least the South Shore Company had equal if not better claims to the Dominion and local subsidies with their rivals and predecessors, and to that extent my sympathy for them is lessened. We find that ten miles was accepted, and we find also that both companies were prosecuting their work up to the present time. I find that in 1894 the Dominion Government gave a subsidy to the Coast Railway Company. Therefore, up to that time, the Coast Line Company were in a position to withdraw from their enterprise without any serious losses, and I think if they had been governed by common sense, as I suggested to the railway companies in the county of Inverness, they would have put their heads together and amalgamated, and in this way have secured a contract from the Dominion Government and from the local government as well, guaranteeing $3,200 per mile from both governments which would enable the amalgamated companies to build a standard gauge of 4 feet 8½ inches in the western counties. If they did not pursue a course of that kind, although it is a little late, I would suggest to those companies to pursue that course now. But I would not suggest to throw the South Shore Railway Company on its back by depriving it of its vested rights in that line. Let the Coast Railway Company proceed with all the assurances they have of a subsidy from the local House, if they will, and let the South Shore Railway Company pursue the same silly course, if they will, until such time as wiser counsels shall prevail. When that occurs, they will put their heads together, and they will not any longer knock against each other, but they will utilize all their available means to build a broad gauge road over the line contemplated by both companies. Now, I am sorry to say that this state of things existed in Inverness up to the present time. I am of opinion it has to a large extent frustrated the undertaking of those lines. I am in hopes now that the local government of Nova Scotia will withdraw its absurd conditions on the local subsidy, and will grant the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway Company $3,200 a mile on completion of every ten mile section, in the same manner as the Minister of Railways of the Dominion of Canada has done. If that be done, the Boston and Nova Scotia Company will be able to build its road. I would also urge upon the local government of Nova Scotia, as the Dominion Government has given a contract to the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company for the first 25 miles of their enterprise from Hawkesbury to Cheticamp, that the local government, without any quibble or without any hesitation, should grant the same company a similar subsidy, guaranteeing $3,200 per mile on the completion of every ten mile section. If, instead of pulling apart, both governments would aid enterprises of this kind in a reasonable manner and neither government would pursue a course calculated to frustrate an enterprise of this kind, I am satisfied the line from Hawkesbury to Cheticamp would be finished within a reasonable time. Contracts have been signed for the first 25 miles to Cheticamp. Assurance has been given that a subsidy will be granted for the balance of the line, the same as was granted to the balance of the line on the branch, and if the companies will take my advice, even at this juncture, they would unite and secure subsidies from this Government and from the local government of $3,200 per mile on the completion of every ten-mile section. If that was done, as it was my desire in the case of rival companies in my own county, the road would be built to the great advantage of both companies, it would be more speedily constructed, and it would confer much greater benefit on the people of the county of Inverness. I may frankly admit that unfortunately this partnership concern between the Dominion Government and the local government in regard to subsidizing railways and other matters since 1886 has not terminated very favourably to either party concerned. I hope the unfortunate political contentions which exist, and which the passing of that inexplicable Act of 1886 fostered to a great extent, will terminate. I have no doubt in my mind, as was the case in Inverness, that the railway trouble in the western counties is owing to political agencies, stimulating both enterprises to knock their heads against each other. If we in this House advise them in a sensible manner and manifest a determination to bring conflicting interests of this kind to a successful issue, I am satisfied that not only will the Western Counties Railway Companies benefit by that process, but the Inverness railway enterprises will be benefited as well. I observe that in an-

other place, which cannot be named here, political rivalry has waxed very warm, and the prospects are that the South Shore Company will be thrown temporarily on their backs. I beg to assure hon. gentlemen opposite that it will be only temporary. This Parliament has committed itself to the encouragement of that railway enterprise from 1892 up to the present time. I believe this Parliament will not go back on its encouragement of that company, and although the obstruction which may exist here and elsewhere may prevent them getting their rights during the present session, Parliament will not expire. I have reason to believe that the powers which rule at the present session will continue to rule for a long time hereafter, and justice will be done to the company that first invested their money in the Western Counties Railway; they will be heard before this Parliament at another time, and any rights and interests which they possess in the South Shore Railway will be maintained for ever. There may be a hope kindled in the breast of some hon. gentlemen opposite that a change may take place in this Dominion, and that in the near future, possibly they may come into power and follow in the wake of the unfortunate condition of things which exist down below. But if I may judge from the signs of the times I do not think any such event will happen within a reasonable period. I think the present Government will be sustained at the polls with a larger majority at the next election than ever before. I have reason to believe that the rank and file will follow their leaders as they did in former times. In fact if I may judge, I think they will follow the example of my illustrious countrymen of days gone by. They now see a clear sky over their heads, and difficulties which may have existed in the past will soon disappear. I think that not only the sun has shone on them, but the moon also seems to favour the party in power. As was said in olden times:

The moon has arisen, it shines on that path
Now trod by the gallant and true;
High, high are their hopes, for their chieftain has said,
That whatever men dare they can do.

Mr. McISAAC. We have heard from the hon. member for Inverness chapters of ancient history regarding railway enterprises in Inverness and other parts of eastern Nova Scotia. The question before the House, however, is one between two railway companies in the western part of the province. The hon. member for Inverness has devoted three hours to questions mainly connected with his own county. I have read most of the correspondence read by him, before, but this is the first time I have heard them from himself, but they contain very little that is new. I have heard them for the first time to-night, but long ago, even before I had a seat in the provinical legislature of Nova Scotia, which is over nine years ago, I had read most, if not all, of them in the newspapers and in "Hansard." The hon. gentleman has succeeded in talking about almost everything except the question under discussion to-night. He has attacked the Liberal government of the province, the government of Mr. Fielding. The hon. gentleman has been at this work for a very long time, and to-night he has repeated what he has often stated in the past. As a member of that government for some years, I deem it my duty to offer some remarks, and I will not occupy the time of the House very long, because it is not necessary to refer to only one question specially, and it is the only question that is new. The hon. gentleman has referred to a contract made by the Government of Nova Scotia with the Boston and Nova Scotia Railway and Coal Company, and he stated that the conditions are so onerous and burdensome that it is impossible for the company to carry out the contract. When a company comes before a Government, and I appeal to members of the present Government as to whether I am not correct, with an offer to construct a railway or any other work, what is the duty of the Government? Is it not to submit their proposition and to receive in return the proposition of the company? In this case the Government entered into a contract with the company. The company accepted the terms, and up to this hour the hon. gentleman cannot show that any one member of the company has complained of the conditions of the contract. If the contract is onerous and burdensome and the company cannot carry it out, who should first complain? Should not the first complaint come from the company itself? But we have the complaint made by the hon. gentleman from Inverness——

Mr. CAMERON. They will complain by 1st September.

Mr. McISAAC. One member of the company is a leading Conservative in the hon. gentleman's county.

Mr. CAMERON. He is none the worse for that.

Mr. McISAAC. He is a candidate running in the county as a supporter of this Government.

Mr. CAMERON. Then he must be a Grit.

Mr. McISAAC. Let me tell you that he has not complained and that he is just as good a Conservative as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron). The only man, therefore, who complains of the burdens imposed upon the company by the government of Nova Scotia, is the hon. member for Inverness. Does he remember that when he makes that attack on the Nova Scotia government, that he, at the same time, makes an attack on the Minister of Railways and the federal Government?

Mr. CAMERON. No.

Mr. McISAAC. Does the hon. gentleman not know that a subsidy has been granted to that same company by the Dominion Government? If the Dominion Government is as good and as wise and as virtuous as he believes it to be, would they grant that company $3,200 per mile for thirty-five miles if they thought it was an impossible or ridiculous contract, or such a contract as was described by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) to-night?

Mr. CAMERON. Let me explain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CAMERON. Surely the hon. gentleman does not want to misrepresent me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McISAAC. Let the hon. member (Mr. Cameron) take his medicine. It is his own medicine which he has been preparing himself and distributing for three mortal hours to-night. If there be guilt in the matter, which I deny, I tell him that the Government of the Dominion is equally guilty with the government of Nova Scotia in regard to the terms imposed upon this company. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) spoke about railways in his own county, three hundred miles away from the railways under discussion this afternoon, and his arguments were more than three thousand miles in point of relevancy from the question under discussion before the House. I shall not, therefore, follow his ramblings into correspondence between himself and others in Nova Scotia and elsewhere for the last quarter of a century. The only relevant question, and it is a question which he has not touched at all, is as to the relative merits of the Coast Line Railway Company and the South Shore Railway Company. Now, the South Shore Railway Company got a charter in 1892, and the Coast Railway Company obtained their charter in 1893. The strong point urged by hon. gentlemen opposite is, that because the South Shore Company was incorporated a year earlier than the other, that, therefore, they had vested rights which should be respected, but which had been interfered with. I grant there may be something in this under some circumstances, but I want to remove the impression which I found to exist in the committee to-day, that these two charters were granted by the government of Nova Scotia. As a matter of fact, both of these charters were granted by the legislature of Nova Scotia, composed of Conservatives and Liberals. The second charter which was passed in 1893 for the Coast Railway Company was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Johnston, the local member for the county of Shelburne, and I think it was prepared by the hon. gentleman (Mr. White) who represents the very same constituency in this House. The government had nothing to do with the scheme at that stage. It was simply introduced by Mr. Johnston as the member for the county of Shelburne, and carried in the legislature. Now, the colleague of the Hon. Mr. Johnston in the representation of Shelburne in the local House was Mr. C. H. Cahan, the leader of the Tory Opposition. One would think that if there was anything detrimental to the county of Shelburne in this charter, Mr. Cahan, its representative, would oppose it, inch by inch, at every stage of its passage through the legislature. Mr. Cahan did no such thing. At page 117 of the debates of the legislature for Nova Scotia, 1893, it will be seen that the charter was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Johnston, and at page 132, the second reading of the Bill came up. If any person wanted to oppose that Bill on its merits, it was his duty to do so when the second reading was moved. Mr. Cahan, the leader of the Opposition in Nova Scotia, representing as he was bound to represent, his friends in the county of Shelburne, had then an opportunity to speak in the interests of his constituents, in the interests of the people in the neighbouring counties, and in the interest of those who obtained the charter one year before. But Mr. Cahan did not speak against this second charter. Only one gentleman, Mr. Hemeon, of Queen's, spoke on the occasion, and he spoke strongly in favour of passing the charter. The hon. gentlemen in this House from the province of Nova Scotia who are supporting the resurrection of this old concern to-day, will tell you that the people of western Nova Scotia were opposed to the second charter, and that the legislature of Nova Scotia has perpetrated a great injury upon the corporators of the first charter. The facts are, that when this second charter was passed in the Nova Scotia Assembly, members on both sides of the House regarded the South Shore charter to be as dead as Julius Caesar, and there was none so low as to do it reverence on that occasion. The Coast Line Railway charter was passed by the unanimous voice of both sides, and the company became organized, and they satisfied the Government of Nova Scotia that under this charter they had the means to complete and operate in these two counties, the road then called the narrow gauge road. Where was the hon. gentleman from Shelburne (Mr. White) then? Where was his associate in the Nova Scotia Assembly? Does this House not clearly see that at that stage, there was only one of these concerns recognized in the province. The Coast Line Railway Company came before the government, and entered into a good, solid contract to build this line through the counties of Yarmouth and Shelburne. They entered into that contract in good faith, and under the charter which both sides of the House gave to them, and after constructing a portion of their road, an attempt was made to revive the old South Shore concern. They got a

few wheelbarrows, and some men, and mules, and went and covered portions of the track, and declared that their vested rights had been interfered with. Vested rights, forsooth; they had no vested rights. If their rights are interfered with they have a legal remedy. At this very time the question is pending in the courts, and a fiat has been issued by the Attorney General under which suit has been brought in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia to test the validity of the South Shore Railway Company. If the charter of the South Shore Company has not lapsed by reason of time or by reason of non-fulfilment, or from any other cause, the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia will protect it and will declare it to be still in existence; and the moment the court does that, this company will have all they require, all they are asking this House to give them to-day. But the moment they find themselves face to face with the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, the only proper tribunal to deal with this matter, they come and ask this House to pass legislation by which the whole matter will be taken out of the hands of the court. Instead of leaving the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia to decide between the rights of the two companies, they ask this Parliament to override all the rights and all the charters held by both companies in Nova Scotia, which I contend would be an outrage for this Parliament to do. In another place to-day an amendment was proposed to the Bill respecting the South Shore Railway Company providing that its operation should not interfere with the case now before the courts of Nova Scotia, and I think the justice of that amendment should appeal to the fair-minded men on both sides of this House. So long as that case is pending in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, this Parliament should not interfere at all. If the rights of these people have not lapsed, the Supreme Court will so decide, and they will still be on top, where they want this Parliament to place them; but if the Supreme Court decides that they have no legal entity at all, and puts them out of court, then this Parliament should not resurrect them and place them over the heads of another company who have bona fide entered into an agreement with the government of Nova Scotia to construct this railway, who have spent over $150,000 on the work, and who have the support of the counties of Yarmouth and Shelburne, through which the road will run and also Queen's County. These counties have given the right of way to the Coast Line Company, and so far as I can learn the people of all three counties are against this proposed legislation. Surely, then, this Parliament will not intervene to impose upon those people legislation against their best interests. I was not in the House this afternoon, but I am told that the Minister of Justice stated that the Government of Nova Scotia, in granting the contract to the Coast Line Company, had done so for paltry party purposes. Now, Sir, I deny that. I was in the government at the time, and I wish to tell the Minister of Justice—I am sorry he is not here—that he is not justified in making that statement. That contract was given and made by the government of Nova Scotia because they believed that it was in the best interests of the counties through which the road was to run, and in accordance with the desire of the people of those counties. The Minister of Justice went to Nova Scotia shortly before the local elections of 1894, and tried to make out that this company was a political machine brought into existence and nursed by the government of Nova Scotia for political purposes. I dare say that even this pure Government, which also grants railway subsidies, do so because they think the people will give them credit if credit is due them. I think every government expects that the people will give them credit for what they do rightly, and I suppose they must also expect that they will be punished by the people if they do not carry on their affairs as they ought. The government of Nova Scotia felt that they were doing the right thing, in the interests of the people of the province, in making this contract. I say the Minister of Justice went to the province of Nova Scotia shortly before the provincial elections of 1894—and I would not refer to this, except that the hon. member for Annapolis a few weeks ago quoted from a speech delivered by Mr. Fielding, and said that the Minister of Justice stated at a public meeting that it was the duty of the Conservative party to oppose the government of Nova Scotia—that the first skirmish in the Dominion elections should be fought in the provincial elections of Nova Scotia of 1894. I do not find fault with the Minister of Justice for making use of this language; but I say that under the circumstances, it is very inconsistent on his part to rise in this House to-day and say that everything the government of Nova Scotia does is for political purposes. Sir, the hon. gentleman's challenge was taken up, and the first skirmish was fought in Nova Scotia in March, 1894, with the result that the Liberals carried the government of Nova Scotia by a large majority. This is not an argument on the question before the House; but I put it forward to answer the assertions made by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Coast Line Company is a political machine of the government of Nova Scotia. I say that the only point for this House to consider is this: if the South Shore Railway Company's rights have been interfered with by the government of Nova Scotia, the Supreme Court will give them their remedy, whereas if they have no rights at all, they should be put out of court. The Supreme Court will deal with the whole matter on its merits. It should not be brought before this Parliament at all until

the case now pending before the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia is settled.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I had intended much earlier in this debate to reply to some of the observations made by the hon. Minister of Justice: but immediately after that hon. gentleman had taken his seat, we seemed to digress into the early history of railway matters in the Island of Cape Breton, and a little later we enjoyed a very long autobiographical sketch by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), consisting largely of references to a gentleman of the name of Dr. Cameron, M.P. I understood the hon. Minister of Justice to defend the application to this House for a charter for a railway known as the South Shore Railway of the province of Nova Scotia, on the ground, first, that the government of Mr. Fielding had given a subsidy for political reasons to a rival railway known as the Coast Line Railway. This to the hon. Minister of Justice seemed to be quite a sufficient argument why this Parliament should be asked to incorporate a company, the incorporation of which might mean the destruction of the Coast Line Railway, or at any rate the infliction of great injury upon that company, which has up to date spent $150,000, which has paid every bill it has incurred, and which, so far as I know, has not any outstanding liabilities. It seems to me that the Minister of Justice should be about the last man to object to the local government taking the line which he says Mr. Fielding has taken. Does the hon. gentleman claim for his government the monopoly of the exercise of political influence in granting charters or subsidies to railways? What particular iniquity, I ask you, was there in Mr. Fielding agreeing to subsidize a line of railway in his own province, which had satisfied him of its bona fides and its ability to build the line. Nobody has dared to dispute, either in this House or elsewhere, the perfect financial ability of the Coast Line Railway to carry out its contract with the government of Nova Scotia. And yet we are to be told by a leading member of the Cabinet that we must inflict upon that company an injury simply because, forsooth, Mr. Fielding, in the discharge of his duty as Premier of Nova Scotia, has seen fit to give that railway a subsidy. Why, we had a letter read here to-night by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), written on the very eve of the election of 1891 by the late Premier of this country, the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, promising to see that the hon. gentleman got a subsidy for a railway in the county of Inverness, two weeks before the election.

Mr. CAMERON. That letter did not promise any subsidy.

Mr. BORDEN. What was it for? What did the hon. gentleman use it for in his campaign?

Mr. CAMERON. It was simply in answer to a letter written before there was any dissolution, and the year before the election.

Mr. BORDEN. It was three weeks before the election, and the hon. gentleman paraded that letter in the public prints, and read it in his county from one end to the other, and called upon the people to vote for him because Sir John Macdonald was going to give him a railway subsidy. The hon. gentleman talks about knocking heads together. It is not knocking heads together, but he is trying to knock the brains out of the Coast Line Railway Company. He coolly asks this House to do this to-day for the reason, forsooth, that Mr. Fielding has seen fit to subsidize a railway which had shown its good faith and which nobody denies is perfectly able to carry out its contract. What is the next reason given, if we can dignify it by the term reason, by the Minister of Justice? The second attack he made was that this Coast Line Railway, which he proposes to sacrifice if he can, is a narrow gauge railway, and, therefore, should be destroyed. Let me go back for a moment. Perhaps the hon. members of this House will be surprised to learn that in its early stages the South Shore Railway, which is now asking for a charter from this House, was a narrow gauge road, and that both roads were on precisely the same footing. Why? Because it was agreed by common consent that it was impossible to get for that section of country a standard gauge road, and, therefore, all parties, including the hon. member for Shelburne who shakes his head, and who was the gentleman who drew up the charter of the Coast Line Railway which he now proposes to sacrifice, agreed that the only road that could be got for that part of Nova Scotia was a narrow gauge road—that it meant a narrow gauge road or no road. Here is what one of the members of the western part of Nova Scotia said on the subject in the Nova Scotia assembly at the time:

> The section of country between Yarmouth and Lockeport, through which the road contemplated by this Bill would pass, was such that a road of this description would fully answer all the requirements for many years to come. The construction of this road would enable the people of that part of the province to obtain railway accommodation, for which they had long waited, and for which they might have to wait many years if a more expensive road was undertaken. It was quite reasonable that the people should seek the construction of this road, and he trusted that the Government would entertain the project favourably.

What do we find? My hon. friend here has already referred to the fact that the people in the western part of Nova Scotia, whom we are supposed to represent, or at any rate whose wishes we are supposed to consider to some extent—the people in every one of the counties affected have sent petitions to the Railway Committee and this House ask-

ing that this Bill which is now about to be proposed to this House shall not become law. There is a petition from the county of Yarmouth, which is largely interested, against the passage of this Bill into law. There is a petition from the county of Shelburne asking that this Bill do not become law. There is a petition signed by the municipal council of the county of Queen's asking that this Bill do not become law. Where have we heard of any petitions asking that the Bill should become law? Not one has been mentioned, either here or elsewhere. The people of all these counties have shown their interest in the Coast Line Railway and their desire for its completion by giving it the right of way or bonuses. Where have we heard of their making any bonus or gift to the South Shore Railway Company? Such a thing cannot be shown. What does all this agitation mean? There must be something underneath which has not yet come to light, but which may come to light before we are through this session. The point taken by the Minister of Justice that there is a wide distinction between these two companies, inasmuch as the Coast Railway was not a broad gauge, is not well founded. The fact is that legislation was passed during the last session of the Nova Scotia legislature, amending the charter of the Coast Railway Company so that they may build a standard gauge road. Further than that, the Coast Line Railway Company, at a meeting on the 6th May this year, passed a resolution unanimously of its stockholders agreeing to increase the gauge from three feet to the standard gauge of 4 feet 8½ inches. More than that, I have here a telegram from the Premier of Nova Scotia, which I will take the liberty of reading:

There appears to be some misunderstanding at Ottawa respecting the position of affairs between the Nova Scotia Government and the Coast Railway Company. The company entered into a contract, giving exceptionally strong guarantees of good faith for the construction of a 3-feet gauge road from Yarmouth to Lockeport, and made considerable progress with the work. At the recent session of the legislature the company obtained an amendment to its charter, providing for the building of a standard-gauge road. Part of the amending Act was reserved to be brought into operation by publication in the "Royal Gazette," by order of the Governor in Council. The company recently applied to have the Act brought fully into operation and to have the contract so amended as to provide for a standard-gauge road. We agreed to these proposals, the necessary order was made to bring the referred part of the Act into operation. Publication was made in the "Royal Gazette"——

I have it here——

—and the company was notified that the Government were satisfied to have the contract amended as proposed. It is fully understood between the government and the company that the road to be built is a standard gauge road.

W. S. FIELDING.

Now, it seems to me that that puts an end pretty effectually to the second point, the only other point made by the Minister of Justice. Some hon. gentlemen have taken the point as an objection to the Coast Line railway that it did not get its charter until after the South Shore railway had got its charter. That is true; it did not get its charter until a year afterwards. But it got its charter at a time when the South Shore railway was considered as dead as Julius Caesar, and it got it with the influence of the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) who sits here now and is doing his utmost to destroy the railway company. He drew the Act, and now he says it is an iniquitous thing that the legislature of Nova Scotia should have chartered this second road. In the charter of the South Shore Railway Company there were certain provisions as to time. It had to commence operations within two years. The Coast Line Railway Company were very careful not to begin operations or spend money until such time as they believed and were advised that the charter of the South Shore railway had lapsed. Then they considered that the coast was clear. They went on and they spent money. Subsequently, the South Shore people, knowing that their charter had lapsed, saw fit to go to work, and spent a considerable sum of money. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question whether the South Shore Railway Company is a company or not is before the courts of the province of Nova Scotia. And we are asked to give judgment in advance, we are asked to over-ride the decision of the courts of Nova Scotia or to legislate in advance of that decision, and to declare that, no matter what happens, we shall see that the South Shore railway has a charter, whether it is entitled to it or not. That company failed to live up to the charter it had received, and the Coast Line Railway went on and expended large sums of money. I contend that it would be an iniquitous thing for this Parliament, in defiance of the fact that the case is now before the courts in the province of Nova Scotia to do such a thing.

Mr. AMYOT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 27th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General :

Office of the Governor General's Secretary,
Ottawa, 27th June, 1895.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Sir Henry Strong, Kt., acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber, to-morrow, at 5 o'clock p.m., instead of this afternoon, for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
C. J. JONES,
For the Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons,
&c., &c., &c.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 135) respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. Daly.)

EXCHANGE BANK.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What amount was guaranteed by Mr. Ogilvie on account of the Exchange Bank ? Has he paid all he guaranteed ? If not, how much has he paid ? What amount remains unpaid ? What steps, if any, has the Government taken to collect it ?

Mr. FOSTER. The amount guaranteed by Mr. Ogilvie on account of the Exchange Bank was $100,000. No portion of that has been paid by Mr. Ogilvie. The amount that remains unpaid is $33,625, exclusive of interest. The correspondence has been placed in the hands of the Department of Justice, but it is only fair to state on Mr. Ogilvie's behalf that he enters an objection to the payment by himself, on account of some question connected with the general distribution of the receipts.

FISHING IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. COLTER asked, Is it true that the fishery officers are selling licenses to fish for salmon with nets in York County, N.B., above tidal boundaries ? If so, how many licenses have been granted, and to whom ? What is the fee charged ? Has any similar licenses been granted to any person or persons in Carleton County, N.B. ? If so, to whom, and what fee has been charged ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the absence of the Minister of Marine, I will answer that question by saying that the fishery officers were not authorized to sell licenses to fish for salmon with nets in York County, N.B., above tidal boundaries. That answer has to be given, because it is impossible at this moment to say what has actually been done, but no authority has been given to them to do that.

BOUNTY TO SILVER-LEAD SMELTING.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House do resolve itself into Committee to-morrow, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $150,000 in five years to encourage silver-lead smelting in Canada, the payment for each ton of ore smelted not to exceed fifty cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would you inform the House what particular raiders are after the treasury ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have only moved that the House go into committee to-morrow, and when I move the resolution I will explain the purpose.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION DAY—ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LAURIER. The House would like to be informed whether Parliament is to sit on Monday next.

Mr. FOSTER. I have great pleasure in saying to my hon. friend that a motion will be made that the House do not sit on Monday next.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON WATERWAYS.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to mention a matter of international importance. I assume that the Government are aware that at the last session of Congress an Act was passed authorizing the President to appoint three commissioners to confer with a similar number of commissioners to be appointed on behalf of Great Britain and Canada, on the subject of the waterways from the lakes to the ocean. I would like to ascertain from the Government whether they propose any reciprocal legislation to acknowledge the friendly action of the United States in that matter, or whether they have taken steps to act upon it or what they propose to do ?

Mr. HAGGART. The attention of the Government was drawn to the action of the United States authorities in reference to

waterways, and the question came up for consideration as to what action the Government should take in reference to it. It will be remembered that the commissioners to be appointed by the United States Government are to receive no pay for their services. I think it would be very difficult for us to get parties who would so act without pay. However, I intend to appoint a departmental commission of two members belonging to the department, who will receive no pay, and associated with them, another gentleman who also will receive no pay, for the purpose of meeting the United States commission.

CIVIL ACTION AGAINST MR. ST. LOUIS.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to notify the Minister of Justice that I notice by the press that the trial against Mr. St. Louis has been postponed until the 15th October, and I have been informed that it is at the request of the Government's counsel that that postponement is taking place. I would like to know if that is correct, and why the postponement is taking place. The hon. Minister well knows that the Opposition have been criticising the Government for their tardy action in this matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Since the hon. gentleman has referred to the matter, I may say that no special instructions have been given to the counsel acting for the Crown, in the matter of the civil suit of The Queen vs. St. Louis. But I incidentally heard that the judge of the Exchequer Court had to adjourn the court in order to keep certain appointments on his circuit, and while I am not at all sure, yet, no doubt, that is the reason. But the counsel for the Crown have neither requested nor obtained special instructions with respect to the suit.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McMILLAN. I desire to know when the papers and correspondence regarding cattle shipments through American territory to Europe will be brought down ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will make inquiries and let the hon. gentleman know on Monday.

Mr. BRODEUR. When will the Postmaster General lay on the Table the returns for which I moved some time ago ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In compliance with the order of the House, the report has been prepared and is being sent up from the Secretary of State's Department to be laid before the House. When it comes down I shall be prepared to make a statement.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to ask when a return moved for and passed by the House about three weeks ago, in regard to correspondence respecting site of the post office at Portage la Prairie, is likely to be brought down ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Postmaster General is absent from his seat, but I will call his attention to it.

MANITOBA SCHOOLS—REMEDIAL ORDER.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman leading the House whether he is yet in receipt of the answer to the remedial order ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have the same answer to make to-day as yesterday.

Mr. McCARTHY. Can the hon. gentleman say whether he has received any information that the order has been despatched from Manitoba or not ?

Mr. FOSTER. I know of none.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 113) to amend Chapter 10 of the Statutes of 1892, respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers.—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 123) further to amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. Ouimet.)

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

House proceeded to the consideration of Bill (No. 124) further to amend the Act to readjust the representation of the House of Commons, as amended in Committee.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) As I was not in the House when this Bill was considered in Committee, would the hon. the Minister of Public Works be kind enough to give me some explanation about the nature of the amendments that were made ?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The first amendment relates to number two of the Bill. This Act as printed reads as follows :—

The township of Courcelles and the north-east part of the township of Joliette are hereby detached from the county of Berthier and annexed to the county of Joliette, for the purposes of representation in the House of Commons.

The words " the north-east part of " in the first line are struck off. Section 3 is also amended. The three last lines were struck off.

As that district is constituted by the Act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, chapter eleven of the Statutes of 1892, as hereby amended.

This gave a false notion of the limits of the county of Joliette. It includes the limits such as they now are, because this county

was not mentioned in this Bill. It is the old description of the county of Joliette such as defined by the Revised Statutes of Canada of 1860, and as amended by the preceding section. I may say that the Bill was drawn up as agreed upon between the hon. gentleman and myself.

Amendments agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Bill (No. 122) further to amend the General Inspection Act (Mr. Wood, Brockville) was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MARTIN. Is it intended to make the fees different at different points ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That would not do. If the Government were to make such changes, it would mean that the rates would be lower at some points than at others, and the result would be that inspection would all drift to that point where it could be obtained cheapest. The section provides for lowering the rates all round or retaining the present rate, and making such disposition generally as may be necessary. There is no danger of any surplus as far as we can see, other than at Montreal and Port Arthur.

Mr. MARTIN. Does that give the Government power to retain a portion of the fees ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It gives the Government power to retain the surplus and apply it to the consolidated fund if necessary, or they can reduce the present inspection fee as they see fit.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the clause as proposed goes much further. It does not merely empower the Governor in Council to lower the fees, but to amend the tariff, which might and would entitle him to increase the fees. As the power is not wanted, I do not think we ought to give the Governor in Council power to increase.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). There appears to be something in that, because the Act fixes arbitrarily the fee, and there is no doubt this would give the Governor in Council power to increase as well as to reduce. There is not one chance in ten thousand that even Parliament would ever be asked to increase the fees. I have no objction to amend the clause in the direction suggested.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not understand from the wording of the section that the Government have any power to retain any portion of these fees at all. Apparently all that could be done would be to apportion the fees between the inspector and the departmental inspector. From all appearances there is likely to be a very large crop in Manitoba and the Territories this year, and even last year the fee of 60 cents a carload was altogether too much for the work done by the inspector at that point. While the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) may be correct in his idea that it is better not to have officers of this kind under salary, yet the Government should have power to appropriate the surplus of the fees to the public use.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It seems to me that the first subsection gives the Government that power.

Mr. MARTIN. There is no power given by this clause to the Government to keep any portion of the fees.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That is the intention and we can amend the section in that direction.

On section 2,

Mr. MARTIN. Might I ask the Controller if he has considered the question that I raised as to the inspector attending to insurance ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The inspector is not doing any insurance business.

Mr. MARTIN. Is not his son doing it ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Not that I know of. I do not know how I could prevent him, if he is.

Mr. MARTIN. The Government should take special pains to see that neither the inspector, nor any person who would be presumed to be the same as he is, is engaged in insurance. If the inspector's son is canvassing for insurance there will be a very strong feeling on behalf of the grain trade to keep in with the inspector and give the insurance to his son. It does seem to me that the Government should perhaps go a little beyond the ordinary course, and prevent whatever influence the inspector may possess, being used to divert insurances from the ordinary source.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The department has taken every possible precaution in the line indicated by the hon. gentleman. If one of the inspector's sons is engaged in the insurance business the department has no knowledge of that fact. If it be that he is so engaged, I do not see very well how the department can prevent it. Now, with regard to the officer himself, and the fact that injury might have been done to consignors, and those who are called upon to insure cargoes by reason of the fact that the officer in question carried on the insurance business, I can only say, that this office is in close touch, as it should be, and as it was intended by the statute to be, with the boards of trade throughout the country. All the department, or the Government ever intended to do, was to provide the machi-

nery and set it in motion, receiving suggestions from those interested in the trade itself. There has been no complaint made by any of the boards of trade, the shippers or any other persons, as to the conduct of the business by Mr. Gibbs. It may be said, as was said by the hon. gentleman when this matter was first under discussion, that any person who had to insure would be at the mercy of the officer, and would not be likely to make any complaint. In answer to that, I may say that the boards of trade throughout the country are composed of men of all classes and of different political views, and we are very apt to hear very quickly if there is any ground of complaint. In this case, I do not see how I can take any action until it is proved that the inspector through his son is engaged in the insurance business, of which I have no knowledge.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman is not likely to hear complaints from the boards of trade for the reason he gave himself. The members who are not engaged in grain shipping will make no complaint, because it is not their business to do so. The only persons who might complain are those who are engaged in the shipping of grain, and they will not complain, as they have told me privately, because they do not wish to have any quarrel with the inspector. Without casting any reflection upon Mr. Gibbs, I think it extremely unlikely that any shipper would object to paying insurance to Mr. Gibbs or his son, so long as he paid no more than he would have to pay to any other person. I am not engaged in the grain trade or in the insurance business; but complaints have come to me from grain men and insurance men who do not think it a proper thing for Mr. Gibbs to be engaged in the insurance business, as he has been in the past to my personal knowledge, or, through any member of his family, and at the same time act as inspector. As inspector, he has great power and responsibility, and his office should be kept clear and distinct from any business connected with the insurance of grain. I lay this complaint before the Controller in my position as member for Winnipeg, and I think that ought to be sufficient notice to him to inquire into this matter. The hon. gentleman says that he cannot prevent Mr. Gibbs' son engaging in the insurance business. I think it would be quite proper for him to say to Mr. Gibbs that it is not proper for him or for a son of his to do business in the insurance of grain, which it is his duty to inspect.

Mr. CURRAN. Where are you going to stop?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). As my hon. friend says, where are you going to stop if you declare that no son or relative of the inspector should engage in the business of insurance at Port Arthur. As the hon. leader of the House suggests, it is not necessary even that a man should be related to the inspector to have such an advantage as the hon. member for Winnipeg points out. It is a singular fact that when I was in Winnipeg, though I discussed this question with the members of the grain exchange and with shippers, I never heard one complaint in reference to the conduct of this office. I found that the rapid development of the grain trade necessitated some change in the law relating to the inspector's fees, and the department has not been backward in introducing legislation in that direction. The export trade in grain from Manitoba is only a matter of yesterday; it is just commencing. It is true that during the past two or three years the emoluments of the inspector have been large, though not $25,000, as the hon. gentleman has stated.

Mr. MARTIN. That includes the insurance.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. gentleman could not have any possible means of knowing what sums he received by way of insurance. However, his emoluments very nearly approached $4,000, which the department considered too large, and hence the introduction of this Act, which I intended to introduce ever since my visit to the west last fall. As I have said, not a word of complaint has ever been received by the department, not even anonymous communications, as to the performance by Mr. Gibbs of the duties of his office, and if there had been any ground of complaint, it is almost certain that we would have heard something, either from the shippers, the grain buyers, or the boards of trade, who keep a close watch on all matters of this kind.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand that the hon. member for Winnipeg desires that any clause should be inserted in this Bill. He brings to the attention of the Controller what he thinks is likely to become a great nuisance, and all he asks from the Controller is an assurance that if these facts exist, the Controller will take steps to prevent their continuance.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). What facts?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The fact that the inspector or his son is engaged in the insurance of the cargoes he inspects.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not know it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Technically he may not be engaged in that business, but he may be actually through his son; and all my hon. friend asks is that the hon. Controller will give an assurance that if, on inquiry, he finds that to be the case, he will take steps to prevent its continuance. Everybody acquainted with the courts of law knows what a scandal it is for judges' sons to appear before their fathers. That has been found in the provinces of Canada to be a scandal and a disgrace, and the bar has

not hesitated to take steps, as far as possible, to prevent it. The same rule should apply here. If this gentleman's son is engaged in the business of insuring the grain which his father inspects, it is very improper that he should continue to occupy that position.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I can only say that I will continue to do as I have done—give this matter every consideration in the best interests of the trade, and if I find that any person is carrying on an insurance business in a way inimical to the export trade, then I will take steps to remedy what I consider a grievance. That is the only assurance I can give.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg is a very important one, and it deserves the consideration of the hon. Controller. It is undoubtedly of the utmost importance that the inspecting of grain should be free from any suspicion or bias in any way. We all know there are often times when grain will be presented for inspection which, perhaps, may not be just equal to No. 1, but good No. 2, and if, by a slight variation, or from any circumstances, he should pass that as No. 1, he will be doing an injustice not only to the buyer, but to every man in this country, because, if confidence in the clear and unbiassed judgment of the inspector is in any way shaken, that will injure every wheat raiser in the North-west. I can readily see where an inspector, if he has any interest in insuring the grain, may be biassed by that fact, and disposed to inspect it more favourably. It would be well for the Controller to put in a clause providing that the inspector should not be directly or indirectly interested in the insurance of this grain.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I will take every opportunity of seeing that the interests of the trade are protected. Of course, if a grain inspector finds there is just a shade of difference in the wheat between No. 1 Manitoba Hard, and No. 2, it is easy for him to class it as No. 1, if he wishes to be dishonest. This inspector is not engaged in the business of insurance, and I do not that that his son is. I do not think he should, directly or indirectly, be engaged in it. I will take pains to look into the matter.

Mr. CAMERON. Last fall there were serious complaints concerning the mixing of grain. It was alleged that No. 2 had been mixed with No. 1. It had all been inspected as No. 1, but whether the inspector knew or not, I do not know. All I know is that there was serious complaint in Ontario as to the mixing of grain.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

River St. Lawrence Ship Channel..... $75,000

Mr. OUIMET. Seventy-five thousand dollars is all we propose to expend next year to keep the dredges at work on the improved ship channel between Quebec and Montreal, in order to make it 27½ feet at low tide. This amount is required to pay for the repairing of the dredges and maintenance.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does this include dredging in the harbour of Montreal ?

Mr. OUIMET. No ; that is done by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. The channel is supposed to start from the foot of the current down to Quebec. Where this work is done is more especially at La Barre à Boulard, Grondines, Lotbinière.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice one of the steamers grounded in Lake St. Peter. Is the channel there not sufficiently wide ?

Mr. OUIMET. The responsibility for that accident has been disputed between the pilots and the authorities in charge of the ship channel, but the real cause of the accident is that the pilot got out of the channel. The channel is deep enough at that place, and there was no reason for the grounding, except that accidentally the steamer got out of the channel.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. gentleman give us the ordinary width of the channel ?

Mr. OUIMET. It is 300 feet wide with 27½ foot navigation—that is 28 or 28½ feet actual depth. And, at different places, the department widens that channel to 500 feet, especially where there are curves. The constant increase in the length of the ships makes it imperative that the channel should be widened at these points in order to avoid collision when two vessels happen to meet in one of these curves. That is part of the work being done.

Mr. GIBSON. Is this vote to be used for the purpose of widening or deepening ?

Mr. OUIMET. For both, and for work of various kinds to be done at different places. The principal work is to be done at Barre à Boulard, which is to be deepened to 27½ feet at low tide. That is pretty heavy work. At other places we have two or three dredges at work which will be occupied in widening the channel where there are sharp curves in order to avoid accidents at these points.

Mr. GIBSON. Is this work being done by the hon. Minister's department, or under contract?

Mr. OUIMET. By the department.

Mr. GIBSON. The work done by the department must be more satisfactory. I would like to know if it is as cheap as the former system of doing it under contract by the yard?

Mr. OUIMET. We believe that the work is done more cheaply under the present system. I am told that the cost of dredging, since the department has taken hold of this work, has been reduced by 50 per cent—that is the actual cost of the material dredged according to the nature of the soil.

Mr. GIBSON. Would the hon. Minister say how much per yard the dredging costs under the present system?

Mr. OUIMET. I am told that the cost is from about 6 cents per yard to about 30 cents a yard, according to the stuff that is taken out.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. Minister include in the cost of dredging under the Government the expense of keeping the dredges in order and other expenses of that kind?

Mr. OUIMET. We include everything, even the expenditure of the shops in Sorel, which are kept going during the winter to repair and put the plant in proper order. But the allowance for wear and tear is not included.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many men do you employ in the shops at Sorel?

The CHAIRMAN. That does not come in on this vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. The expense is part of the cost of dredging.

Mr. OUIMET. The number of men employed in the shops at Sorel varies from half a dozen to 200, according to the amount of work in hand.

River Kaministiquia..... $10,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How does the hon. Minister intend to spend this money?

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman knows that Fort William is now the great shipping harbour of that part of the country, and that a good deal of work has been done there to enable the vessels, whose capacity is increasing every year, to enter the river and reach the elevators. The channel has been dredged, but last year, as the result of the severe winter and the heavy snowfall, material was carried down in the spring so as wholly to block the channel. In order that trade might not be stopped, we were obliged at once to send a dredge there. We sent one of our elevator dredges, which is working there now with another dredge of less depth. During the summer we were able to make one cut of 100 feet wide by 20 feet deep, which gives full accommodation to the vessels going up to load at the elevators. The intention now is to make that channel 200 feet wide and to restore the 20 feet depth, it having filled during last spring so as to reduce it to 18 feet.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the distance from the mouth of the river to the elevator?

Mr. OUIMET. About a mile and a half.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is the mouth of the river protected by piers so as to prevent a recurrence of the filling in?

Mr. OUIMET. No; there is nothing of that kind. Up to the present time I have not had the means to make it a permanent work.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would suggest that if accidents of this kind are likely to occur again involving annual appropriations for the purpose of keeping the harbour clear, so important a point as the Kaministiquia River should be protected by piers, so that the scouring in the spring would keep the channel clear.

Mr. OUIMET. As I said last year when we asked for a vote of $15,000 for this work, we expect, by making the channel 20 feet deep and 200 feet wide, that the scouring during the spring will keep it free. But in any case the amount necessary to spend in order to keep the channel open is less than the interest on the cost of permanent works. The permanent improvement, it is estimated, would cost about $600,000. So that this is comparatively a cheap way of doing the work. We expect we shall not have to spend next year more than $7,000 in order to keep the channel at the depth of 20 feet.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the work done by Marks & Macdonald, referred to at page P—26, Auditor General's Report, was let by contract, and whether they were the lowest tenderers?

Mr. OUIMET. It is not by contract. That was the only dredge available. As I have said, we required this dredge to make the first cut, because our elevator dredge draws too much water to do the first cutting. We use that dredge on the sides in order to scrape the channel about nine feet deep, and then the elevator dredge is put on.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the Minister tell us the reason why they sent the dredge to Kaministiquia and abandoned Port Arthur?

Mr. OUIMET. It is because trade is going there. We cannot direct trade, and so we have to give it the channel it requires.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the Minister tell us whether this is the same Kaministiquia River that Mr. Mackenzie named as the water terminus to the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way, and for which he was found so much fault with ?

Mr. OUIMET. I think so.

Mr. GIBSON. How much money did the Government spend on Port Arthur ?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not say.

Mr. GIBSON. Why have they abandoned Port Arthur ?

Mr. OUIMET. Port Arthur is yet a very thriving town and port, a very good trade is done there.

Mr. GIBSON. When were you in Port Arthur ?

Mr. OUIMET. I was there in 1885.

Mr. GIBSON. I understood you were going last year.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, I was to go.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, you wanted to go up and see the harbour.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the Minister explain the reason why this work was given to Marks & Macdonald ?

Mr. OUIMET. Because we could not give it to anybody else.

Mr. GIBSON. Did you try ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, we tried.

Mr. GIBSON. Who did you try ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman must imagine himself in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. GIBSON. Not at all. If I understand the matter aright, there was another firm of dredging contractors, Murray & Cleveland, who were able to do all the work up in Kaministiquia. Why were they not asked to do this work ? Is it because Marks & Macdonald are more friendly to the Government than Murray & Cleveland?

Mr. OUIMET. I may tell the hon. gentleman that Murray & Cleveland did do some work some years ago. They charged 25 cents per yard, and they used an American dredge. That dredge has gone back to the United States. We are paying $8 for the present dredge, and are saving about 10 cents per yard, on what we were paying before.

Mr. GIBSON. Where does the Government get their dredges made ?

Mr. OUIMET. All our dredges are built in Canada. Last year we built one dredge the "Laval," and we are now building another elevator dredge in Sorel, and another very fine dredge is now being built for the maritime provinces by Messrs. Carrier & Lainé, of Lévis, Que.

Mr. GIBSON. Where were the former dredges built ?

Mr. OUIMET. That is ancient history.

Mr. GIBSON. No, because they were built on the American side. The hon. gentleman would not employ Murray & Cleveland's dredge because it was an American dredge, I suppose.

Mr. OUIMET. I am not going to be cross-examined as a witness. Let the hon. gentleman make his speech, if he wishes.

Mr. GIBSON. I am asking the Minister of Public Works the reason why he did not ask Murray & Cleveland, as well as other contractors, to do this work. He says the reason that he asked Messrs. Marks & Macdonald was that there was nobody else available. I tell him that there are dozens of Canadian contractors available for the purpose of dredging public works, but he gave it to Marks & Macdonald, of Port Arthur, over everybody else, because they were friendly to the Government.

Mr. OUIMET. Since you assert everything as if you knew it to be true, why do you expect an answer ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have a right to know whether the Government did this matter by tender, as it appears they were bound in duty to do, and as is always done in ordinary cases on public works, or whether they arbitrarily selected a particular man. Now if, as appears, they arbitrarily selected a particular man in the person of Mr. Macdonald, or his firm, then the Government are bound to give a much better explanation than they have done. Prima facie, by neglecting to tender, they have put themselves distinctly in the wrong in this matter, and may have inflicted—I cannot say positively—a large loss on the country. Had they tendered, and had Macdonald been the lowest tenderer, there would be no more to say about it. But I do not understand that is the case at all.

Mr. MACDONELL. The hon. gentleman who is questioning the Minister, evidently was misinformed entirely upon the subject he was speaking about. In the first place, it is true that Murray & Cleveland had the contract for dredging in the Kaministiquia. But they had not one dollar's worth of plant, they had not a dredge, and they sublet the contract to an American who brought his plant in from Duluth, and used it there during the summer, and took it away in the fall. Murray & Cleveland never did one dollar's worth of work themselves. The only work that was done, was done with American plant, brought into the country in competition with the very plant that the hon. gentleman speaks about. Now, when this contract was given, it was a small amount ; I think the whole amount was only $5,000. It was so small that the incidental expenses of advertising would be considerable in proportion. No contractor

who owns dredging plant would take it to Lake Superior, and there were no other dredges on Lake Superior available. No one would take their plant to Lake Superior for the amount of work that was to be done. In giving the contract to Marks & Macdonald, they gave it by days' labour, or by hours' work, and they gave it to the only Canadians that have plant in the whole country, who were available to do that work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then they would have been perfectly safe in tendering. The Government might have tendered with perfect impunity; they might have complied with the law. Apparently, as the matter stands, they have not attended to the regulations which are laid down, and to the custom of the department. They have given this without tender, and that is a thing which they have no right to do. As for this business of allowing the Government work to be done by hours' labour, I think that this House, after what we have heard, and I think that the Minister of Public Works in particular, after our experience with a certain Emmanuel St. Louis, ought to know that doing work by hours' or days' work upon a Government contract, is not a cheap and economical mode.

Mr. OUIMET. It has been pretended that the Minister of Public Works should bow to the castigation of hon. gentlemen opposite, given very uncourteously and in very bad grace, and that he should quietly allow them to administer it to him. I am not going to do so. Mr. St. Louis has done his work. His case has been brought before the courts. If he has not been punished, it is not my fault or the fault of the hon. gentlemen. He is able, however, to defend himself whether he is taken before the courts or elsewhere.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OUIMET. Hon. members say "hear, hear." Moreover, St. Louis is known as a first-class contractor in Montreal, where he has been honestly prosecuting his trade for years and years——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OUIMET. Hon. members say "hear, hear." I tell them that a good many people may not think much more of some of those hon. gentleman than they think of St. Louis. I suppose this is outside the question. But if my answer is not good, the argument was still worse.

The CHAIRMAN. Keep to the question.

Mr. OUIMET. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to keep those hon. gentlemen to the question. When an hon. member says that the department has been acting contrary to the law, I reply that he is not able to cite the law to show that we have to give this work out by contract and that we have been doing an unlawful act. I have already stated that by carrying out the contract by days' work we reduce the cost by 10 cents a yard as compared with Murray & Cleveland's price, and I do not think the Committee can find fault with that action. I could not say the number of cubic yards, but my engineer says that the work done by the dredge at $8 per hour brings the cost to 17½ cents to 18 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite sure, after the statement of the Minister of Public Works, the country will come to the conclusion, and will be confirmed in the view entertained for a long time, that St. Louis has a friend at court.

The CHAIRMAN. You had better keep to the question, too.

Mr. McMULLEN. This has been pointed out very clearly.

Mr. OUIMET. I will not allow any one to insult me under cover of attacking my cousin.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say——

Mr. OUIMET. If any one will attempt to insult me, when proceedings have been taken against St. Louis, I will not allow it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish you, Mr. Chairman, would keep the Minister quiet. The evidence is that the department have violated the law in regard to this dredging work. It may be a large or a small contract, but unquestionably when it was quite within the possibility that the Government could get other men to carry out the work, they should have asked for tenders. But for some reason, known only to themselves, they let the work to Marks & Macdonald without asking for tenders. We have had no positive evidence of tenders being called for, and this kind of thing should not be repeated. Under ordinary circumstances, unless there is grave reason to the contrary, and where it is absolutely necessary that the work should be proceeded with without taking time to advertise, I contend in every instance tenders should be asked for. Was the dredging of such an urgent character that there was not time to advertise? Why has the law been violated, as it has been from time to time?

Mr. MACDONELL. The hon. gentleman has given an exhibition of utter ignorance of the subject under discussion. He has stated that probably several other parties would have tendered for this job. Let me tell him that there is not a single contractor in the whole province of Ontario, or even in the Dominion, and no one knows this better than the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), who, for a $5,000 job, would take dredging plant and tow it up to Lake Superior. In the first place, it would cost from a thousand to fifteen hundred dollars

to do $5,000 worth of work. The dredge that the Department of Public Works sent there cost, I am sure, over $1,000 to tow from Goderich to the Kaministiquia. With respect to the urgency of the work, the hon. gentleman is in total ignorance in regard to it. The rabid assertions sometimes made by hon. gentlemen opposite are enough to astonish one.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to ask——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the hon. gentleman in order, and is he discussing the question?

The CHAIRMAN. I think so.

Mr. MACDONELL. I am discussing the subject under consideration now, and during the discussion I have a perfect right to criticise the remarks made by speakers who have preceded me. With respect to the urgency of this work, every hon. member knows, particularly the western members, that a year ago last spring a very serious flood occurred on the Kaministiquia River; so much so, that where there were 16 feet of water over the bar in the fall of 1892, in the spring of 1893 that bar was found to be filled to within ten or twelve feet of the surface. The spring fleet arrived there to the number of 20 or 22 vessels, and they were all deeply laden to 14 feet. The first vessel that attempted to go up the river was stranded, the next followed, the third went on the bar and the others anchored out and remained there with their cargoes on board for some weeks. From all parts of the country complaints came into the Department of Public Works, more particularly from western members. The Minister of the Interior received some hundreds of telegrams from grain shippers in the west. I received no end of telegrams which I forwarded to the Minister of Public Works. The dredge commenced work as quickly as possible, and it made a gulley through the bar and allowed vessels to go in and out. The cost of the work, whether let by tender or otherwise, was 10 cents a yard cheaper than similar work was done by the Department of Public Works during the Mackenzie regime. Whereas that work cost 26 and 27 cents per cubic yard under the Mackenzie Government, it cost 16 and 17 cents under this Government. So there can be no very serious complaint as regards the cost of the work, and out of the small appropriation granted I venture to say that that part of Ontario got just as much benefit as was derived from any work ever done in the country.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. member seems to be the defender of the Minister of Public Works in that section of country which he represents. The hon. gentleman stated that the work done by the dredge owned by Marks & Macdonald was done at a cost of 10 cents per yard less than that done under the Mackenzie regime. How can the hon. gentleman explain that assertion? Were the measurements inspected, and how was a conclusion arrived at as to the cost? The remarks of the Minister of Public Works show that work was done by the cubic yard for less money by Murray & Cleveland than it would cost at $8 per hour under the present rate as charged by Marks & Macdonald. I would like to ask the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) how long Marks & Macdonald have owned a dredge. I did not know that Mr. Marks was in the dredging business. I thought he was a merchant. He is perhaps doing the same kind of thing that he complained of Murray & Cleveland doing. He said that Murray & Cleveland never did an hour's work there. It is nothing new, and it is quite common for contractors to take work and sub-let it to other people. But in the present instance instead of asking for people to do this work, the Government employed Marks & Macdonald to do it at $8 an hour, irrespective of the number of yards taken out. If we are to understand anything of the number of yards taken out by the Public Works Department, we may go down to the Quebec graving dock where we would find that probably 500,000 more yards were paid for that never was done. It is quite easy for the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) to state that the work was done for 10 cents a yard less than was paid for it during the Mackenzie Government; but was the right number of yards taken out? That is the question. It is not a question of how much a yard, but how much was taken out, and what it was done for? I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that knowing the condition of affairs in the Public Works Department, that the contract of Marks & Macdonald on the Kaministiquia River cost more than the work did under the Mackenzie Government, because I know that under the Mackenzie Government no man was paid for a dollar's worth of work that he did not do. We find in the Department of Railways and Canals and in the Department of Public Works to-day, that men are paid for work they never perform, and this is an instance of it. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell the House, how he arrived at the conclusion and on what he has based his data, for stating that the work was done on the Kaministiquia River by this dredge of Marks & Macdonald for 10 cents a yard less than during the Mackenize Government. It shows most conclusively that Mr. Mackenzie's forethought as a statesman saw that this was the proper place for the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. After the present Dominion Government had spent a million dollars in trying to make an artificial harbour of Port Arthur they had to abandon it. The Minister of Public Works told us that he intended going there last year, but he did not go. If he did go, he might find that the place is deserted, practically speaking, and that the whole of the

shipping is being carried on at the Kaministiquia which was so much opposed by the Minister of Public Works and his fellow-members of the Conservative party when Mr. Mackenzie was in power.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I am certainly sorry for the density of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson), that he did not know that Mr. Marks owned a dredge. I knew some years ago that he owned a dredge. I have known that he has owned a dredge for at least the last four or five years, and I believe that he is doing good honest work with it. Now, with regard to the price of the work. The hon. gentleman makes the same rash statement over and again, and he has not one tittle of evidence to prove it. He would not on his own responsibility make that statement sincerely. As to the measurements, he has done work enough to know perfectly well that no Government—whether it be the incapable Government that preceded this one, or the present Government—would allow any man to work without having supervision over him. There is supervision over that dredging, and for my own information I inquired repeatedly from the inspector to find out the quantity of material excavated, and I compared that with the price that was paid by the Mackenzie Government, and paid to whom? Paid to Americans that came in there. It is true that money has been spent on the harbour of Port Arthur, and to-day one of the best harbours on the lakes is there. If the Canadian Pacific Railway do not choose to take advantage of the opportunities afforded at Port Arthur, surely this Government is not to be condemned for that. This Government made the improvements in good faith and because they believed they were warranted in so doing, and, Sir, I have faith enough in the country to be satisfied that we will all see the day when that harbour of Port Arthur will be utilized, and utilized to its greatest extent, to ship the grain from the west to the consumers of the east. Now, criticism on the Kaministiquia might be in order, but I will not indulge in it further than to point out, that during the Mackenzie regime there was some money spent on the Kaministiquia. But where was it spent? It was spent upon a part of the river that never in the world will be used for boating. It was in the wrong place, because it was seven miles from the mouth of the river where no one could go with a large boat. I claim that that money was wasted, and that the country never got any benefit from it. I do not believe that the country ever will get any benefit from the money that was spent where the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway is now, and where the famous old Neebing Hotel used to stand, and where these gigantic piles of steel rails graced the bank of the river as an ornament for years.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to inquire from the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) who is Mr. Macdonald, of the firm of Marks & Macdonald, owner of this dredge? Is he any relative of the hon. member, or is the hon. member himself a member of the firm. Let us know who this Mr. Macdonald is?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I am sorry for the density of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), because if he will look at the Auditor General's Report he will see at a glance that the name of that gentleman is not the same as mine. The gentleman who does the dredging is a man named Hector Macdonald. He lives back of Toronto. He was employed for many years by A. P. Macdonald the contractor, a gentleman well known. This gentleman is also well known in the country. I believe that he has the merit of being a Scotchman, and I think that he was born in Scotland some fifty-five years ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonell) says that the work done by the Mackenzie Government on the Kaministiquia River was a total loss. I challenge that statement. The particular portion that was dredged out by Mr. Mackenzie is used to-day for a turning basin in the Kaministiquia River and the hon. gentleman knows that. A gentleman whom I believe is still engaged in the carrying trade told me that it was an utter impossibility to fasten a steamer so as to load her out of an elevator at any other point than on the Kaministiquia River, because you cannot keep a vessel sufficiently steady at Port Arthur to load. He said that owing to that fact Port Arthur could never be made a point of shipment for the wheat of the North-west, and that the Kaministiquia River would have to be used, and is used now, and will be continued to be used. He further informed me that the improvements made by Mr. Mackenzie, will have to be largely extended to meet the growing trade of the North-west.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Mr. Chairman, that is another exhibition of want of knowledge. The hon. gentleman complained of the expenditure in connection with the harbour of Port Arthur. I admitted that there was an expenditure there, and a very useful expenditure, one purpose of which was to make a harbour inside of which vessels could lie either at anchor or at the docks. I would explain to the hon. gentleman, in case he is ever so forgetful as to make the statement again, that there is a breakwater across the front of the harbour, with a gap of 350 feet, through which vessels enter the harbour, and the water inside is as calm as a mill-pond.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, not if there is a storm.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Do not say no. I must contradict that on account of your

utter ignorance. You cannot possibly know, or you would never make the statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I have made a statement——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). I did not know a point of order was taken. I merely rose to correct any false impression that might exist in the minds of the members of this House with regard to the harbour of Port Arthur. I have stated the facts as they are known by gentlemen who have visited the place.

Mr. FRASER. Of course, no one takes seriously the personal allusions of the hon. gentleman. It would be unparliamentary if I said that he cannot be anything if not impertinent. Surely we can discuss matters without these personalities.

Mr. FOSTER. Such personalities as your own friends commenced.

Mr. FRASER. And the leader of the Government, the would-be Prime Minister of this country, thinks it is a sufficient answer to say that somebody else began. That is a remarkable position for a statesman to take. Surely it is no answer or excuse, and I am sure that in his better moments the hon. Minister would not so think it. To say that a man shows gross ignorance in this House is not a way to discuss public questions. Now, I am not going to say a single word about Port Arthur. All I have to say is this, that the only carriers who are or ever will be there did not think it as good a place as the Kaministiquia, and they left it. That of itself is a sufficient answer. Do you think the Canadian Pacific Railway would have gone to the Kaministiquia unless it was a better place? Certainly not. The foresight of Mr. Mackenzie saw that; but the present Government would accept nothing that Mr. Mackenzie did, and so they expended large sums of money to make a harbour at Port Arthur. I do not know whether Port Arthur is a good or bad harbour. I was there on a very fine day, and it looked all right; beyond that I can say nothing. But hon. gentlemen opposite have had to come back to the harbour selected by Mr. Mackenzie. Not only in that respect, but in a great many others has that man's policy been shown to have been in the best interests of the country. Now, I think that the expenditure of public money on the Port Arthur harbour, after the Canadian Pacific Railway has left it, is an expenditure that should not be made, because we should not make expenditures on works that cannot be utilized. Ardent as the hope of the hon. member for Algoma may be that Port Arthur may become a port of shipment, it can only become such if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will make shipments there, and they will only do so because there will not be enough accommodation at the Kaministiquia. Nearly all the wheat coming from the great west is shipped by the water-stretches which were so much maligned when Mr. Mackenzie advocated them. With regard to the work in question, I do not think the statement that there was only one person to do it is a sufficient reason for not asking for tenders. The business of the Government is simply to go through the regular way, and give everybody an opportunity to tender. Then, if there is only one tender, nothing more can be said.

Mr. OUIMET. I am reminded that last spring, very unexpectedly, the channel of the Kaministiquia was closed by an unusual flood, which caused a descent of sand and earth to such an extent that the channel was, I believe, not more than twelve feet deep, and ships were actually prevented from going in. On a Canadian Pacific Railway train going west, Mr. Van Horne and the hon. member for Bothwell were apprised of the fact, and Mr. Van Horne telegraphed to my department to have the work done as soon as possible. It was certainly out of the question to call for tenders. The dredge was there, our price was fixed and accepted, and the work was proceeded with as early and as rapidly as possible; and as soon as we sent up our dredge, the work was continued as I have stated. Even if it had been otherwise, if we had not been obliged to use the dredge which was on the spot, the course that was taken could be defended, because we were only paying a very reasonable price for the dredge, and, as Mr. Macdonell has stated, no dredge could be sent there without an expense of at least $1,000, which would have had to be added to the cost of the work. On the whole, I think the action of the department was perfectly justifiable. As to the general charge that is made against my department of not giving to the country value for every dollar that is expended, I do not think it can be proved specifically by any hon. member of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Guysboro' must be very imperfectly acquainted with the history of Port Arthur and Fort William, and the Canadian Pacific Railway's operations there, or he would not make the statement he did. He states that the fact that they built their elevator at Fort William is an evidence that the harbour of Port Arthur was not suitable, and he concludes that what had been done by the Mackenzie Government in locating the town site up there and dredging the river was properly done.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman knows, I suppose, that the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way built their elevator first at Port Arthur and then left it and built their elevator elsewhere.

Mr. SPROULE. The Canadian Pacific Railway, when about to locate their headquarters at Port Arthur, made a standing offer to that town that if they would give, if my memory is correct, 250 acres of land to the Canadian Pacific Railway for their purposes, the company would locate everything down there. They must have perfectly satisfied themselves, after careful examination, that the harbour was suitable at Port Arthur, or they would not have made this proposition. The Port Arthur people, however, would not accept it, and because of their lack of liberality the Canadian Pacific Railway went up the river where they could get property much cheaper.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Beatty, who was the manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway line of steamers, told me himself that you could not keep a steamer in smooth enough water at Port Arthur to load her, and that the only place where you could safely and comfortably load steamers with wheat was just below the Kaministiquia Rapids.

Halifax Drill Hall, including purchase of site $20,000

Mr. FORBES. Has the contract been let yet?

Mr. OUIMET. It has been let, but not signed. It has been given to Mr. Asquith, for the sum of $196,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If this is going to cost a couple of hundred thousand dollars, the hon. gentleman must be proceeding exceedingly slowly when he only wants $20,000, and that a revote. Is this to be kept open steadily for the next two or three years, or as much longer as may suit political exigencies?

Mr. OUIMET. We are going to spend the money as fast as the treasury affords, and as the treasury is not plentiful now, we are going very slow. If we go fast the hon. gentleman finds fault, and if we go slow, we cannot satisfy him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find fault with a system of spending public money which will probably result in clear waste. If you are going to put up a building which will cost $200,000, the expenditure of $20,000 in the course of a year will be to a great extent frittered away. Public buildings are not at all improved, either in their construction or anything else connected with them, when the expenditure is spread over a period of three or four years, instead of the building being completed, as ordinary business men would do it, in eighteen months, at the outside. We have seen a good deal of that sort of thing. We have seen these things kept dangling before constituencies, so that the members of the particularly-favoured locality may be able to utilize them, not only for one, but two elections, or may be an odd by-election, as it appears to be the practice in Halifax to have two or three elections in succession, owing to certain circumstances well known to hon. gentlemen opposite. On what principle does the hon. gentleman ask us for the sum of $20,000? My impression is, he had better save the vote altogether, and proceed, when prepared to build the work, in a proper business-like way.

Mr. OUIMET. I ask for only $20,000 because the department does not intend to spend any more next year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is no explanation. When the hon. gentleman asks for the expenditure of public money, he ought to be able to explain how he proposes to use it. The site has been bought and paid for. He is going to spend $200,000 on the building, and he now asks for $20,000. I say that expenditure will be a clear waste of public money, and the hon. gentleman is unable to explain why he requires it.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman has not made it clear that there is going to be a waste. We intend to proceed with the building so as only to spend $20,000 this year. I do not know how the hon. gentleman makes out that the money will be wasted by going slowly. The work has not yet been begun; and if we begin only in the fall, for instance, the contractor is going to make all his preparations, open his quarries, probably, and the amount of $20,000 will be sufficient to enable him to go on with the work until the House has another opportunity of voting the further amount required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the contract been let?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, but it is not signed yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If not signed, it is not let.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman knows how these things are done. The contractor has been notified that the department, with the authority of Council, has accepted his tender. He has been notified to come and sign the contract, he has signified his intention of doing so, and I suppose it is only a question of a few days when the contract will be completed. The contractor is Mr. Asquith.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman knows anything about the matter, I should like to know what particular amount of work he expects to be done for $20,000.

Mr. OUIMET. It is expected to commence the building, not by the roof, but by the foundation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not believe the hon. gentleman expects to get even as far as the foundation. If $20,000 is enough for the first year, when is the work to be completed ?

Mr. OUIMET. Within the next fiscal year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is to be completed within the next fiscal year, and is to cost $200,000, and the hon. gentleman wants an appropriation of $20,000. That is a remarkably business-like way of proceeding. His $20,000, I fear, will be something like the widow's cruse ; it will have to be filled a good many times over. He says that it is to be completed in the fiscal year, and he now comes down with an appropriation of $20,000. If that means anything, it means that these Estimates are not worth the paper they are written on. The hon. gentleman expects, if the statement be correct, to ask us—or somebody else very likely will have to ask us—for $150,000 more within the fiscal year in order to complete this contract ; and the whole of these elaborate reductions, which are made more particularly in public works, are worth nothing. We are told that there is going to be a reduction in the expenditure for public works of something like $875,000. But on this one item we find from the statements made by the Minister himself that the so-called vote of $20,000 is a delusion and a snare, that we are to spend $200,000 for this drill shed within the fiscal year, and the balance is to be made up by a supplementary estimate brought down a little later on. That is a very curious way of saving money and I hope the House will lay it to heart and understand it.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is building an argument on a mistake I made when I said that the building would be completed within the fiscal year. I did not think at the time that the 1st of July had not come yet. When I say that it will be completed within the next fiscal year, I refer to the fiscal year following that for which this vote is asked. The hon. gentleman may rejoice at having such a good opportunity of making a seemingly good argument based upon a mere mistake. What I mean to say is that within the fiscal year following the one covered by these Estimates—the fiscal year 1896-97—we expect to complete this work. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the revenue has suffered a very large decrease during the year just closing, and is not likely to be up to what it was before or what we should like to see it in the coming year. We must, of necessity, reduce the expenditure so as to bring it within the revenue. We thought, and the Finance Minister thought, that we could not expend more than $20,000 on this work this year without unduly increasing the expenditure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will perhaps say whether there is any understanding with the contractors as to how much is to be spent the first year. Suppose the contractors come and say : We shall nearly complete this building the first fiscal year. What then ?

Mr. OUIMET. It will be provided in the contract that the contractor is to proceed as the money is voted by the House.

Mr. GIBSON. After this $20,000 is spent what provision will they make to pay the contractors for continuing the work ? This building is to cost $200,000, and the Minister comes to Parliament for only 10 per cent of that amount on the ground that the revenue has been reduced and they must reduce the expenditure. He says he will put up a building in Halifax to cost $200,000 exclusive of $37,000 for the site, and he proposes to economize by asking only 10 per cent of the amount which will ultimately be spent.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman cannot say any longer that I said so. I said the expenditure would be delayed.

Mr. GIBSON. The impression the hon. gentleman would give the country is that his department is going to save money, but instead of that he is only asking for 10 per cent of the amount of expenditure to which the county will be committed. Why does he not come before the House as he ought to do, and ask for the sum required to complete this work. Instead of that he will resort to a Governor General's warrant, or else he will stop the work of the contractor and give him ground for a claim for extras. This principle is wholly wrong. The hon. Minister should take the House into his confidence and ask for the sum required for this building, instead of trying to lead the country to believe that he is saving by simply postponing the greater portion of the expenditure upon this work.

Mr. FRASER. When the tenders were asked for was it stated that the contract would be let upon the conditions the Minister now speaks of—that only $20,000 is to be expended next year, and the balance in the fiscal year 1896-97 ?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. FRASER. Then it is evident that there has been unfairness to the other men who tendered. Of course many tendered upon the idea that the Government were going on to complete the work, but if it had been understood that this was not the case, the tenders might have been considerably different.

Mr. OUIMET. The contractors did not know any more than the other tenderers

what would take place. They were all on the same footing.

Mr. FRASER. But the call for tenders did not state the conditions under which the money was to be expended. I want to show the hon. Minister that that is unfair to some of the tenderers. A man can tender more favourably if he knows these conditions, for he has virtually a year for preparation and can arrange the most favourable terms for everything he wants. It is wise not to proceed too hastily, I suppose. I do not know enough about the question to speak as to the time that should be occupied in the work, but I do not believe that it is wise to proceed too slowly. If the Government have made up their minds that the building is to be constructed, I should think it would be better in the interest of the people that it should be constructed at once. I should not think that, even with the present deficit, it would be worth while for a country such as this to delay the completion of a necessary building in order to postpone the expenditure of something like $180,000. Another point: the tender of Mr. Asquith having been accepted, I would like to ask whether the cheque that was given by each of the other tenderers has been returned? I had a letter from a gentleman in Halifax who put in a tender asking me when his cheque would be returned. There is another thing that I think is very unfair. The moment the Government agree upon accepting one tender, they should forthwith send back a cheque. It is worth interest to the man, and he should have the money. Would the Minister inform me whether the cheques have been returned?

Mr. OUIMET. I think all the cheques were returned, with the exception of that for the second tender, that of Mr. Keefe, which was only returned the day before yesterday, after it had been ascertained that the lowest tenderer would accept the contract.

Mr. FRASER. That explanation is sufficient.

Mr. OUIMET. When tenders were asked for, the returns for the year were all before the House, and could have been known by all the contractors. These contractors know more than the hon. gentleman seems to think.

Mr. FORBES. They never saw them.

Mr. OUIMET. All the contractors of the Government know very well that their contract may be stopped at any moment, either in part or entirely. That is one of the conditions that is always in a contract, and it is natural it should be so, because Parliament may reduce the appropriation, or stop the work entirely, or the appropriation may be cut down. All these things are provided for in our contracts.

Mr. GIBSON. But the ordinary contractor does not know all the conditions until the contract is submitted to him for signature. As the hon. member for Guysboro' has pointed out, if the contractor knew that time was to be given him, time to suit his own convenience, so to speak, that enables him to look around for suitable quarries, get suitable material, or brick, in connection with this building, especially when only a small appropriation is asked for, and then he has got a year to lie upon his oars, in which to spend the $20,000. But I want to point out that the moment this building is begun, the Government sends down an inspector at $3, $4, or $5 per day, as the case may be, at the expense of the country, and if this work should stop, or the appropriations should lapse, as the Minister points out, and the thing should be held in abeyance, what about this inspector? He is incurring expenses, and we all know that if this work is hung up, and time is taken by the Government to furnish the balance of the money for the completion of this contract it simply puts the contractor in a position to make a claim for extras, and we know how successfully contractors usually are in dealing with this Government in the matter of extras. We have only to look across the street to the Langevin block and remember how many thousands were claimed by the contractor for extras, even when no suspension took place. But the Minister tells us to-day that what he asks for is 10 per cent of the amount required to finish this building, a sum quite inadequate for the work required. Why should he limit himself to $20,000? Why should the work once begun, be hampered and interfered with? The Government could facilitate the work of the contractor by placing at his disposal the money he requires, because we know that the longer this building is in progress of construction, the more money it will cost, not only outside the contract itself, but the Government of necessity will be obliged to keep inspectors there much longer than would be necessary if the work was done expeditiously. As I said before, the Minister is entirely misleading the country when he says that he is simply asking for $20,000, because the revenue of the country will not stand it. He is under an obligation to spend $200,000, and it does not matter to the country whether it is spent before the first day of July of this year, or the first day of July of next year. It is an obligation the country has undertaken, it is an obligation, no matter whether this Government is in power or a more competent Government that will soon follow them, and who will have to pay that money. I say the Minister is misleading the country when he says he is simply asking for $20,000 because he wants the balance expended according to the revenue of the country.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman when he talks of the Langevin block, ought to know that the result of the inquiry that was made two years ago showed that the building cost much less than any other building of its size and quality, on the continent. I do not see why we should be taunted with these general insinuations, which are always made but not proved by the hon. gentlemen opposite. As the hon. member for South Oxford has indicated that I would have a successor from the other side of the House, perhaps the hon. member for Lincoln thinks he is the man who is going to take my place, and I suppose he is now trying to prepare himself.

Mr. GIBSON. I want the hon. gentleman and the country to understand that I do not envy his position worth a cent. Thank fortune, I can live without requiring to be kept by the Government of my country. I have no designs on the hon. gentleman's position, and I hope he will take that as a serious answer on my part. Personally speaking, I make no reflection upon the hon. Minister. I have a public duty to perform here as a member of the Opposition, and I want to perform that duty as long as I am able. He has brought up the question of the Langevin block this afternoon. I only cited it as an evidence of how this incompetent Government allow contractors to be paid about 50 per cent more than the total contract. We know that Charlebois' contract only amounted to $290,000, and yet by a clause in that contract, he was enabled to exact from every sub-contractor 25 per cent to allow them to go in and do the work of putting on the plaster, putting in the girders, laying the floor, putting on the roof, &c.; and the result of it was that when all the claims come in, the cost of that building will be a million dollars. The Minister shakes his head, but will the Minister say that there are no claims by Charlebois that will probably be settled between now and the elections, and that will run the cost of this building up to a million dollars? That is the question. I am sure the hon. gentleman ought to thank his stars that there was a Langevin block, as otherwise he would not be where he is to-day. He need not reflect upon the Langevin block. It is an old Scotch saying that it is an ill wind that blows nobody any good, and it was an ill wind that blew the Minister where he is to-day; so he need not reflect upon what I said about the Langevin block. He ought to be delighted that there is a Langevin block and a Kingston graving dock, and all the other things. I know how the hon. gentleman kicked. He said that everything was being done by Mr. McGreevy. Well, the hon. gentleman has his St. Louis, and his other relations, as well as McGreevy, Larkin, Connolly & Co. I assure the hon. gentleman that I do not want to take his place in the Government of this country, but if I did take it, I am sure I would conduct the affairs of his department better than he is doing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have not heard a word of explanation about anything but the Halifax drill hall, and a very bad explanation it was. We want to know something about the Lunenburg post office, and also the Pictou post office.

Mr. OUIMET. This vote is the balance that will be required to complete the contract on the public building in Lunenburg. That includes the site, building, heating, furniture and everything connected with the building. The whole cost will be $34,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the population of Lunenburg?

Mr. OUIMET. The population in 1891 was 4,894.

Mr. McMULLEN. The receipts from customs are $2,270, and from post office, $100. There are forty places in Ontario where the receipts are over $4,000. The building is now being completed, and it is quite right the balance should be paid; but it shows that this work was undertaken for a purpose.

Mr. OUIMET. I am sorry the hon. member for Lunenburg is not present. He would say, what is quite correct, that Lunenburg is one of the most rapidly growing towns in Nova Scotia, and it is the second or third town in importance in the province.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The revenue does not show that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is a very thriving fishing town.

Mr. OUIMET. There is a very large amount of business done. No less than $13,658 was collected for customs. The exports were of the value of $911,848, and the imports, $400,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the explanation with regard to Pictou post office?

Mr. OUIMET. This vote is to complete the building, inclusive of fittings and furniture.

Mr. McMULLEN. The receipts are only $5,000 a year. There are thirty places in Ontario where the post office receipts are from $8,000 to $9,000.

Mr. OUIMET. The postal revenue was $5,592.

Mr. McMULLEN. The town of Woodstock gives a postal revenue of $16,000, and there are several other Ontario towns showing larger receipts. Nothing has been done in regard to erecting the building at Pictou, and I should like to know why a post office is to be built there when there are twenty or thirty places in Ontario giving double the postal revenue?

Mr. OUIMET. We have discussed that before.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Minister has no reply to offer, and so I will tell my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) why post offices are provided in small places, and not in towns like Woodstock, which give a large revenue to the country. Every hon. member knows that these amounts are voted for partisan and political purposes, although I do not know that the people are aware of that fact. The hon. Minister disregards altogether the amount of revenue received under various departments, but that should be recognized as the principle to govern the erection of these buildings altogether, irrespective of party reasons. If the hon. member did not know the reasons why these votes were passed for small places, I think I have stated it pretty plainly, and the Minister of Public Works and other members of the Government, on the present occasion will not attempt to deny it. I simply take the opportunity to make this statement so that the people of the country may understand that while in the past, members of the Government have endeavoured to give some reasons why towns and cities showing a larger revenue from post office, inland revenue, and customs, had been passed over and other places had been selected for grants, the Ministers have now given up any defence, and admit that in their administration of affairs these grants are made for party purposes, and not for the public service. If that is the admission of the Government, it is well that the House and the people should know it.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. member has insinuated, or rather stated very broadly that in the public expenditure, which we are sorry to hear is so very much limited this year by the income of the Dominion, only constituencies represented by supporters of the Government have been favoured in the distribution of these funds.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I did not state that. I know there are some constituencies passed over represented by Government supporters. I did not insinuate anything, I made a broad statement. My statement was, that the expenditure was made in constituencies where it would answer party purposes. I did not say that it was all given to Tory constituencies which should have it.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman did not make an insinuation, he made a very broad statement. He is not in the habit of insinuating anything, because, known and respected as he is by both sides of the House, he has the courage to state, and to state broadly, what he means. He has told the Committee this afternoon that this expenditure is made solely for political purposes. I do not believe that such is the case, because I do not think a Government, composed of its present members would so distribute the public funds.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. KENNY. That is my opinion. But I would remind hon. gentlemen opposite that some years ago, in 1878, when the good people of Canada thought the Grit party had ruled this country badly long enough, one of the members, when he appeared before his constituents in Nova Scotia made this appeal. He stated that during the five years the Government had been in power they had spent $1,877,704, as against only $650,288 spent by the Conservative Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. Where?

Mr. KENNY. In Nova Scotia. That was an appeal made by a member of the Cabinet. And if it is very naughty to do so to-day, it must have been equally so in 1878. I do not like these tu quoque arguments, I admit, but it is just as well when an hon. gentleman makes such a statement, that he should be reminded that his own party have transgressed much more flagrantly than the present Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the statement made by the hon. gentleman proves that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statement made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) only proves that there was an expenditure made, and that there was an expenditure where the largest amount of revenue was collected, and where the public interest required expenditures to be made. In Pictou a public building was erected deliberately for the purpose of a post office and customs and inland revenue department, which I am told is large enough to embrace nearly the whole population. Last year when this matter was under consideration, the Minister of Public Works told us that though that building might be adequate in its accommodation for a post office as well as for the other purposes, yet the present Minister of Justice had set his heart upon having a post office in this place, and as he was away in Paris the Minister of Public Works did not like to assume the responsibility of striking the vote out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was here last session and we voted the amount without dispute.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, it was the year before. However, it is a work that has already been undertaken and partially completed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The site has only been bought.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is nearly completed, and I have about 1,500 applications from parties willing to take care of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would embrace nearly every man, woman and child of the population.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there so many out of employment under the National Policy ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No ; but they would all like to be employed at that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I believe it to be the fact that the Mackenzie Government laid down the rule, that public buildings were to be erected in places whence the greatest revenue was received. It will not be disputed that this was the rule, and whether in the case referred to by the hon. member (Mr. Kenny) it was departed from or not, I am not prepared to say. An hon. gentleman who was a member of the Mackenzie Government tells me it was not. I know, however, that that rule was regarded in Ontario, and I hold that some such rule should govern the administration of affairs to-day. The conduct of the present Government in this respect is a violation of their trust. I am glad to know that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who is looked upon as an honourable business man, has expressed himself as ashamed that no member of the Government would stand up and deny the statement that I have made. The time has come when the people of this country should know that the rule which this Government adopts in erecting public buildings, is not a rule in the public interest, but for the purpose of securing votes. For myself, as representing the county of Oxford, which perhaps is the gravest case of neglect on the part of the Government in this respect, I thought that if a petition were laid before the Government some years ago, and that they recognized the large amount of revenue received from the town of Woodstock, that town would receive some consideration from them. However, I was mistaken. If the people are willing that the public money should be spent in this improper fashion we have to abide by it ; but it is our duty to expose it in the meantime, and to point out to the people how their affairs are being administered.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would be glad to have some of the Ministers confirm the assertion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), that appropriations for public buildings are not made for political purposes in any case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That goes without saying.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would the Secretary of State tell us why an appropriation was made for a post office in the insignificant village of Cayuga, why a port of entry was made at Hagarsville, another small village, and why a bridge was built across the Grand River, all of which happened to be in his riding ? If these appropriations were made in the public interest then there are a great many villages in this Dominion which need public buildings as badly as Cayuga does. The truth is, that the appropriations for buildings have been made by this Government in a manner to warrant the suspicion that the object they had in view was to secure political influence. Such must have been the case in the instances I have cited in the county of Haldimand. If you trace the object of these appropriations in the different provinces, you will find that it is of a character to wield a certain degree of political influence in favour of the supporters of the Government. I assert in the broadest terms that the Government of this Dominion have spent money for railway subsidies, for the erection of public buildings, and in various other ways, for the express purpose of influencing votes, and that they have used millions of money belonging to the people for the purpose of bribing the people in an indirect manner to keep them in office, and to continue the same species of misgovernment that they have perpetrated for many years past. In regard to the assertion of my hon. friend (Mr. Kenny) that the Mackenzie Government had been extravagant in their appropriations for the province of Nova Scotia——

Mr. KENNY. Excuse me, I did not find fault with the expenditure.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman sought to convey the impression that the expenditure of the Mackenzie Government was excessive as compared with the present Government.

Mr. KENNY. I did not make that argument.

Mr. CHARLTON. The expenditure of the Mackenzie Government for public works the last year they were in office was $997,000, and the expenditure by this Government for public works last year was $2,033,000, or considerably more than double the amount. The financial record of the Mackenzie Government, in whatever way we may look upon it, proved that Government to have been economical and thrifty in their management of the fiscal affairs of the country.

Mr. KENNY. The people do not think so.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps they did not ; but as regards the question of fact it does not matter what the people think.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. The question is : What are the facts ? If the Mackenzie Government are arraigned at the bar of public opinion, and the people arrive at a conclusion diametrically opposite to the facts, that proves that the people are ignorant of the matter, but it does not prove that the Mackenzie Government are wrong. The Mackenzie Government had a good and honest financial record, and the people of the country are beginning to understand that now. The Mackenzie Government increased the expenditure but very slightly, and where they had to increase

it to any extent, it was to meet the obligations entered into by their predecessors. The financial record of the Mackenzie Government from whatever point it is viewed, commends itself to the people of Canada. I repeat that it is useless for the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), or for any other member of this House, to deny that this Government have used vast sums of money in the form of appropriations, not for the purpose of carrying on public business, not for the purpose of judicious and proper expenditure; but they have made these appropriations wholly for the purpose of influencing public opinion in ridings, and benefiting themselves as a political party. They have taken the money of the people, in point of fact, to buy the people and to maintain themselves in position.

Mr. RIDER. Is it customary for the Government to build letter boxes and drawers in the Government post offices?

Mr. OUIMET. In all the public buildings that we own ourselves.

Mr. RIDER. Who receives the rentals for the letter boxes and drawers?

Mr. FOSTER. That comes under another vote.

New Brunswick—Marysville public building $5,000

Mr. CHARLTON. What is this building for, and what is it to cost?

Mr. OUIMET. The cost will be very reasonable. The sum now voted has been two years on the paper, and has not been expended; but it is expected that arrangements will be made during the year to have this building constructed.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the revenue of this post office now? I do not find in the report that there is such a post office as Marysville. I would like to know what the receipts are.

Mr. OUIMET. If the hon. gentleman cannot find it in the report, I am afraid I cannot.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suppose the Government now admit that if a grant is asked for a new building at a place which they do not know the revenue of that is evidence that there is some other object to be served than the public good. I think that is very clear, because the Government are not able to say whether any revenue is derived from this post office or not.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is extravagant in his assertions. He would lead the House to believe that there is no business in Marysville. If my hon. friend had ever been there, he would have found a most thriving village, where a large number of people live and an immense amount of business is done. I cannot at the present moment tell what the revenue is, but it is comparatively large. This proposed public building is intended to accommodate the post office and other public offices. There is no public building there at present.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is a wide departure from the rule to which the Government pledged themselves. There are a hundred places where there is no post office, but where there is a larger population and a larger revenue than at this place.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a very exceptional place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A very exceptional place, and a very exceptional thing; I have not the slightest doubt about that. I want to know a little more about Marysville. The hon. gentleman says it is a thriving village. Does it contain a population of 1,500 souls?

Mr. FOSTER. More than that—about 2,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And a village of 2,000 souls requires, in the present state of the public revenue, a public building which is to cost how much? Is this $5,000 for the site, or what is it for?

Mr. OUIMET. The building is to cost something like $8,000, not more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that there can be no more wasteful use of public money than to stud these little insignificant places with public buildings which will require an expenditure of $1,500 or $2,000 a year to keep them up, when the whole work might be done for $150, while in many parts of the country there are places with six or seven times the population and twenty times the revenue which the Government do not consider worthy of the slightest notice. I cannot imagine anything more utterly at variance with all principles of sound policy than this practice of going in search of little villages for the purpose of erecting public buildings in them. It is bribery pure and simple, and nothing else.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is quite wrong. I said that this was an exceptional place and so it is; and if my hon. friend had ever been at Marysville, he would understand what I mean. It has a business and a population and a condition of things which I think are unique in this country. The amount of business done there is very large. One of the largest cotton mills in Canada, with a large number of operatives, is there; it is the centre of an immense lumber trade; it has a large brick yard; and altogether it is a perfect hive of industry. The population is about 2,000. The village is exceptionally well built. Besides the places of business, the mills, the factory, and the like, the houses of the operatives engaged in these industries are all built very neatly of

brick and in a superior style of architecture for that kind of dwellings. There is a church, built by the chief business man of the place at a cost of over $30,000—one of the most beautiful and ornamental churches in the province of New Brunswick, or for that matter in Canada. The object for a number of years has been to have a public building somewhat in keeping with the thrift and the general characteristics of the village itself. Mr. Gibson gives one of the finest plots of land in the village as the site. The building is to be built at an exceptionally low rate of cost. When completed it will not cost over $7,000 or $8,000. There are to be no charges of caretakers or the like. The postmaster will be the caretaker and superintendent of the building. My hon. friends have spent a good deal of time criticising votes, and they have let a great many votes go through which might very well be criticised, but they are to-day spending their criticism upon one of the most defensible votes which we could possibly bring down in the Estimates.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think the hon. leader of the House is justified in making the statement he did. When I first started to criticise the vote, I do not know that I ever have objected to a vote for a public building in other places. It is the principle on which the money is being expended that I object to. The hon. gentleman himself voted for a rule which should govern the expenditure of public money with regard to public buildings. This rule is now flagrantly violated, and the only rule that seems to govern the public expenditure now, is the rule of partisan advantage.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not say that other constituencies represented by Conservatives in this House have not cause for complaint. I am sure my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Masson), who sits so quietly by, has cause. I know that there is a petition from his county asking for a public building in a place very much larger than this one, and where the revenue would probably exceed the expenditure. The hon. leader of the House can hardly expect members to sit quietly by when the rule which was laid down is not only violated but set aside altogether. Under any circumstances, I would be justified in asking what is the revenue. The hon. gentleman has not stated what the postal revenue in that town is. I think that is a very reasonable question, and when we receive that answer, I think it is right that we should point out other places which have twenty and thirty times the revenue, and to the petitions from which for public buildings no attention is paid. The hon. gentleman himself is a candidate in this particular constituency, and while he boasts of his exceeding carefulness in economizing, while he talks to other representatives from other sections on the decrease in the revenue and the necessity to economize, yet in a constituency where he expects to become a candidate himself, he finds it convenient to ask for a vote of $8,000 for a public building to be put up in a place so small that the Government is not able to give us any idea of what its postal revenue is. I do not want to be unfair here, but I want to find out whether the statement I made is correct or not; and if it is not, I want to be put right here.

Mr. FOSTER. I tell my hon. friend straight that the vote does not bear the construction fairly which he puts upon it, and which he wishes the House to put upon it. The construction he puts upon it is that because at the next election I will be a candidate in York, this vote is put in. I can tell my hon. friend that there is not the slightest connection between my candidacy in York——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I repeat there is not the slightest connection between my candidacy in York and this vote for a post office. My hon. friends smile. They will give me the courtesy of making a statement; and if they will not, the country at large will give me the credit of being truthful in making that statement, I am not obliged to make it. The arrangement with reference to the building at Marysville was entered into three years ago, and is being carried out by the Department of Public Works, but some consideration with reference to the plans and the like delayed the construction: but if I had not been a candidate in York, the same vote would have been in the Estimates. With that slight explanation, I wish to say that there is not the least connection between my candidacy in York and this vote. All the same I am very glad the vote is there. It is surely not in the category of new post offices, but is a matter at least three years old, and is carrying out what has been in progress during that time.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. When we rose at six o'clock it was understood that the hon. Minister would state the amount of receipts of this office.

Mr. OUIMET. I expected to get the figures from the Postmaster General, but I could not. I will try and give it to the hon. gentleman before these items are finished.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In that case the item had better stand.

Mr. OUIMET. I think the hon. gentleman will probably not insist——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is a peculiar case, and we are entitled to some information. The hon. Minister must recognize the position of those of us who are interested in this matter.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman will have another opportunity of discussing the matter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think we can best discuss the question upon this item. I have no intention of going behind the hon. gentleman's back to say anything that I would not say to him publicly. I stated that I wanted to use this information before the public, and would like to get it on the floor of the House. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, and I think the most convenient way would be to let the item stand.

Mr. OUIMET. There is a feature of this case that applies to other cases as well, and which it might be as well to state. This building is to be built half by private subscription, as it were. This is a young and thriving village, and the people were anxious not only to give the site, but to reduce the cost in every way. Since I came into the department, no new vote as to post offices has been taken. When the public revenue increases again to normal proportions, the claims of other places including that urged by the hon. gentleman will be taken up—unless it is taken up by another Government, as was hinted. I have no doubt that then full justice will be done to these places which have been forgotten.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It would be good to know that all governments would do justice.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have the report of the Postmaster General for the year ending 30th June, 1893, and I see no Marysville post office mentioned.

Mr. OUIMET. For the same reason, I cannot find it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have the same report for 1894, and I do not find in it either the name of Marysville among the list of post offices. No other post office in New Brunswick is omitted. I think that, under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman should allow the item to stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no desire to delay the Committee. But I think the hon. Minister will see that we shall get along much faster with the Estimates if this item is allowed to stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Stand.

Quebec—Richmond Post Office and Customs and Inland Revenue Offices..... $5,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is this all that is required for this work?

Mr. OUIMET. The total cost of this building, including site, furniture, and everything, will be $15,502.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the entire receipts of this post office last year were $2,084.77. The amount paid for the office now occupied is $100. Here we are about to spend $15,000 to provide a post office in the place where there is a revenue of a little over $2,000, and there are fifty places in this country having receipts of $5,000 that have no post office.

Mr. OUIMET. This building will also accommodate the other services—customs and inland revenue.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the amount of inland revenue collected here?

Mr. OUIMET. Through some error, that and the amount of customs receipts has been omitted from my notes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was this building commenced before the present Minister came into office?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not say exactly that it was commenced before my time, but I can say that it had been on the programme and that I had to carry out the promise made by the Government.

Rimouski Post Office, Custom-house, &c., site to be given free of cost by municipality $5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to draw attention to this case, also. Last year the receipts of this post office were only $1,856. The rent of the office we occupy now is $400 a year. And yet we are going to build a new post office there.

Mr. OUIMET. This will accommodate also the customs and inland revenue services. The customs duties amounted to $11,055. The building will also accommodate the new office in connection with the Agriculture Department, the officer attending to the quarantine business. All the public services will be accommodated there. Though this place may not be growing very fast, it is very important as being the head of summer navigation.

Mr. McMULLEN. You have now a post office that answers all purposes, and you are paying $80 a year for it. How much will this building cost?

Mr. OUIMET. About $15,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. At 4 per cent, that is $600 a year. We are getting post office accommodation for $80, and we are going now to invest $15,000 in a post office which, at 4 per cent, will cost $600 a year.

Mr. OUIMET. As I have already said, Rimouski is the head of ocean navigation,

practically, in the summer time. All the first-class passengers, all the people of some importance and of means, leave the steamer at Rimouski, and this public building will give them a good opinion of the country when they set their foot for the first time on the shores of the St. Lawrence. I think from that point of view it will be a useful expenditure.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the public will have a better opinion of this country if the Government would manage to keep us out of debt, and to abstain from expenditures of the character of some of those we have been criticising. There is no justification for a country situated as Canada is, with an enormous debt, with burdens weighing upon the people beyond their ability to pay, indulging in reckless and extravagant appropriations of the character the Government are making. Rimouski may be an important point for tourists, it may be a point where vessels call for the last time when bound outward, but it is small place of 1,800 inhabitants, the post office revenue of which is less than $2,000 a year; and the other business of the place, I fancy, is very small indeed. I would like to ask the Minister how much customs duties are collected there, and how much inland revenue. There are scores of places in Canada of very much more importance, that are not entitled to public buildings, and do not receive them. I have no doubt this rental of $80 a year procures a building ample for the wants of the post office service, and a small sum would provide accommodation for a custom-house for all the business done at that place. If we had plenty of money, and the country did not feel it, it would be all very well, but we have not plenty of money, we have a very large debt, we have a deficit this year, we are unable to meet our obligations, unable to meet our expenditures, and yet the Government are lavishing money by these appropriations, and have been doing so for years past, doing it in opposition to the promise of their leader of two years ago, that in making appropriations for public buildings, they would be governed by the amount of business that had to be accommodated, and by no other consideration. This consideration does not apply here, and there is no justification for the appropriation we have under discussion at this moment.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is not fair, I think. He forgets that this building is to be used not only for the post office, but also for the customs, the inland revenue, and the quarantine station. Therefore, he ought to add to the rent of the post office, a sum that would cover rentals for buildings for all those other services. I think it would require at least $400 to pay rentals for all these other services. So that when the hon. gentleman says that $80 suffices to pay all these services, he is not doing justice to the Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. What rental are you paying for accommodation for the custom-house officer there now?

Mr. OUIMET. I have not the figures, but the building will accommodate him also. We pay $80 for the rent of the post office alone. The hon. gentleman knows what kind of accommodation that sum will procure us. An allowance of $80 procures us one of these little places where the postmaster keeps the post office in his private house. As a rule, these post offices are not a credit to the country. As I have said, Rimouski is an important point by reason of the fact that many strangers call there, and it is important that they should be favourably impressed by the buildings which the country provides for its public services. Suppose a gentleman travelling over the continent, stops at Rimouski to get some letters, and he goes into a small room used as a kitchen to inquire for his letters; certainly he is not very forcibly impressed with the resources of this country. In this view, I think the expenditure ought not to be criticised by the hon. gentleman as useless.

Mr. BOWERS. The remarks of the hon. Minister, if they apply to Rimouski, apply with far greater force to Digby. Here is the centre of a large mail service for all the western part of Nova Scotia, a large number of people are continually coming in from the United States, as it is one of the chief watering-places of the maritime provinces. There is only a small post office, hardly as large as that table, where the people have to squeeze in to get their letters. There is no custom-house building, and the customs officer has to keep the office in his own house, and the inland revenue officer the same. The revenue collected in Digby is $500 more than is furnished by Rimouski. Digby is a great centre for the delivery of the mail, and if Rimouski requires a new post office and custom-house, Digby requires them with much greater reason.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can explain to my hon. friend that the reason why Digby is neglected in this respect is because it is not represented by a Minister of the Crown, while Rimouski is. Before dinner we were discussing the granting of money to build a post office in the prospective seat of a Minister of the Crown, and we are now granting money to finish a post office in a seat now held by a Minister. My hon. friend will therefore understand that if Digby were represented by a Minister of the Crown, it would have a post office, in accordance with the ideas of the Minister of Public Works, who stated himself that of course the Government, when they have public money to expend, would consult the interests of their friends first.

Mr. OUIMET. I am sure the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) will admit that Digby has not been illtreated. We have spent nearly $28,000 to make a wharf there,

which will compare in usefulness and solidity with any work of that kind that has been built in the whole Dominion. I did not wait until the county elected a friend of the Government before doing that work, which the department considered was useful and necessary work. I am sure that when the resources of this country are sufficient, the claim of Digby for a public building will be duly considered.

Mr. BOWERS. I have no particular fault to find with the Minister; I was only putting forth the claims of Digby in this respect. I will give this credit to the Minister of Public Works, that I think since I have represented Digby, he has treated me fairly well as regards public works.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman ought to have said so at once.

Mr. GUAY. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before the Committee should pass to the next item, I should like to inquire from the hon. gentleman if he has taken in earnest consideration the request addressed to him by the city council of Lévis for the building of a post office in the limits of the town of Lévis?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The request of the city council of Lévis has certainly received the most earnest consideration of the Government; but as the revenues of the country, at the present time, are not very large, we had to postpone this very good work to some other time. We are compelled to postpone some of the works that will win us the gratitude of Lévis as well as other places. We cannot do all in a day, but I hope the beautiful town of Lévis will have its turn as well as a building worthy of it.

Mr. GUAY. (Translation.) I understood that one of the strongest arguments, as given by the hon. gentleman a moment ago, that induced the Governmnet to build a post office at Rimouski, was that many foreigners, coming especially from Europe, called there, and that it was in order to give them a good opinion of the country that the Government was building a post office there. If such a reason holds good for Rimouski, it ought to hold doubly good for Lévis, where a great many foreigners, coming from Europe and elsewhere, call every day. They would thus be in a better position to judge whether the Administration by which we are ruled is good or bad, and in particular whether the country is prosperous. We must bear in mind that the town of Lévis is one of the most important of the province of Quebec, from the standpoint of population. The post office there gives a large revenue. One of these gives about $1,500 a year; another one gives over $1,300, and then there is the South Quebec post office. The aggregate revenue of these three post offices is over $3,000. It seems to me the request made by the voters of Lévis was very justifiable, and I am surprised the Government should not have thought it their duty to meet it during this session; but, as stated by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the Government have not done distributing their favours, and I am pleased to think that next year they will grant a share of them to the voters of Lévis.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) In answer to the statements just made by the hon. gentleman with respect to foreigners who call at Lévis, I have only this to say, that the sight that offers to their gaze is so grand that an additional building in the town of Lévis would not do much to raise the country in their esteem. Indeed, the panorama which unfolds itself to their gaze is such a beautiful one, that they need no post office at Lévis to provoke their admiration.

Mr. CHARLTON. With respect to the item for Grosse Isle quarantine station, $1,000, I observe that it is only one-fifth of the amount voted last year. Does the Minister expect to reduce the expenditure at that station by that amount?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes, this is only for repairs. Two years ago the quarantine station was placed in such a state of repair as to meet every requirement. All that is now needed is to maintain it in a good condition.

Mr. LAURIER. From what appropriation is it proposed to take the money which is to be spent upon repairing a new post office at Laurentides?

Mr. OUIMET. Out of the general vote for repairs and furnishings, $10,000.

Mr. LAURIER. If I understood the Minister aright, in answer to a question, he stated yesterday, or the day before, that he proposed to spend $350 in connection with the post office at Laurentides? If I understood his answer, it was that he had not purchased a building, but that he had leased a building for five years at an annual rental of $300, including fuel, light and repairs. I should like to know from the hon. gentleman what reason there can be to justify such a course of action. Laurentides is a small place, with a population of not more than 2,000 people, if that many, and the revenue derived last year from the post office was $787.41. Yet the hon. gentleman has rented a building at an annual rental of $300. I know the place well, and I venture to say, and I am sure that my statement cannot be contradicted, that it never was rented for more than $3 per month, or $36 per year, for the last fifteen years. The place is an ordinary country place, a large village incorporated as a town. The revenue is not $800 a year. There is not in the whole province of Quebec a single place for which more than $100 is given for rent, fuel and light, with certain exceptions which I shall name. For the post

office at St. Jean, suburbs of Quebec, $400 is given for rent, fuel and light, and from that office we get a revenue of over $5,000. Then there is St. Roch's, in the same city, where for rent, fuel and light the Government pay $708.31, but receive a revenue of $7,000. For the post office at St. Sauveur there is paid $426.60 for rent, fuel and light, and the revenue received is $2,000. The town of Laurentides, as I have said, gives a revenue of $787.41. It does not cost the country anything at present for rent, fuel and light, which are supplied by the postmaster. The post office is kept by a storekeeper in his store in the same manner as in hundreds and thousands of other places, and I ask where is the justification for entering into an agreement to pay $300 a year rent under such circumstances ?

Mr. OUIMET. I will state the reasons why I yielded to the solicitations made on the department for several years in regard to a post office at Laurentides. I have already stated in this House that, in my opinion, in a great many places first-class accommodation could be obtained at a much cheaper rate than to build costly structures to accommodate the public service, and I suggested as one means to adopt the payment of a reasonable rent to the private owner of a fine building, such as this is, which could be used as a post office, and after furnishing it properly we could thereby obtain adequate accommodation at a relatively small expenditure. While I do not wish to indulge in provincialism, I wish the expenditure on public buildings to be as adequately distributed as possible among the different provinces. There are other reasons beyond the mere providing of accommodation for the public service that would support the selection of suitable public buildings, and that was that public buildings should be erected so as to reflect credit on the country, and act, as it were, as an advertisement. Having these points in view, I thought that an experiment might be made in the line I have indicated, and I considered I was justified, in order to set at rest the claims of that town, which were certainly equal to those of a great many other towns, in ascertaining how such a plan would work, not only as regards the department, but also as to whether it would meet with the approbation or approval of Parliament. I think the department should be congratulated on having tried this experiment. If we had been obliged to erect a building there, it would have been necessary to take into account the interest on the money invested, the payment of caretaker, also payment for heating, light and repairs, and other expenditures which make the service for public buildings more expensive than I should like to see it. I should be inclined to reduce it if I could ; but for various reasons, Parliament has been willing to incur that expenditure, and I would not be justified in criticising its action. The agreement in this case has been made for five years, and it will furnish an experiment which may guide the department in its management. The hon. gentleman is really not doing justice to himself when he states that Laurentides is deserving of no more attention than any other place, when if legend be true this village has the great honour of being the birth place of my hon. friend. That fact reflects credit on the town, and something more than ordinary attention should be given to it. I am really astonished to see the first experiment I have initiated, made at a place which should be so dear to the heart of the hon. gentleman, so severely criticised by him. No doubt, the question of economy has suggested the hon. gentleman's remarks, but I shall be very much disappointed if I do not meet with the support of the House in making this experiment I have outlined.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has been very kind to refer to this place as my birthplace. It is ; and it is because it is my birthplace, and because I have maintained a deep interest in it, that I do not like to see it associated with any form of boodle. Setting aside all the blandishments of the Minister of Public Works, I must say that I will not favour corruption in any form whatever. The hon. gentleman has stated that this is an experiment, and that it is cheaper to rent a place like this than to build a post office as was done in Rimouski. I quite agree with him in that. Does the hon. gentleman lay down as a principle, that every place from which a revenue of $780 is derived is to have a post office ? If he does, and if that is the rule which is to prevail, then the hon. gentleman had better make appropriations at once for the expenditure of millions of dollars. The salary of the postmaster here is $270 a year, and is, I dare say, adequate for the work he does : but it is not adequate to give him a living, and he has to do something else. As is the case in many other places, the man is a general merchant, and keeps the post office in the store, and the idea of renting a place for $300 at some distance away is preposterous. The thing has been done simply because the owner of that place which is to be rented, had an elephant on his hands, and did not know what to do with the building. I am informed that he has not derived $30 a year for that building during fifteen years, and this is the place, forsooth, that the Minister of Public Works says he has agreed to rent for $300 a year. There is no possible justification for such conduct as that. It is nothing else but a job, perpetrated to do a favour to a political hack of the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The present postmaster is paid $270 a year, and it is important for us to know whether, in future,

he will be compelled to devote himself entirely to the keeping of the post office, or whether it is intended that the postmaster shall carry on his general store in a building rented by the Government, and the rent of which is paid out of the public treasury. If that is not the intention, then is it the intention to force the present postmaster out of his position so as to make room for another person ?

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I am very familiar with this question of the St. Lin post office, and one of the reasons why I am so much familiar with it is that the petition asking for this post office was presented to the Government by myself. The hon. leader of the Opposition is not well informed if he has only the information he has given to the Committee. I must tell him that his information is contrary to facts. The petition to which I have just referred was addressed to me, and I sent it to the department which had to deal with it. The hon. leader of the Opposition can see the petition, either in the Post Office Department or in that of the Public Works. This petition was signed by his political friends as well as by the Conservatives, and I will say why. This petition was addressed to me as representative of the county, and I sent it to the department, and it was signed by both the Liberal and Conservative merchants of the place.

All the merchants in that locality, both Liberal and Conservative have petitioned the Government to change the post office to this place. It is on the petition that the Government, after having waited for two years have agreed to rent the house mentioned. The leader of the Opposition says that this place could not be rented for more than $3 a month. He is mistaken in that. The department could not take possession of that house before the 1st of April, because the lodgings in it were rented one for $8 a month, and the other one was rented in the winter, after the fire, for $5 a month. I declare here publicly that in the whole parish of St. Lin, and in the whole town of Laurentides, there are not ten people dissatisfied with the new post office. I have nothing to say against the present postmaster. There are as many Liberals as Conservatives in that town, and they have all signed a petition to take the post office out of the present general store. One of those who signed the petition is well known to the leader of the Opposition, and is Mr. Gauthier, brother of the late member for L'Assomption. St. Lin is not a large town now, but is the centre of a fertile and productive district. The Canadian Pacific Railway has its terminus there, and the line will, we hope, soon be extended to Joliette. It is a fine market-place, and Mr. Gauthier, the ex-member, buys largely of the products of the country there. The people are anxious that it should thrive quickly, and the Government must help it along. Laurentides, the town itself, is building one of the finest hotels in the northern country, outside of Montreal. The only thing I regret is that the Government has not seen fit to erect a fine building there, at a cost of $10,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). An hotel ?

Mr. JEANNOTTE. Oh, no, the hotel is nearly finished now, and the Government has nothing to do with it. If the Government spent $10,000 there in erecting a post office it would be money well applied. It is a centre there, which serves all the parishes around.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is the hub of the universe.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. Oh, no ; I know the Montreal people would not go there. It has a large saw-mill and flour mills, and if the hon. members of the Opposition would like to have a pleasant journey, they might go and see the place, and when they come back they will ask the Government to grant $10,000 for a post office there. Hon. gentlemen need not think this is a great favour to that town. It is simply an act of justice, which was petitioned for first by the Liberals. I am surprised that the hon. leader of the Opposition does not like it. At L'Assomption I was not authorized to make the statement I did, but I took upon myself to tell the people that if they wanted the same thing they could have it, and they refused it. They said : We do not want any building rented here ; we want to have a fine post office to cost at least $10,000. The hon. leader of the Opposition seems to think it was a great favour to St. Lin. to rent a house when the proprietor is obliged to furnish fuel and light, lamps and everything. I would like to know if there is any member of the Opposition who would furnish all these things for $50 or $60 a year. I am sure there is not one ; I would not do it myself. On the whole, I do not think the Government has done a favour to Laurentides ; it has only done an act of justice, and at the request of the Liberals ; and I am sure all the Liberals will be satisfied with it.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the House will be much obliged to my hon. friend for giving us all this information, which I knew, but which I could not, I am sure, have put so well as my hon. friend has done. I quite agree with him that the Government have done no favour to the town of Laurentides by putting this grant in the Estimates ; but they have done a great favour to one of their friends who happened to have an elephant on his hands—who had a house which he could not rent except occasionally for more than $30 a year, and who is to receive from the Government $300 a year. This is the man who receives a favour from the Government. I agree with the hon. gentleman that no one here would furnish

fuel and light for $50 or $60 a year; but the present postmaster furnishes it for nothing at all; and which is the most advantageous to the country—that the Government should pay these things, or should receive them from the present postmaster for nothing? The hon. gentleman says St. Lin is a very large town, with saw-mills, flour mills, hotels, markets, and so forth; yet with all these the revenue of the post office is only $780. It is too bad that a town of that size should furnish no more revenue than that. That ought to be, after all, the basis of the expenditure of money for such purposes—the amount of business done in the place. The expenditure at present is the salary of the postmaster, $270, which leaves a balance of $510 to the credit of the country. Now you add $300 a year of rent, which will leave a balance of only $210. As I said before, it is impossible to justify this transaction; it is a job—we can call it nothing else.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. The hon. leader of the Opposition thinks the postmaster's salary is too high. The law governing salaries of this kind was passed, I think, fifty or sixty years ago, and this is the only department that has not made progress. I think it is a shame for a country like ours to have postmasters who have to keep their places open from the beginning of the week to the end, and sometimes on Sundays, and from 9 o'clock in the morning till night, and to pay them only $20 a year. Last year I drew the attention of the Government to this. I think the law should be changed. It is said there is a deficit in that department. Well, I do not care much about deficits; I care more for the welfare of the country; and I think the Government cannot have employees without paying them properly. I regard the postmasters as employees of the Government, and it is a shame to pay them only $20 or $30 or $35 a year. The salary of a postmaster should not be based upon the revenue he receives; it should be based upon the business done in the locality. The hon. leader of the Opposition asks why the revenue of Laurentides is not larger than $780 a year if the town is so large and so busy. It is very easy to explain. Ten years ago not more than ten newspapers per week were received there, whereas now between eighty and a hundred are received and distributed every week. These do not yield any revenue, but they give work to the postmaster. Besides that we have the "Journal d'Agriculture," which is distributed gratuitously and does not give any revenue to the postmaster, and all those small circulars.

Mr. AMYOT. Why does he not resign, if he has too much work?

Mr. JEANNOTTE. No, he will not resign. All the business men of the Laurentides have petitioned the Government against having a post office in a general store, and are very much pleased that the post office should be put in a private building, which is not occupied as a store.

Mr. LAVERGNE. If an equal distribution of public money in the province of Quebec, as well as in the other provinces, is to have any force, I would suggest to the hon. Minister to look up the names of the different post offices and see which deserve more consideration. I would draw his attention to my constituency, where he will find a dozen post offices from which the Government derives a revenue of from a $1,000 to $1,500 a year. I might mention Drummondville, Arthabaskaville, Victoriaville, Stanfold, Warwick, and several others. The reason given by the Government to-night for the absurd expenditure on post offices are about as convincing as those given in 1892 when they spent $20,000 on a post office at Laprairie, which gives an income to the Government of $400 a year. The reason then given was that it was a historic place. Now the reason for the expenditure at Laurentides is that the leader of the Opposition was born there, and that it is a railway terminus. I might tell the hon. gentleman that there are, in my county, several large towns which are railway terminuses, but for which I would not dare to ask for a vote for a public building. If all that was required was to get a petition signed by Liberals and Conservatives, that would be a most easy thing to do. It is impossible to commend this vote on any grounds. We are unable to get the information we want with regard to it, and the only reason we can find for it is that we are on the eve of an election.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that what the Minister has proposed cannot have had the approval of his colleagues, and certainly the explanation given by the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte) is of a very extraordinary character. In a comparatively small town, where the postmaster must keep the office in connection with some business, in order to be able to live, the Minister of Public Works proposes to remove the office from the general merchant's store and put it into a rented building under a postmaster who does nothing else. It seems that the reason for this is because four or five other merchants are jealous. The post office, with its salary of $270 a year, is to be taken out of the hands of the postmaster, and put into a building for which $300 rent is paid, and a postmaster who does no other business, is to be appointed. Why did not the hon. gentleman admit that it is a scheme to force the postmaster, who is a merchant, out of office, and to put the work into the hands of a party who is in such poor circumstances that a salary of $270 will compensate him for the discharge of the duties. The man who can afford to live

on that amount of money, with no other business to attend to, and who is put in a building rented by the Government where he cannot carry on any other business, is a man whose circumstances are such that I would hardly care to put the distribution of the mail and the keeping of the office into his hands. The hon. gentleman, if he proposes to dismiss the postmaster, ought to have taken a more courageous way about it.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. The last speaker has said that a man who can live on a salary of $270 should not be trusted with keeping the post office, Well, we have no millionaires in our county, and a man with a revenue of $250 can keep house and live very well, and be just as honest as a man with $10,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then we understand the position to be this: The hon. gentleman moved by a patriotic desire to increase the population of this town desires a new office to be created which will maintain an additional family. If this is the policy of the Government, I have no doubt they will find numerous opportunities of applying it, not only in the village in question, but in many other villages, especially in New Brunswick. Just see what a field is opened there for adding to the enormous increase in population within the last few years. You might add 5,000 per cent to the population by such a principle judiciously applied. I recommend it to the hon. Minister of Finance.

Ontario—Arnprior Post Office, Custom-house, &c.. ..... $7,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the building to cost?

Mr. OUIMET. The cost of the Arnprior building is to be about $17,000.

Rideau Hall, heating apparatus, electric lighting, new dairy, etc..... $1,300

Mr. McMILLAN. How much of this goes to the dairy to be erected at Rideau Hall? I think that a few years ago a dairy was erected there.

Mr. OUIMET. Last year there was a vote of $5,000 under the same heading. We concluded that we would give the work by tender. This is a supplementary vote to complete the payments.

Dominion Reformatory $20,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What about this?

Mr. OUIMET. Nothing has been done by the department, with the exception of buying a farm.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where?

Mr. OUIMET. In Alexandria. It was a favourite scheme of our late Premier, as Minister of Justice, to provide a special place where juvenile offenders could be sent, and this has materialized in an appropriation being asked for that reformatory, and Alexandria has been selected as the most favourable place for it. The plans are not made yet, and I cannot say what the whole thing will cost.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the size of the farm?

Mr. OUIMET. One hundred acres.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And nothing has been done?

Mr. OUIMET. Nothing except the survey. We are waiting for special instructions from the Department of Justice to prepare the plans. And, as we have not very much money, we go pretty slow in order to meet the views of the hon. Minister of Finance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the cost roughly—we will not be particular within $20,000?

Mr. FOSTER. It is difficult to tell without the plans. This must be a specially designed building.

Mr. LAURIER. And are you so imprudent as to take money without having the plans ready?

Mr. FOSTER. How without the plans?

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman cannot say how much it will cost, yet he asks us to vote money.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not pretend that I have the information the hon. gentleman wants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Public Works can tell us.

Mr. OUIMET. If Parliament is of the opinion that such a reformatory would be a good thing for the country, I hope we shall not be stopped because we cannot tell within a thousand dollars what the cost will be. I understand that $100,000 will cover the whole thing. The sotimental part of the affair does not come within my department. I am only the building instrument.

Mr. SCRIVER. What is the sentimental part?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To secure the presence here of our friend from Glengarry.

Mr. OUIMET. It is considered most important that young offenders should be separated from the older criminals and sent to a prison where they will be free from the bad influence that permeates the atmosphere of the penitentiary. It is the experience—a very sad experience indeed—that, even under the severest regulations that can be devised to prevent intercourse among the inhabitants of these penitentiaries, if a young offender is left in an institution of that kind for two or three years, there are

five chances out of ten that he will leave with such ideas of virtue that ultimately his crmies will bring him back. The establishment of a special place of detention for these young offenders has been advised as the best way to obviate these evils.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There may be something to be said in favour of separating young offenders from the hardened ones, and if the hon. gentleman would extend the application and have a special wing in which to keep the junior Ministers from the older members of the Cabinet, I am not sure but that it would be a good thing.

Mr. OUIMET. I am sure the hon. gentleman would take advantage of that as well.

Mr. SCRIVER. What is the cost of the farm ?

Mr. OUIMET. I think it was $5,000.

Mr. SCRIVER. Has it been conveyed to the Government ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. INNES. Were any memorials in opposition to the proposed site presented to the Government ?

Mr. OUIMET. I cannot say as to that; but I am surprised that the hon. gentleman's recollection does not cover these matters, as the whole question has been the subject of discussion for two or three sessions.

Mr. INNES. But were memorials in opposition to the site presented ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes ; and it was mentioned in the report of the inspector.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is it the intention to bring criminals from all parts of the Dominion to this reformatory ? The Minister has just announced that the matter had been threshed on the floor of Parliament for two or three years, and thoroughly understood. Now, he admits, when asking for a grant of money, that no plan has been prepared, that it is merely the roughest kind of estimate as to what it may possibly cost in the future.

Mr. OUIMET. It is the intention to bring juvenile offenders from all parts of the Dominion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is it the policy of the Government to make any provision for sending these offenders, when discharged from these prisons, back to the place they came from, or to some other place ?

Mr. OUIMET. Certainly. Every convict who comes out of the penitentiary is provided with a good suit of clothes, his ticket and a sufficient amount of money to take him to his own place, and even to enable him to live long enough to procure employment. These regulations are in force in the penitentiaries, and I have no doubt they will be adopted in this reformatory.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand that the Government will bring juvenile offenders say, from British Columbia ?

Mr. OUIMET. As far as practicable, but the expense may stand in the way. But those are the regulations that will be submitted to the House when the reformatory is built.

North-west Territories—Public Buildings. $11,200

Mr. OUIMET. This sum is to be applied in carrying out works of renewal, improvements and repairs, which are not covered by any special or general appropriation made by Parliament, and have to be undertaken during the fiscal year 1895-96, in connection with Dominion public buildings in the North-west Territories under control of the Federal Government in order to place these buildings in a proper state of repair and efficiency by providing for the immediate requirements of the public service. Amongst other things, I see that an expenditure was required of $1,217 for the Calgary court-house, and $1,265 for the Regina post office.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the meaning of this Prince Albert court-house, $5,000 ?

Mr. OUIMET. That was one of the first buildings erected in the North-west Territories, and unfortunately it seems that the architects had not a sufficient knowledge of the nature of the ground and the severity of the climate in that new country, and they did not make the foundations deep enough to stand the frost. One side of the present building is almost tumbling down, and new foundations will have to be made. The intention, however, is to build a new building in a more central part of the town. The court-house and jail are now about one mile from the centre of the present town which is growing in a different direction from that which was at first expected.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This has only been built five or six years.

Mr. OUIMET. It has been built for a long time, but nearly every year we have had to take a vote in connection with it. I am told it was built about 1883, that is, the old court-house. The building we are now going to erect will be a new court-house. The present building will serve for the purposes of a jail and a police lock-up.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is it not a fact that this new building was put up and has never been occupied as a court-house, on account of the shoddy manner in which it was built ?

Mr. OUIMET. I have explained that the foundations were not deep enough, and the building was never very good, although it has served as a jail. I understand that the

judge last year, finding the building was so remote and was so uncomfortable, held the court in some other place nearer the centre of the town.

Mr. LAURIER. Where is the new building to be placed ?

Mr. OUIMET. In the centre of the town.

Mr. LAURIER. Has the site been purchased ?

Mr. OUIMET. Not yet.

British Columbia—
Dominion Public Buildings, renewals improvements, repairs, etc., $3,000 ; Victoria drill hall and accessory buildings $2,500 ; Victoria new post office, $40,000 ; total..... $45,500

Mr. LAURIER. What about the Victoria post office ?

Mr. OUIMET. The contract was given to Mr. Toms, of Ottawa, who died and the contract was transferred to Elford & Smith, of Victoria, by Order in Council dated 14th March, 1895, for the same price.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is the building to be erected on the site formerly purchased by the Government ; do I undestand that no second site has been purchased ?

Mr. OUIMET. No second site.

Mr. MARA. I wish to call the attention of the Government to the advisability of building a land office at Kamloops, with vaults large enough to contain books and papers. In the fall of 1893 the office there was burnt, and many of the records and books were destroyed. At present, a temporary office is rented for which $15 per month is paid. As rents go, that is as low as the Government could get a suitable building ; but for about $3,000 a building could be erected with vaults large enough to contain all books, papers, and applications. Great inconvenience would follow if another fire should occur, destroying applications for settlement. Considerable business is done at the office. The receipts last year were over $10,000, and ninety homestead applications were made for 13,000 acres of land. As a matter of simple precaution to save the Government property there should be proper vaults provided, and as a business investment it would pay the Government to erect a building, for they would save thereby $100 a year. I hope the Government will look into the matter.

Mr. OUIMET. The Minister of the Interior is not in his seat, but I may promise the hon. gentleman that I will lay the matter before him, and I am sure the Government will come to the best conclusion in the premises, from a business point as well as in the interest of preserving the valuable archives.

Mr. MARA. Last session I called attention to the subject, and reasons of economy were given then, as now, for not erecting a proper building.

Experimental Farms, new buildings, improvements, etc $6,000

Mr. McMILLAN. I should like some explanation as to where, and how the money is to be spent.

Mr. OUIMET. This amount is to carry out repairs and improvements on the different experimental farms throughout the Dominion.

Nova Scotia—Cow Bay Breakwater..... $4,000

Mr. McDOUGALD. What part of the repairs to Cow Bay breakwater does the department propose to undertake with $4,000?

Mr. OUIMET. That part which will be found absolutely necessary to keep the breakwater in place. I could not exactly say what part.

Mr. McDOUGALD. I wish to call attention to the fact that there is a large gap in the breakwater, and that $4,000 cannot repair it ; more like $10,000 will be required to connect the pieces now separated. I cannot understand what sort of repairs can be carried out for $4,000. The breakwater is a valuable one. It has been maintained by the Dominion for a great number of years, and has rendered great service to the marine, and I cannot understand how $4,000 is going to do anything towards maintaining the pier in its present position, or putting it into such a condition as to save it from further damage.

Mr. OUIMET. I must candidly say that when these Estimates were prepared the breakwater was not as badly damaged as it appears to be to-day, a great storm having damaged the breakwater since that time. I had reason to hope that, perhaps we might have a larger amount at our disposal if the Supplementary Estimates were to be granted, but it seems to be agreed by both sides of the House that Supplementary Estimates are to be dispensed with this session. So I must say to the hon. gentleman that this amount of $4,000 will be employed by our engineers with the best result possible, and I am sure they will do everything possible with that small amount to preserve the breakwater until next year, when I hope Parliament will be more generous towards the department. There is also a question of asking the coal companies to join in these repairs, as they are benefited by them, and these negotiations have not come to any practical issue yet. I assure the hon. gentleman that the question has not been lost sight of, and everything possible will be done to prevent that valuable work from being damaged.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is the first time I knew you to consult the Opposition about bringing down the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. OUIMET. I must say that in my opinion the Minister of Finance has done very wrong in consulting the Opposition, and especially yielding to their very earnest prayer.

Mr. BOWERS. What part of Digby pier is to be repaired for the $4,000 ?

Mr. OUIMET. There is a revote to enable the department to spend the balance of the appropriation in completing that part of the pier which was left unbuilt. This will make the wharf the most solid structure in that part of the country.

Mr. BOWERS. If the work is to be done this season, I hope the Minister will proceed with it at once, and not leave it until the fall of the year. The days are long now, the weather fine, and the water smooth and if the men are employed a good day's work may be obtained, instead of working half time if done in the autumn. If these repairs are not done at once the very first heavy gale will cary that part of the wharf away and then it will cost $10,000 or $15,000 to repair it.

Mr. OUIMET. It is the intention of the department to do the work at once.

Mr. BOWERS. Was the $300 voted last year for the Church Point wharf expended ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. McISAAC. Is the $1,000 for Arisaig wharf, to be expended this season or is it a revote to cover the expenses of last season.

Mr. OUIMET. The work has been ordered and I think it is now being done.

Mr. McISAAC. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the present condition of this wharf. It is in fairly good repair but although large sums of money have been expended on it, it does not afford the facilities to the shippers and others of that district which it should. I do not find particular fault with the Minister, but I want to call his attention to some facts in connection with this. The space between the wharf and the land has filled in with sandstone and other materials during the last year or more, so that it does not at all afford a safe harbour for sailing vessels. I am informed that if a dredge were sent there for two weeks, it would render it a safe harbour, and I trust that the Minister will do this. This harbour is on the northern coast of the province of Nova Scotia where the water is very rough and dangerous to vessels, and this is the only place in which they can seek safety. It is very necessary that a dredge should be sent there as soon as possible. This is a very important place not only because it affords facilities for shippers and travel, but because also a very valuable iron mine was discovered in the locality a few years ago. It was operated last year for the first time by the New Glasgow Iron Company, and as there are no railways there the ore had to be shipped in vessels from this wharf. Ordinary sailing vessels at the present time can only load at the end of the wharf, and often that is not safe, and unless they are enabled to land and load at the side, where greater safety would be afforded in rough weather, the wharf is practically of no use. There is a steamer subsidized by the Government of Nova Scotia which calls at this wharf, and at other ports in the counties of Antigonish and Inverness, and in order that this steamer may do her work properly, it is absolutely necessary that the harbour should be dredged at once. I trust that the Minister of Public Works shall see to it that the dredge, which I am told is now working in some place near, will be sent at once to Arisaig. Two or three weeks of dredging would afford sufficient facilities for landing of steamers and vessels and make a safe harbour for any class of vessels.

Prince Edward Island—	
General repairs to piers and breakwaters	$ 6,000
Kier's Shore—Extension to wharf and repairs	4,500
North Rustico—Repairs to breakwater, etc.	5,000
Souris—Reconstruction of breakwater..	10,000
Wood Island—Repairs to breakwater, etc.	3,000

Mr. WELSH. I thank the hon. Minister of Public Works for putting in this appropriation for Wood Island. He made a good job of it last summer and I trust that he will not forget to have the dredge sent there at once so as to make it a good and convenient harbour for the people. I have been for nine years asking for something for those people, and the Minister last year was kind enough to put in the Estimates a sum for the completion of the breakwater. Now, all it wants is to be dredged, and we shall have a good harbour.

Mr. PERRY. I would like to ask whether the sum of $6,000 is all that is to be voted for repairs to piers and breakwaters around the shores of Prince Edward Island. I suppose it must be, unless we are to expect a further sum in the Supplementary Estimates, although we have been told that there are to be no Supplementary Estimates this year. There are thirty piers around the shores of Prince Edward Island, besides Kier's Shore, North Rustico, Souris and Wood Island, and many of them require to be repaired. This sum of $6,000 would hardly repair the Tignish breakwater alone. The Minister last year promised that he would send some one of his engineers to survey that breakwater and make a report upon it. He has not done so. If he does not attend to that breakwater, it will go to pieces and float away in a short time. It is a work that cannot be overlooked, as Tignish is a place where a great deal of shipping is done. I would like to know also if the Minister intends to build a pier at West Point. Surely he must know that the

Dominion of Canada is in honour bound to do so by the solemn compact made with Prince Edward Island. I am not aware that he has sent an engineer to survey the place and make a report. How does he expect the people to ship their cattle and horses and other produce there without the necessary accommodation. The Minister is aware that work has commenced at the Brae. The people agreed to contribute $1,000, which was supplemented by another $1,000 by the Public Works Department; but it would require perhaps $1,000 more to make the work substantial and permanent. An application has also been made for a pier at Campbellton. Work is also going on at Kier's Shore, and I would like to know whether it is being done by contract or by day's work. This vote of $4,500 is, in my opinion, large enough to do work by contract. I believe the man who has charge of some of the work is from Ottawa; but I do not see why a man from Ottawa should travel all the way down to Prince Edward Island to do this work when it could be as well and as cheaply done by people on the island. I want to know if the Minister is going to send an engineer this year to report on the Tignish breakwater. If he is, I would ask him to let me know a day or two previous, so that I could drive the engineer down there, and give him an opportunity of obtaining information from men who are perhaps better acquainted with the locality than I am myself.

Mr. OUIMET. I may say to the hon. gentleman that the resident engineer has received instructions to visit the Tignish breakwater, but his report has not yet been received.

Mr. YEO. When a similar item to this was being discussed earlier in the session, the hon. Minister stated that when the main Estimates came up he would give us some information in regard to the wharfs on which he was going to expend money in Prince Edward Island. I brought to his notice then several wharfs in Prince County particularly Brae and West Point, which need repairs. Every session since 1891 the needs of these wharfs have been brought to his attention, and he has promised to look after them; but so far very little has been done. I hope now he will say that something will be done during the present summer upon these works. I am glad to see that a further appropriation is made for the wharf at Kier's Shore, and I would like to ask the Minister if it is intended to continue this expenditure until the work is completed. I know that a petition was presented to his department last year, asking for the building of a wharf at Gordon Point between Sea Cow Head and Cape Traverse; also a petition for a wharf at Campbellton. The inhabitants at the latter place have constructed a considerable work, and they hope the Government will supplement and extend it. We have brought these matters to the attention of the hon. Minister so frequently that I hope he will now say he intends to do something for them. I would also like to know if it is his intention to do anything during the coming summer at Cape Traverse. A steamer has been plying between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine, but owing to the shallowness of the water on the Prince Edward Island side she can only run there during tide time. I would like also to ask the Minister whether it is his intention during the present season to do anything at the harbour of Summerside. The work there has been petitioned for, and the engineers who have been sent to inspect the harbour have reported to the department. I know it will require a small outlay but, considering the importance of Summerside, I think the hon. Minister should give it most serious consideration without delay.

Mr. OUIMET. With the exception of those places specially mentioned in the resolution, we intend to spend $6,000 in repairs, as much as possible on every work of importance which the resident engineer will report as requiring repairs. The amount is very small, I must admit, but some of the places mentioned by the hon. gentleman, especially Summerside, would require an expenditure of about $50,000. All I can say is that the department will do its best, and the hon. gentleman may rely that every dollar spent will be represented by useful work.

Mr. PERRY. I hope the hon. gentleman will not forget to spend a few dollars at Bray.

Negro Point Breakwater—St. John Harbour, New Brunswick..... $7,000

Mr. BOWERS. How much money was spent last year on Negro Point breakwater?

Mr. OUIMET. A very small amount. Nothing but what was absolutely necessary to protect that part where the lighthouse is situated. But we are now expending $5,000 in making and placing concrete blocks; and if the experiment is successful, we intend to solidify the whole breakwater with these concrete blocks, weighing about twenty tons each, heavy enough not to be carried away as ordinary boulders are by heavy seas. We were not able to secure the necessary labour and go on with the work before now, and we will see exactly what will be the result of that experiment before going further.

Harbours and Rivers, Quebec $61,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know how far the ice piers at La Prairie have proved of practical utility?

Mr. OUIMET. Without them, the whole of the village would be exposed, every spring, to be overflowed, and especially the

large pier which is there, and which is under the control of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost?

Mr. OUIMET. Fourteen thousand dollars.

Mr. RIDER. I would like to inquire of the Minister of Public Works if he has completed the purchase of the wharf at Magog, and if the repairs are being attended to?

Mr. OUIMET. The purchase has been made, and the Department of Justice has to see that the deed is completed. The other day I said to the hon. gentleman that it would require an expenditure of about $200 to make the pier perfect, and that will be attended to at once.

Mr. RIDER. I am very glad the Government has decided to make this a Government work, and have taken the precaution to purchase the site and approach to the wharf. This is a very important wharf, situated on a most beautiful sheet of water, Lake Memphramagog; and as the season of navigation is now close on, it would be still further appreciated if the hon. gentleman would hasten its repairs.

Mr. OUIMET. It is understood that the repairs are to be done as soon as the money can be available. Instructions will be given at once.

Mr. RIDER. Will the work be done by contract?

Mr. OUIMET. By days' labour. It is only repairing the planking of the pier.

Mr. BRYSON. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to an amount I submitted for his consideration the other day. I find that a very small sum indeed has been appropriated for general repairs and improvements on the province of Quebec. The House will recollect that last year a small sum was placed in the Estimates for Baie des Peres wharf. The amount voted was expended last fall and this spring the wharf was in an unfinished condition and very likely to be carried away by the spring freshet. The foreman, the man in charge, secured a gentleman, Mr. Mann, to assist him in completing the work. The work has been completed and the bill has been sent certified by the inspector of the work. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the amount paid, $320, will be one of the first amounts taken out of this vote of $10,000? As it has been expended by the foreman in charge, and expended for the purpose of preventing the wharf being carried away—it is the only wharf at this place where three steamers are running daily—I would suggest that the hon. Minister give us assurance that this amount will be one of the first taken out of this vote. I regret exceedingly that the amount for the whole province of Quebec is so small; but I trust that out of it the amount that has been paid to these labourers, and for maintenance, the account for which has been certified, will be paid.

Mr. OUIMET. The amount mentioned by the hon. gentleman has been expended and put to good account, and will be paid as soon as this money is available.

Mr. CARROLL. (Translation.) I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the Kamouraska wharf. I understand that according to the plan, this wharf should be longer by a hundred feet than it is now. For some years past, no work was done there. I would like to know why the works were not continued?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) One reason, by which I am spared the trouble of giving any others, is that I had no money to do more. Another reason is that I think the wharf is already long enough for the traffic carried on at Kamouraska, and it has not yet been represented to me that there was any necessity for making the expenditures referred to by the hon. gentleman. A hundred feet more of this wharf would cost about $12,000 or $15,000, and the condition of our finances does not justify such an expenditure at this time.

Mr. CARROLL. (Translation.) I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I think that with two or three thousand dollars, and not twelve or fifteen thousand, he could have this wharf extended a hundred feet. As for the usefulness of this wharf, I think representations were made to the Public Works Department on the matter.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) I made a slight mistake, which was corrected by the hon. gentleman. But in the main I was right, inasmuch as the information given me by the department is to the effect that an addition of a hundred feet to the wharf would not make it more useful than it is now, since it would not give any more water. That is to say, with a hundred additional feet there would be no more depth of water than there is at the end of the wharf such as it is now. We would have to build four or five hundred additional feet of wharf, which would entail an additional expenditure of from twelve to fifteen thousand dollars. I do not think the hon. gentleman himself would, under such circumstances, recommend to the department the making of such an expenditure.

Mr. CARROLL. (Translation.) I will give the hon. gentleman the opportunity to correct once more the information given him by his engineer, by stating that no such expenditure would be required, for a hundred feet more would surely give much more water, three or four feet more than now.

Mr. RIDER. I would like to know if anything is to be spent on the wharf known as Bryant's Wharf, on the west shore of Lake Memphremagog about ten miles from Magog ?

Mr. OUIMET. There is nothing for that.

Mr. RIDER. Is there any report on that wharf ?

Mr. OUIMET. That is not a Government wharf ; it is a private wharf.

Mr. RIDER. But I did not know but that the Minister might have had it brought to his attention.

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I would like a little more information about this $10,000. About 1882 the hon. member who represented the constituency I now represent had some work done on the Black River, in the county of Drummond. Some years after, when the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) was Minister of Public Works, he promised me that the engineer of the Government should be sent to make a new report on the river. It is pretty sure that the amount that has been spent there, $2,000, will be entirely lost if the Government does not see fit to send the engineer to make a new report. Is any part of the $10,000 for that purpose ?

Mr. OUIMET. No ; none of it will be applied there.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Can we get any information as to how this $10,000 is to be spent ?

Mr. OUIMET. I can tell the hon. gentleman what was done with a similar vote last year, though I am not sure that he will be much wiser for it. We had expenditures : Bic Wharf, Des Joachims, Grosse Isle Quarantine Wharf, L'Islot Wharf, Portage du Fort, and other works.

Mr. TARTE. An item appears, $5,000 for Baie St. Paul. Will the hon. Minister say what he intends to do there ?

Mr. OUIMET. To build a wharf and make it available for general navigation, and more especially for the boats of the Ontario and Richelieu Navigation Company, which ply between Quebec and the ports of Murray Bay and Chicoutimi. That work is under contract, and this is to pay for the balance of the work. I understand that it is expected to be ready about the middle of the summer.

Mr. TARTE. Can the hon. Minister tell us how much has been spent so far on the new pier ?

Mr. OUIMET. The last contract has been for an amount of about $6,500. There is what we call the isolated block, which has been kept in repair until now. We are sure that the other wharf will give all the necessary accommodation.

Mr. TARTE. Can the Minister tell how much has been spent altogether ?

Mr. OUIMET. I have not the figures now, but I will get them and send them to the hon. gentleman if he wishes.

Mr. TARTE. I would like to know something about that Pointe aux Esquimaux wharf, which is a celebrated pier.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman knows this Pointe aux Esquimaux is the principal port in that section. It is a place where the steamer stops, and is an important port so far as shipping is concerned, and also as being the centre of that region. There is an old structure there now that does not deserve to be called a pier, but it has served its purpose, and has become so dilapidated that we decided to build another pier. In order to lessen the expense, we intend to purchase that old pier from the present owner, a man named Lavoie. But there is a question as to whether he can give a proper title. At all events, we are willing to pay $700 for the pier, and as soon as this contract is completed, the pier will be built with the sum we now ask Parliament to re-vote.

Mr. TARTE. Does the Minister intend to ask for tenders for that work.

Mr. OUIMET. My engineer tells me that he intends to recommend that it should be built by day's labour. But the present pier will be utilized and put in shape.

Mr. TARTE. I should think the Minister's experience of day's labour was not very favourable.

Mr. OUIMET. Well, there is a great deal of prejudice against day labour, but I must say that according to all the reports I get from my chief engineer, as well as from the resident engineers, there are circumstances where the work is certainly better done, and cheaper, when done by day's labour than when done by contract. It depends altogether on the circumstances. If the hon. gentleman has an hour or two to spare, and will call at my office, we will be able to show him the practical working of the two systems, at least since I have been in the department ; and we will be able to prove to him conclusively that the best work and the cheapest work that has been done, since I have been at the head of the department, has been done by day's labour. The reason is this : On account of the great competition between contractors, they cut down the prices as low as possible, and in order to save themselves, there is always a tendency to use poor material, especially in works of repair, which, of course, they find very much cheaper. In other cases we prefer to get the work done by contract, and it is for the chief engineer, who has no political purpose to serve, to decide which system to adopt under the circumstances. I may say that in the public

works we are now carrying on, we do not expect to make any political capital by employing day's labour, and we are trying to do the work in the best possible manner, and for the least amount of money. We have no other purpose to serve. I think I can show the hon. gentleman that we have tried both systems under the most favourable circumstances, and that the day's labour system has been found in many cases to be preferable. Our policy is always to be governed by the circumstances, and to give the work by tender when the chief engineer, from all the information at his disposal, thinks that it will prove the most successful. But I am not afraid to assert and to state publicly, that whether we have followed one system or the other, we have done the best that could be done under the circumstances.

Mr. TARTE. The Minister may have the best intentions possible, but I am afraid that when the election comes on, neither he nor his chief engineer will always be able to do the best for the country. Now, take that Pointe aux Esquimaux business. Suppose we have an election in a short time; the Ministerial candidate will manage to untilize the expenditure of this money on his own behalf, and a public work which the Minister intends to be carried out in the public interest, will become simply an electoral engine. This is not right, and for that reason I would urge the Minister not to insist too strongly on the day's labour system. The Minister says he has tried both systems and that the day's labour system has worked well. Well, I am glad to hear that from his mouth, but he must admit that our experience in the past has not been such as to impress us very favourably with the advantages of that system. I would like to ask the Minister what works he has conducted by that system. For instance, has he tried it in Sorel ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes ; in Sorel we have our repair shops for the whole dredging fleet of Canada, and our experience is that we get our work done in Sorel, and we can prove it to the satisfaction of every practical man, at least 50 per cent cheaper than we could get it done in any other establishment. There may be a special reason for that. We have men there specially trained for the work, and it is done under the supervision of a gentleman who is a practical engineer. We have also as one of the overseers a young French Canadian, Mr. Goulet, who has proved himself to be possessed of great talent as a mechanical engineer. The salaries of these officials are reasonable. We have no dividends to pay to shareholders, and on the whole the work is done very cheaply, as I am informed by officials whose information is reliable. We have certain difficulties, no doubt, in carrying out the work. Very often people are not satisfied because we do not employ people holding certain political convictions, but the officials manage to get over these difficulties fairly well, and in the management of this vast establishment at Sorel, the department has not been exposed to reproach for committing injustice so far as politics are concerned.

Mr. TARTE. Who is the chief engineer to be sent to Point Esquimalt ?

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Blais will be sent down. He will take charge, as in previous years, of the work on the north shore, and from my experience of the last two years he has given full satisfaction. I may point to the work done at Tadousac, and on the different wharfs of the Saguenay, which will satisfy any one that he is a competent man, for he has done the work, not only in first-class style, but also very cheaply.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand the question at present under discussion is as to whether the Government should employ day labour on public works, or let them all out by contract. I desire to ask a practical question, and it is this : Suppose the Government wish to renew a work such as a pier or harbour at a cost of $2,000 or $5,000, how is it possible that this can be done by contract ? It cannot be done by contract. And why ? By reason is there is a great difference in the piers and works, and for that reason it is impossible. No engineer can make an estimate, and, therefore, in regard to such works on which the expenditure is from $2,000 to $10,000, the proper way is to do it by day's labour. If it is done by day's labour, the first consideration is, who is the party most interested in the pier, or work ? If that work can be placed under his supervision, and he can be allowed to employ day's labour in connection with the expenditure of the amount, $2,000 or $5,000, or $10,000, then the Government will get better work done than by contract. When an hon. member talks about carrying out all these works by contract, I reply that it is impracticable and therefore there is no argument in hon. gentlemen finding fault with the Government because they do not give all works out by contracts, but execute some by day labour. In regard to new works, I can understand that contracts may be let, but not as regards renewing works. It is not fair to say that the Government gave work out in order to obtain political capital.

Mr. CARROL. What will be the length of the pier at Point Esquimalt?

Mr. OUIMET. It will give twelve feet of water at the lowest tide. I am told the pier will be about 250 feet in length.

Mr. TARTE. I should like to have some explanation of the item of $8,000 for formation of tidal basin at Rimouski.

Mr. OUIMET. This work has been very earnestly pressed on the department by the people engaged in the lumber trade in this

region, especially Price Bros. and King Bros. Those firms which are now engaged in the lumber trade in that region are now obliged, on account of the shallowness of the water at the end of the wharf, to cart their lumber to Matane, or send it down to Campbellton. The cartage to Matane is, of course, very costly. On the other hand, if they ship it by the Intercolonial Railway to Campbellton, they are placed in a very disadvantageous position. Lumber shipped from a port on the Baie de Chaleur is considered to be the lumber of that region, and it appears—I do not know anything personally about it—that the reputation of the lumber of the Rimouski region is very much higher than that of the lumber round Baie de Chaleur. I am told the difference amounts to about $2 per thousand. The people of Rimouski, and the firms I have mentioned have urged on the department that the wharf at Rimouski should be lengthened, and a tidal basin built, so that not only may ships come to wharf, but also float in the basin at low tide without injury by wind or wave. This work would be a very expensive one, and the department has not yet taken practical steps to proceed with it. We have had plans prepared and estimates made; we have not yet asked for tenders, but everything is ready to advertise for tenders. It will depend very much on the amount required whether we shall go on with the work or not. The amount in the Estimates is very small, compared with the probable total cost, which may be placed at from $90,000 to $120,000. I am asking for this vote so as to be able to go on with the work if it is possible for the Government and the department to undertake it.

Mr. TARTE. It seems to me that the Minister should be very cautions about such a work.

Mr. OUIMET. I think we have given you evidence that we are cautious.

Mr. TARTE. I do not see why we should be called upon to vote this sum when the Minister admits that he does not know the cost of this work.

Mr. OUIMET. Do you object to it?

Mr. TARTE. I do not. Having no official information, I would not take upon myself to object to it. The Minister should not be in too much of a hurry about the matter if he does not know the cost of the work. I am informed that there is a question as to whether Pointe au Pere would not be a better place, and I would like to know if the Minister has taken that into consideration.

Mr. OUIMET. That is an old sore in the department. It has been pressed upon our attention for a long time by the people who live there and by the pilots, but it was found that the large shipping companies did not care very much for that harbour. The work, no doubt, would be useful to allow the pilots to land in stormy weather, but it would require an expenditure of nearly a million dollars to do it properly. Even if I had the inclination, I am sure the Minister of Finance would not allow me to go into that heavy expenditure now. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I will proceed very cautiously in this matter, as in everything else.

Mr. TARTE. I am afraid that if we have a general election, the Minister will be carried away from the safe course he announces. I have in L'Islet a wharf which could be lengthened for a very small sum of money.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be dangerous to put public money there if there are to be elections.

Mr. TARTE. The Minister tried it before, but they were not successful. I again ask the Minister to give a little attention to the wharf at L'Islet.

Mr. OUIMET. If I were to do it before the elections, you would charge me with bribery, and I must avoid that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister has made an observation which shows how often we are proceeding in the dark. The Minister has told us that this work, for which he asks $8,000, will cost upwards of $100,000. I wish to call the attention of the House to a practice which has grown up here of recent years, but which is wholly unknown in the United Kingdom, and that is, of asking a certain appropriation for public works without first solemnly laying before the House the cost of the undertaking as a whole, and informing the House of the nature of the work for which an appropriation to a limited extent is asked in the Estimates. We have over and over again been committed surreptitiously—I am not speaking of this department particularly, but I would instance the industrial schools in the North-west and British Columbia—to a charge that is not a yearly charge, but a permanent charge for all time. I say that we should follow the English rule, which is the only proper rule in cases of this sort, and that the House ought to be fully informed as to the total amount of the cost for which a partial sum is asked. The House will see how very important it is that a small sum ought not to be asked for a work that implies a large expenditure, without fully informing the House as to the amount of that expenditure and the character of the work.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) ought to know that last year when this vote was first asked, all the information he refers to was duly given. I gave the estimated cost of the whole work, the object for which the vote was asked, and the

benefit that was expected to come from the undertaking. The only thing asked last year was to allow the department to have at its disposal this small sum of $10,000, but at the same time asking confidence in the department to entrust them with the expenditure of the whole amount, if the department saw the necessity for it. The hon. gentleman cannot charge me with not giving the House full information on the subject. Perhaps if there is anything that can be charged against me, it is that I am too candid, and give too much information, for which hon. gentlemen opposite are not willing to give me credit.

Mr. TARTE. Am I to understand that the Minister will not begin the work at Rimouski Wharf without knowing the entire cost and without asking for tenders ?

Mr. OUIMET. The only way to ascertain the cost of a work is first to have the plans and estimates made by the engineer. That has been done. The more practical way of ascertaining the cost would be to advertise for tenders, and I have said that everything will be ready for that in a short time, if it is not ready now. I am not expected by the hon. gentleman to call for tenders and award the contract before I am authorized to do so by the House. The only thing left for me to do now is to have an estimate prepared, and have the matter laid before the House, according to the information I have received from my engineers, and that is what I have done.

Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. Minister kindly tell me who is to be the resident engineer for all the works in Rimouski county ?

Mr. OUIMET. Breen is the resident engineer in charge of that district down to the Magdalen Islands.

Mr. TARTE. Is it not a fact that last year J. C. Tache was sent down there as one of the engineers ?

Mr. OUIMET. Two years ago Mr. Tache was detailed to take charge of the repairs to the wharf at Rimouski, and also the repairs at Matane. Breen was occupied somewhere else in the meantime.

Mr. TARTE. Is he going to be sent this year ?

Mr. OUIMET. No. Mr. Tache was detailed two months ago to look after the work at Ste. Anne de la Parade. He has not yet returned. I do not know where his services will be required this year, but he will not be sent electioneering. We do not depend very much on the works of these engineers in that respect.

Mr. BRYSON. On the 20th of July, last year, as will be found at page 6,508 of "Hansard," I brought to the attention of the Minister the claims of some farmers for damages caused by the construction of a dam at Grand Falls at the head of the Coulonge River Slide. On that occasion the Minister said :

> The report was received too late to bring the matter before Council, and will have to stand over for another year.

As I am disappointed in not seeing any provision in the Estimates for these land damages, I would like to ask the Minister if he will be able to take sufficient moneys from some of the amounts voted for the province of Quebec, to pay these farmers ? The matter has been standing for five years, and it is of importance to these farmers, and I would ask the Minister to give it his earnest and careful consideration.

Mr. OUIMET. I am informed by my engineer that this item, which was in the Estimates as they were prepared for Council, has been omitted somewhere, either in my department or in the Finance Department.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly not in the Finance Department.

Mr. OUIMET. It is unfortunate that these people should be deprived of what is due to them, which is a small amount ; but I am sure that I would be hauled up before the Public Accounts Committee by the Auditor General if I should try, even for the sake of doing justice to his friends, to take the amount from any other appropriation. I do not see how it could be done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman should not complain if he is hauled up before the Public Accounts Committee, if he has not the amount voted by the House, and takes it from another item. That is a very curious proposition.

Mr. OUIMET. How dear is the Auditor General to hon. gentlemen opposite. I have just said it could not be done, and the Auditor General would not allow it.

Mr. BRYSON. If the Government will send an arbitrator to the farmers and have the amount fixed which these people are to receive, so that next session we shall know exactly how much is required, some progress will be made.

Mr. OUIMET. That will be done.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I would like to have some information about this item of $8,000 for the tidal basin at Rimouski. Are we to understand that it is to be applied in part payment of the contract for that tidal basin, or for preliminary works to be done by the department ?

Mr. OUIMET. There is no preliminary work concerned in it. The preliminary work is done by the officers of the department, and they are paid with the salaries they receive.

Mr. LAVERGNE. That is not an answer to my question. Is this to be applied in part payment of the contract ?

Mr. OUIMET. If the contract is entered into and the work proceeded with, this money will be paid out as the work proceeds.

Mr. LAVERGNE. If not, it will not be used ?

Mr. OUIMET. If not, it will remain in the coffers of our esteemed Finance Minister.

Mr. BRODEUR. I notice that $5,000 is voted for guide piers for the Beloeil Channel in the river Richelieu. Has a contract been given for this work ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. To whom has the contract been awarded ?

Mr. OUIMET. To Mignault & Belanger. They have signed the contract, and the work is going on.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is the amount of the contract ?

Mr. OUIMET. Three thousand, eight hundred dollars.

Mr. BRODEUR. For what reason is $5,000 asked for ?

Mr. OUIMET. The contract only covers crib-work, and the balance will be employed in dredging and some other additional work that will be necessary to accomplish the object in view, that is, to facilitate the passage of boats through the channel.

Mr. BRODEUR. Was only one tender received ?

Mr. OUIMET. Several tenders.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that the work has not been begun yet ?

Mr OUIMET. The contract is signed, and the contractors are making their preparations.

Mr. BRODEUR. When are they obliged to finish their contract ?

Mr. OUIMET. At the end of November.

Harbours and Rivers, Ontario..... $105,350

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to know what exactly has been done, including the regulating of the water of Lake Simcoe and Couchiching. I see that the hon. gentleman got some money last year as well as this.

Mr. OUIMET. The trouble with that outlet of the lake is that it is too small in the spring freshets, and the work to be done is to increase that outlet without making it deeper. It is just to enable a larger amount of water to go through the outlet when the water is high. What I mean is that the bottom of that outlet will remain as it is, so as in the summer time to leave the waters of the lake at the same height as now. That work has been done to prevent a second flooding of the surrounding countries in June after seeding time, and also to improve the lake for navigation.

Mr. MULOCK. Has the hon. gentleman already taken any steps to carry out this work ?

Mr. OUIMET. Tenders have been called by public advertisement, and the contract passed, and the contractor has received instructions to go on with the work.

Mr. MULOCK. A vote was in last year's Estimates. Why was the work not proceeded with last year ?

Mr. OUIMET. Because the plans were not completed and also because there were some difficulties raised as to jurisdiction. Complaints were also made that the result of these improvements would be to injure some people who had water powers in the vicinity, and this had to be inquired into before undertaking a work which might involve future litigation. It has been ascertained that no injury will follow to anyone, but that, on the other hand, it will be a benefit to the whole surrounding district, which is a farming district of very great importance.

Mr. MULOCK. I am quite familiar with the locus in quo and I know that the regulating of the waters is of public interest. I am not objecting, but quite the contrary, because I have more than once pressed upon the Government the necessity of having this matter attended to. Has the hon. gentleman made any arrangements with the owners of any of these privileges ?

Mr. OUIMET. No, there are none to be made because we have found the representations of the people baseless, and are pretty sure that the improvement will be injurious to nobody.

Mr. MULOCK. Then no part of the grant goes to anybody for any water privileges at the outset ?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. MULOCK. It all goes towards regulating the waters ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. What are the details of the plan for regulating the waters.

Mr. OUIMET. These works consist in excavating supplementary passages 14 to 95 feet wide down to low water level opposite the eastern outlet of lake Couchiching into the River Severn at the north end of ——— Island, so as to increase the discharging power of this outlet very materially during the high water period without interfering with the same when the lakes reach their normal level.

Mr. MULOCK. What are the arrangements made, if any, for keeping the water back ?

Mr. OUIMET. It cannot be lower than it is now because the outlet is going to be widened and not deepened, so that the discharge of the lake at low water will not be larger than it is to-day.

Mr. MULOCK. Supposing after this contract is carried out and the widening has the effect of lowering the level so as to interfere with navigation, then it will be somewhat late.

Mr. OUIMET. It will not interfere with navigation.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. Minister is not familiar with the geography of the neighbourhood.

Mr. OUIMET. My engineer is.

Mr. MULOCK. There is a narrow connection between Lake Simcoe and Lake Couchiching. If you lower the level too much, it will interfere with navigation.

Mr. OUIMET. If the hon. gentleman will look at the rough sketch I have sent him, he will see how the work is to be done. He will see that the channel is not to be deepened, and when the water reaches its ordinary level the discharge will not be greater. It is only while the water is very high that the discharge will be greater.

Mr. MULOCK. Have the levels of all the outlets been taken ?

Mr. OUIMET. Four outlets have been surveyed, but the improved work will only be made in two of them.

Mr. MULOCK. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to a point of great importance. While it is important that the water be regulated so that it will not be too high and flood back on the adjoining lands, it is also important for many reasons that the level should not fall too low. If your scheme lowers the waters, without any provision for retaining the waters after the principal spring freshets are over, it may happen that you will be disappointed in this scheme and find the communication between the two lakes absolutely interrupted for a certain season of the year. The theory is well enough, but the practical effect may be if you lower the water down to a certain level and there is not sufficient supply to the lakes for the remainder of the season, to make up the loss by evaporation and overflow, navigation between the two lakes may be interfered with, and vessels will not be able to approach the harbours around the lakes. That is a danger you have to guard against.

Mr. OUIMET. My engineer tells me that all that has been taken into the calculations.

Mr. MULOCK. Did the hon. Minister advertise for tenders, and who has the contract ?

Mr. OUIMET. The contractors are Wurtele & Co. We did advertise for tenders.

Mr. MULOCK. In what papers ?

Mr. OUIMET. In the papers in Ottawa, Barrie, Toronto and other places. The only charge that can be made against us in that connection is that we advertise too much.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a matter which I first urged upon his consideration two years ago—the removal of the obstructions that are accumulating to the interruption of navigation in the river Sydenham. And we informed him publicly, as well as by letter, this work should be done that season. Last year I called his attention to the subject again, and the assurance was given by himself and Minister of Marine and Fisheries——

Mr. OUIMET. Not by me.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)—that one or the other would do the work, whichever found that it was within his jurisdiction. Now, there is no special appropriation for this work in this vote. I call the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns for the last thirty years, the amount of shipping leaving the river Sydenham every year is larger than that of any port in the Dominion, except the port of Montreal. The hon. Minister has an appropriation for dredging Port Dover harbour, $15,000. The amount of shipping visiting Port Dover harbour for a whole year, I will venture to say, is not as much as enters the river Sydenham in a fortnight. From the port of Dresden, the upper port on the East Sydenham, a steamer runs daily—or did run as long as navigation was possible—to Sarnia ; and there is also a daily boat from that port to Detroit. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the subject again, and I ask him and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is here, which of them proposes to undertake this matter during the current year. When the water is high large trees, branches and all, that have fallen into the river, float down stream until they become saturated and sink, or they are sunk by the earth that adhere to their roots. Though the river is deep it is, in many places narrow, and these sunken trees are a serious obstacle to navigation. There are also sunken logs ; and sometimes steamer owners complain of the wheels of their vessels being broken, and there is danger of more serious disaster by the vessels being pierced by the logs that remain in the water. This contract for clearing the river ought to have been undertaken two years ago. The cost of the work

will be comparatively little. I think that all these obstructions were removed some years ago by dredges; and, no doubt, the same thing could be done now. Both branches of the Sydenham, both north and east, ought to have obstructions removed. The lumbering operations carried on on the river are very large, and the traffic very considerable. I think the Minister ought not to permit the third year to go by without having this matter attended to. There are a large number of items very much in excess of what would be required for the work I mention, for works which in public utility and public importance would bear no comparison with this that I ask the Government to undertake in the public interest.

The CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, Mr. Chairman; I want to know what the Minister proposes to do in the matter. I think I am entitled to an answer, especially after the pledges that have been made.

Mr. OUIMET. So far as I am concerned, the hon. gentleman knows that I agree with him that we should look into the matter and see that the obstructions in the river Sydenham should be removed. After looking into the matter, I discovered that it was outside the jurisdiction of our department, and it was more within the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I think, took some steps towards the redemption of the promise that I had made; and from what I could ascertain at the time, I believe that the obstructions were not considered of a sufficient character to justify the expenditure, and for some other reasons, we did not spend what was necessary for the work at that time. I will promise the hon. gentleman that I will direct my officers to again confer with the Department of Marine and Fisheries in order to come to some understanding; and to ascertain again the extent of the work necessary to be done and also the means to be taken in order to do it. If the work can be done at all it could be done, I think, out of the general appropriation for dredging, and probably the two departments will come to an understanding, and, if our engineers report that the work is necessary, we shall have to see that it is done.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to a promise made by him a short time ago to a deputation who waited on them from the town of Chatham, with reference to a bar at the mouth of the river Thames. The hon. Minister kindly promised them that steps should be taken to remove the bar, which is one of the greatest impediments to the navigation of the river. But I am sorry to say the matter seems to have escaped the hon. Minister's attention, and nothing has been done as yet. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, while we are on that vote, when we may expect work to be commenced, and whether any contract has been let as the hon. Minister promised?

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman knows that in consequence of the continual receding of the water in the lakes, the dredging work to be done in all these harbours is very considerable. I should say more considerable than our plant will enable us to make, while the amount placed at our disposal by Parliament is not sufficient to meet all demands. It is a very serious question whether this Government will have to undertake the very large expenditure that will be required if the level of the lakes continues to lower. I am inclined to think that this country could not undertake to keep all its harbours at the depth that is required to meet the requirements of navigation. I must say also that, as a rule, the business done and the traffic at all these ports, have been greatly reduced since they have had communications with the large railway lines. All these things have to be carefully considered, and the department will have to decide very soon whether a larger amount will not have to be placed at the disposal of the department to keep up these harbours, or whether we shall let them shift for themselves. It is hoped that the level of the water in the lakes will again rise in course of time. Engineers and those who have experience in the matter, say that the level of these lakes has been gradually lowering for seven or eight years, and after that they say the water will rise for an equal number of years. I do not know if that theory is correct, but we are keeping a record, and in a few years we will be better able to say. At all events, as regards the harbour referred to by my hon. friend, if a promise was made that the work will be done, it will certainly be fulfilled. The dredges at our disposal have done the work that has been promised, and the harbour in question will receive its due share of attention, although I am afraid that on the eve of a general election I shall be charged with attempting to bribe the electors of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am glad to have that promise of the hon. Minister, because the matter is a very important one, as was pointed out to him at the time. For about twenty-five miles from the entrance on that river there are eighteen to twenty feet of water. It serves a large section of the country between the city of Chatham, and other portions of the territory. Now, right at the mouth of that river, there is a bar where there was only seven feet of water this summer.

Mr. OUIMET. It forms every spring.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not every spring. The department dredged out the channel there, I think, two or three years ago. Now, all

the people want is a small appropriation, probably $2,000, to dredge a channel through in the meantime. We hope and believe that the level of the lakes will gradually rise, and if this amount is expended now, there will be no further sum required probably for a good many years. This was all pointed out to the Minister some three or four weeks ago. As I stated, it is a matter of great importance to the people of that part of the country, and I think, under the circumstances, they are entitled to this work. They are not getting anything, so far, and this is such a small amount to ask for that I think the Government ought to grant it. I think one of the Government dredges is not far from that neighbourhood, and it would only be a matter of a week or two at most for the dredge to go in there and cut a passage through, making the water ten feet deep, and thus accommodate the vessels that require to pass through. I cannot press this matter too strongly upon the attention of the Minister, and I certainly hope that he will take it into his serious consideration, and that before the season of navigation passes by, some steps will be taken to relieve the people of that part of the province. I would like to ask him how soon does he think a dredge will be available to do that work.

Mr. OUIMET. I expect about the end of July.

Mr. TAYLOR. In this vote that is now being taken, I see an item for improvements or dredging in Kingston harbour. I may say that I have received several letters in reference to that portion of the harbour lying north of Kingston bridge, and the mouth of the Rideau Canal. I made application to the Minister of Public Works, and he stated that that portion of the river belonged to the Department of Railways and Canals. I applied then to the Minister of the latter department, and I got the reply from him that it belonged to the Kingston harbour. Now, I am just in receipt of a letter to-night which I wish to read, and I ask the Minister of Public Works to consult with the Minister of Railways and decide which department will attend to this matter, for I think it is one of great importance. I will read the letter:

Bedford Mills, 26th June, 1895.

Dear Sir—Last week we went to Kingston on the steamer "James Swift," and were surprised to see how low the water was below Kingston Mills. The steamer got stuck in that part known as the Basket, and dragged in many parts through the flats. If there is not something done with this part of the channel very soon, we fear it will be the cause of stopping navigation on Kingston and Rideau Canal. So far this season we have been freighting Ottawa and Montreal way, and expect to commence now freighting Kingston way. We find trade very dull, and if we have to contend with bad navigation, it will be a regular calamity in our trade. Hope you will succeed in getting government to put the Rideau Canal dredge on the part of the canal mentioned, and feel sure if the head of the department knew the great necessity of the work, it would be attended to at once. Wishing you success..

Yours truly,

J. P. TETT & BRO.

Those gentlemen are shippers of lumber, and have their mills at Bedford. They have been shipping to Montreal and Ottawa, and now, as they say, they want to ship to Kingston. I have received a complaint from the captain of a steamer that there are some boulders and some sand bars to be removed, which could be done at very little expense. I hope that whatever department has charge of the work, they will see that it receives prompt attention; if not, it will necessitate the stoppage of freighting over the Rideau Canal to Kingston.

Mr. MULOCK. What are the terms of the contract for the work in the harbour at Toronto? By the Auditor General's Report of last year $63,000 was paid to Murray & Cleveland at the eastern gap. Can the Minister state the terms of the contract, how far it has been performed, and how much yet remains to be performed?

Mr. OUIMET. The contract was given to Cleveland & Murray, and it is being carried out on a schedule of prices, of which I will send the hon. gentleman a copy. We are building a double row of jetties in order to preserve a channel in the eastern part of the harbour and secure for it a depth of fifteen to sixteen feet. The jetties are built of large and heavy crib-work, after dredging has been done, and the cribs are filled with stone. It is very important work, and is being very well carried out. It forms a magnificent and solid structure that will last for years and be of immense benefit to the harbour of Toronto. It is expected the whole work will be completed, so far as it is now proposed, during the fiscal year.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). This work is justifying its construction every day. It has reduced the time of the boats going across the lake to Niagara, and what is still more satisfactory, it is preserving the island, which is one of the best assets that Toronto possesses. The sand is piling up against the breakwater, and is thereby saving the island, and every day we can see that the land is increasing.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Minister will send me a copy of the specifications and schedule prices connected with the work, I will accept that in lieu of the explanation to-night.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is it the intention of the Government to send the dredge to work at Bayfield harbour during the present summer?

Mr. OUIMET. I am sorry to say that I have not at my disposal the necessary money to do the work that should be performed to make advantageous the dredging suggest-

ed by the hon. gentleman. The first thing to do would be to repair or rebuild the breakwater in order to prevent the continuous filling up of the harbour, which I must say is one of very great importance. As soon as we get rid of more important works we will look to it.

Mr. McMILLAN. That harbour was built largely by moneys contributed by the residents there. A large number of fishermen are engaged there. Had these works been properly cared for, the present condition would not have ensued, but the work was never properly carried out. When a storm occurs the fishermen cannot put into the harbour, but must go to Goderich or some other port. I hope the Minister will take the matter into his consideration.

British Columbia—Fraser River—Improvements of channel..... $10,000

Mr. CORBOULD. I am sorry to see the item for the improvement of the Fraser River has been dropped to the sum of $10,000. At no time in the history of British Columbia has it been more necessary for an expenditure to be made on the Fraser River than at the present time. The committee will remember that last year the valley of the Fraser was visited by a flood which did immense damage. At that time the leader of the Government, Sir John Thompson, announced that the Dominion Government were entering into a joint scheme with the provincial government to carry on extensive works of improvement on that river. Last year a survey of the Fraser was commenced. The small amount of $5,000 was placed in the Estimates, and the work was proceeded with. But this year I see that no sum is to be voted for continuing the survey of the Fraser. I should like to ask the Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to drop the survey or continue it.

Mr. OUIMET. The survey of the Fraser River, as I am informed, is completed so far as it is necessary to ascertain what improvement works are to be carried out to secure uniformity of the channel, and to prevent the erosion of the shores. But that belongs to the Dominion Government only so far as it may interfere by changes of the channel, with navigation. We are not bound to do the work of protecting individual property, but we are bound to do work that is necessary to prevent the channel being altered continuously, as it is exposed to be altered every time the water becomes very high. That work is to be continued. The amount at our disposal is perhaps not so large as we would desire to see it, but I can assure the hon. gentleman it will be put to good use. The work already done has been very useful, and I hope that next year we will be able to spend a larger amount so as to increase the benefit that has followed the work done by the department in the direction of the improvement of the Fraser River navigation.

Mr. CORBOULD. This $10,000 is only towards the improvement of the mouth of the river?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. CORBOULD. I can quite understand that the Dominion Government is not liable to keep the river from overflowing, but only as regards keeping the river in its proper channel?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. CORBOULD. Therefore, the survey was made. Surely the Minister was mistaken in saying that the work is completed, because it is not half way down the river yet.

Mr. OUIMET. I am assured by my chief engineer that so far as we require information, the work of surveying done is sufficient. Surveys had been made before, and the work done last year was only to complete what was required. Probably the hon. gentleman refers to another survey asked for by the local government in order to ascertain what means should be taken to prevent floods from taking place, as it did last year, and generally to prevent their recurrence and damage being done. This has formed a subject of negotiation with the provincial government, and negotiations have not come to a termination yet; and I think when the negotiations are completed, we will be in a position to join with the local government in undertaking any survey and inquiry with the object I have stated, to ascertain if works can be devised to prevent the recurrence of these very unfortunate floods that occurred last year.

Mr. CORBOULD. The surveys have not been dropped?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. MARA. Last year Mr. Gamble resident engineer of the Public Works Department in British Columbia made an examination of the Columbia River, from Golden to Revelstoke, with a view of ascertaining the practicability and cost of making that part of the river navigable. Just above Revelstoke there is a small canyon which could be improved at slight cost. From there to Death Rapids the navigation is tolerably easy, and from Death Rapids to Boat Encampment, a distance of 60 miles, it is easy navigation. Along the Canoe River, there is a large area of good agricultural land, which can be brought within easy communication of the mines of Kootenay Lake. I would like to know from the Minister if it is the intention of the Government to carry out the works mentioned in his report of last year?

Mr. OUIMET. The information referred to by the hon. gentleman has been sent to

the department, and the necessity of making improvements in the navigation of the rivers indicated by him has been carefully looked into. On the other hand, information was received that no communication by steamboat was in contemplation now, and the department, having such limited resources at their disposal this year, did not see fit to ask for an appropriation. As soon as there are signs of steamboat communication being opened up, I am sure the works he has referred to will be undertaken and completed without delay.

Mr. MARA. Early this spring the Public Works Department conjointly with the provincial government did good and substantial work on the river banks at Revelstoke in preventing the erosion of the banks at that point. It is necessary that this work should be extended both above and below Revelstoke. Is it the intention of the Government to extend that work, provided the local government will co-operate ?

Mr. OUIMET. Our intention is to complete that work conjointly with the local government.

Mr. HASLAM. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that some time ago I presented a request on behalf of the board of trade of Nanaimo for some dredging to be done in Nanaimo harbour. Last year there has been an export of some $2,691,000 worth out of that harbour, and three vessels have touched bottom in the south channel, although in each instance the vessels were drawing less water than the admiralty chart shows should have been there. The channel is gradually filling up with silt from the river, so that to-day the buoys marking it are over 200 feet north of where they were a few years ago. In view of the very large amount of shipping in that harbour and the close competition there is now in the export trade, very serious damage may be done to the whole of British Columbia if there is any neglect in doing the dredging necessary to keep the channel in good order. There are two channels to the harbour, but large vessels cannot very well come out at the north channel. It is more convenient to come in at the north channel and go out at the south channel. The class of vessels are gradually getting larger, so that to-day it is easier to get vessels carrying 3,500 or 4,000 tons than it was to get vessels of 2,500 tons a few years ago. These two circumstances together make it possible that in a very short time, the chances are, vessels will have to increase their rate of insurance. If the rate of insurance and the charges are increased it will be very damaging to the trade, because they have to compete very closely in the market against coal, from Japan, Australia and England, and a few cents additional very often makes or breaks a trade. I hope that the Minister will take this into his consideration, and have that work done at Nanaimo. It would be a calamity to the whole province if the shipping trade were damaged, by increasing the cost of insurance.

Mr. OUIMET. Representations have been received by the department and instructions have been sent Mr. Gamble, our resident engineer, to report on the cause of the trouble at Nanaimo, and as to the best means of remedying it.

Dredging—Maritime Provinces..... $30,000

Mr. YEO. Where is it intended to employ the Prince Edward Island dredge during the present season ? I would remind the Minister of the necessity of dredging being done in the channel leading to Kier's wharf. This wharf is being repaired and extended now, but before it can be made a good shipping place it is necessary that the channel should be straightened and deepened. I know that application has also been made to the department for dredging at Summerside, and I hope that during the present season a dredge will be sent there. I may also remind the Minister that his department has been petitioned for dredging at Egmont Bay and Victoria West, Prince County, and also at Cascumpec harbour. I would particularly ask the Minister to pay attention to Malpecque and Summerside which are places of great importance.

Mr. OUIMET. The dredge is now at Cardigan, and as soon as the work there is completed she will go to Souris to do some work that is absolutely necessary. She will then proceed around the north coast to the various places where she can be utilized.

Mr. WILMOT. In reference to the dredging done on the St. John River, that work is in charge of Mr. Shewan, the resident engineer ; and last year I pointed out that inasmuch as this gentleman was a stranger there, unacquainted with the river, I considered that it would be desirable, in the interest of navigation, that he should have the advice of some person who is acquainted with it. A very important work is being carried on at present on the Oromocto shoals, and the engineer is not carrying it on in accordance with the views of persons who are best acquainted with the navigation of the river, such as the captains of vessels. I should like to remind the Minister of my communication to the department in reference to this matter, and I would ask if it is his intention to have some one to consult with the engineer in regard to the work.

Mr. OUIMET. The chief engineer has heard the remarks of the hon. gentleman, and I am satisfied that he will go and see the place, and get a competent engineer to

confer with Mr. Shewan and himself, and see what is the best means of carrying on the work. I must say, at the same time, that Mr. Shewan's reputation for ability and earnestness in his work is one of the best in the department, and I am quite surprised to hear that he is open to the charge of making mistakes in the work he is doing. At all events, the matter will be inquired into.

Mr. FORBES. I have a stock question which I have asked for the last four years: When are we going to have the dredge ready for operation on the south shore of Nova Scotia? The original dredge which we had there has been lost for a number of years. There is one in operation in Prince Edward Island, and we cannot get the use of that for even a portion of the year. There is work enough there to keep a dredge in operation for several seasons, and I think the least the Minister could do would be to send us for a part of the season a dredge from another part of the country. In my county alone, there are three places that require the use of a dredge, and the operations of commerce are impeded very seriously for the want of one. It is nearly twenty years since we have had any dredging in the harbour of Liverpool, which is obstructed by a bar. A year and a half ago, the hon. gentleman's own engineer reported on the condition of that harbour, and one of his own colleagues, at the request of some of his friends in the Cabinet on my question, made an application for a small vote of $3,500 to improve it, if not completely, at any rate, partially; and I would like to know why that amount is not in the Estimates, and if there is any hope of it being voted at the present session? The hon. Minister is also aware that there is a bar at Coffin's island which is a serious impedient to navigation. In stormy weather, if the fishermen are caught outside of the harbour, this bar, being directly across the mouth, are unable to enter. Several lives have been lost here, though I do not attribute this entirely to the want of dredging; but if the bar were properly dredged, a great deal would be done to facilitate the operations of the fishermen, and to render their lives and property more safe. I have spoken of the bar further west at Port Mouton, where the pier has been lately repaired by the Government; but that cannot take the place of the dredging. I am sorry that the vote has been reduced this year by $10,000. Might I ask the Minister why that is done, and also if the whole appropriation of $40,000 last year was expended?

Mr. OUIMET. The vote of last year was totally expended. The hon. gentleman may draw his own conclusions as to whether $30,000 will enable us to carry on operations during the next fiscal year. As to the new dredge. I am assured that it will be completed in the month of September, but I am very much afraid that the lateness of the season will make it rather risky to send it down the gulf this year. It will certainly be there at the commencement of next season, and ready to do good at all the places which the hon. gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. YEO. Has the Minister any idea when the dredging will be completed at Cardigan and at Souris, and also to what part of the north side of Prince Edward Island it is intended to send the dredge?

Mr. OUIMET. I am told that it will take three weeks to complete the work at Cardigan, and three weeks at Souris. After that the dredge will go to the north side.

Mr. YEO. To what part of the north side?

Mr. OUIMET. Every harbour where work is urgent and useful.

Mr. YEO. There are different harbours on the north side, but I would ask attention particularly to the one I have named.

Mr. TARTE. What does the hon. gentleman intend to do with the sum of $25,000?

Mr. OUIMET. We are now building an elevator dredge. We have four elevator dredges. One has been sent to the Kaministiquia. Another has been dismantled, and with the machinery we have mounted a new dredge which is now working at Barre à Boulard, Lotbinière, and another is working at Contrecoeur. We are now working at another elevator dredge, and we expect that dredge No. 11 will be too old after the work of this season, and will take out its machinery and place it in a new dredge. Each dredge has a tug to accompany it.

Mr. TARTE. Where will that tug be built?

Mr. OUIMET. At Sorel.

Mr. TARTE. What amount out of the $30,000 for Ontario and Quebec is to be expended in Quebec?

Mr. OUIMET. It will be divided between the two provinces as equally as possible, so as to meet the urgent requirements of both.

Mr. TARTE. Where is the share for Quebec to be spent?

Mr. OUIMET. We are doing some work just now on Lake St. Louis, and we are going to work at Laprairie, to dredge the canal for the steamers. Last year the regular line of steamers was stopped on account of the channel not being deep enough. We have been doing some work at Louiseville at the mouth of the river, in order to enable the boats to get in. There is a pretty large traffic being done there. At Nicolet we are also doing some work. We may do work at L'Assomption and various other places, where it is necessary for the improvement of navigation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the hon. gentleman estimated a certain sum for certain places, or is it a mere guess ?

Mr. OUIMET. This is an annual vote. We know pretty well what our own dredges can spend and this is to meet that expenditure. Every spring we have a programme. We take all the demands made and the reports sent to the department, and we do what is most pressing and useful.

Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman buys a great deal in Sorel. I would like to know under what system he buys ?

Mr. OUIMET. We buy in the open market. Whenever supplies of some magnitude are required, we buy by tender, but as a rule they are not advertised for. We send round invitations to the most important merchants to send in their prices. We have a superintendent there who requisitions the department every time he wants something.

Mr. TARTE. What is the amount your officer is authorized to buy without reference to your department ?

Mr. OUIMET. Nothing at all. He has to refer every time. The whole control is at the head office.

Mr. TARTE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us who is the officer in Sorel who makes the purchases ?

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Dorais, under Superintendent Houghton.

Slides and Booms..... $8,500

Mr. TARTE. Is any part of this to be spent on the slide at Alma, in Chicoutimi and Saguenay ?

Mr. OUIMET. No. $5,000 is to be mainly expended on the St. Maurice work. The requisitions in that direction to the department have been greatly increased. The timber taken down the St. Maurice will certainly be double this year of what it has been, and the revenue will be more than doubled. The expenditure has been kept down as much as possible.

Mr. TARTE. Does the hon. Minister say that the slide at Alma is to be abandoned ?

Mr. OUIMET. I think it will.

Mr. TARTE. I have heard a great deal of complaint about it. I have in my hand a letter in which pretty hard things are said, whether true or not, I do not know. I am told that a large sum was spent there, and that slide is of no use.

Mr. OUIMET. It was largely used while timber was made in that region, but last year no timber went through the slides, and the question now under examination is whether we should abandon that work altogether, and I think we will.

Mr. TARTE. Who is in charge of that slide ?

Mr. OUIMET. A man of the name of Boulanger.

Mr. TARTE. How much is he paid per year ?

Mr. OUIMET. Something like $300.

Mr. TARTE. I call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that that man Boulanger with his sons, I am told, monopolized the whole amount of money that was spent there.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Chairman, I observe that in this vote there does not seem to be any sum asked for for repairs to the bridge at Des Joachims. In connection with that I would draw the attention of the committee to the report made by the chief engineer of the Department of Public Works, dated 30th June, 1894. He says :

> The Des Joachims bridge is an interprovincial bridge crossing the River Ottawa, and was completed by the department in 1884-85. Towards its construction the provinces of Quebec and Ontario contributed $4,000 each. * * * It is in such a dangerous condition, that, in January, 1894, it was condemned and closed against traffic.

If my information is correct, the total cost of the bridge was about $40,000, $8,000 of which as stated in the report, was contributed by the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and the balance, about $32,000 by the Dominion. The work, as stated here, is in a very dangerous condition, so dangerous that parties have been notified not to use the bridge. Now, in the Supplementary Estimates of last year the sum of $1,250 was voted for the repairs, and an equal sum, I understand, was contributed by the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. But no part of the $2,500 was expended, for the reason, as I understand, that the sum would not be sufficient to make the substantial repairs that are required to the superstructure of the bridge. The information I have in regard to it is that the substructure is in a very good condition, but that it would require some $10,000, or perhaps a little more to put the superstructure in a state of complete repair. It seems to me that it is doubtful economy to allow a work of that character which has cost the public so much money to be abandoned and go into a state of disrepair where so small a sum as that stated by me, part of which would doubtless be contributed by the provinces, would be required to put the superstructure into a condition of repair. I may state that this work is of the greatest possible necessity to the lumbermen who are operating on the north shore of the Ottawa. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is intended to abandon the work altogether, or to ask money at some future time to put it in a state of repair ?

Mr. OUIMET. As the hon. Speaker has stated, the amount necessary was too large

to allow of any repairs effectually being made out of the limited vote at our disposal. There is no danger that the bridge should be carried away by water, and we can wait for another year without endangering the substructure of the work. During the year, negotiations will be opened with the local governments to ascertain whether they will be willing to pay their share of the repairs, and if successful, I would recommend to the Government to place at the disposal of the department the amount necessary for the work.

Mr. LAURIER. As to the bridge at Edmonton. Has the site been selected yet ?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Which site is it.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman knows where the old ferry is. There is now a ferry a little below at the bend of the river. That is the place.

Mr. LAURIER. There are two ferries.

Mr. OUIMET. I think there are three now. There were two when I was there. The site selected is opposite what we used to call, at the time, the Ross Hotel.

Mr. LAURIER. Is not that below the town as it exists to-day ?

Mr. OUIMET. No : it is the site which has been selected by the town itself.

Mr. TARTE. Who is the resident engineer for the work ?

Mr. OUIMET. Gouin and St. Laurent prepare the surveys and plans. They are stationed at Winnipeg, and have charge of the works of the department in Manitoba and the North-west.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would call the attention of the Minister to the bridge across the Burlington Canal. I notice that $5,000, which is a re-vote, is placed in the Estimates for this purpose. I trust the Minister will be able to give us some assurance that this work will be prosecuted during the coming season. I need not press upon him the great necessity of completing this bridge at the earliest moment, because I am sure he is aware of the nature of the present means of communication across this canal. The means of crossing the channel at present is an old-fashioned scow, which has been in use a great many years. A great deal of travel crosses the canal here, for this is one of the leading roads into Hamilton from the north. Besides, a village has grown up on the beach extending a considerable distance on either side. I would ask the hon. Minister if he is able to say that the work will be proceeded with this summer, and if he thinks it will be ready for the superstructure in the winter season ?

Mr. OUIMET. The work is going to be proceeded with. The hon. gentleman is perhaps aware of the obstacles we met with on advertising for tenders. The Hamilton people protested, and those owning property adjoining the bridge objected that the swing bridge would interfere with their buildings. Then the question came up whether it would not be better instead of a swing bridge to have a drawbridge. Investigations were made, plans were submitted by interested parties, especially by these people who expected that a drawbridge could be drawn on the road, and would not interfere with the buildings adjoining. But this plan had to be set aside again. The masonry for the pier has been advertised for, and in due time a contract will be passed, and probably the bridge will be ready next year.

Telegraphs—Land line on the north shore of the St. Lawrence—To improve roadways, repair line and increase operating facilities between Godbout and Pointe aux Esquimaux..... $1,500

Mr. TARTE. Has the Minister any report ?

Mr. OUIMET. The vote is merely to keep the road in order. The hon. gentleman knows there is no regular road there, and our own linemen have to travel long distances. The amount is just to keep the road in suitable order to enable the line repairers to go along the line as necessity requires. This vote is certainly necessary.

Telegraph lines, British Columbia..... $4,500

Mr. MARA. As the Minister of Public Works is aware, I applied for an appropriation to construct a telegraph line from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Nicola, a distance of forty miles. The Nicola Valley is known as a thriving settlement, and the settlers think the time has arrived when they should be put in telegraphic communication with the outside world. I may say that I believe the provincial government would contribute one-half the sum if the Dominion Government would pay the other half.

Mr. OUIMET. I am not aware of such an arrangement. But it is the policy of the Government to have these various places, which are becoming more important every day, provided with proper telegraphic communication, that is, until such time as the regular telegraph companies can take hold of it themselves. I think they have been very useful in the past, and if there is any need of undertaking the construction of that line, the Government will do so. Before leaving this subject of public works, I may say that I was asked the other day as to whether Mr. Hamel had received any pay after he was discharged. I made inquiry, and I am in a position to say that he has not been paid one cent since.

Mr. TARTE. Has he been discharged altogether ?

Mr. OUIMET. He has been discharged. His services have been dispensed with.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask a question of the Minister with regard to the Picton post office. My hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I (Mr. Davies), was to ask the question. I was out and he also happened to be out at the time. I received a communication from Picton on the subject, asking for information. The item was passed a little while ago, but if the Minister would allow me, I would like to ask if that work has been let.

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Mr. MULOCK. My correspondent tells me that the land was bought some time ago, and that it is revenue-producing, and he desires to know who is getting the revenue of this property.

Mr. OUIMET. The department.

Mr. MULOCK. When is this work to be proceeded with?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not exactly say. Tenders have not been asked for.

Mr. MULOCK. Is it intended to proceed with it this year?

Mr. OUIMET. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The item is passed and cannot be discussed. I raise to a point of order.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Minister of Public Works does not wish to say anything further about the item, there will be another way by which I can get at this information, no doubt. I am told that a large portion of the revenue derived from this property——

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is talking of an item that has already been passed.

Mr. MULOCK. I ask the Minister of Public Works. If he chooses to answer, well and good.

Mr. OUIMET. I will give the information as soon as I can get it. I do not know myself now.

Mr. MULOCK. The information I want to get is this: the property was bought I am told some years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. I object to this as being out of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Denison). It is out of order.

Mr. OUIMET. Perhaps the hon. gentleman might have a talk with me to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and the committee rose.

ADJOURNMENT—THE PICTON POST OFFICE.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to suggest to the Minister of Public Works an item upon which I should like to obtain some information, if he will give it at a future occasion. I allude to the property bought some years ago as a site for a post office at the town of Picton. I am told that for some time the revenue from that property has been collected and retained by the former vendor for his own benefit; that may or may not be correct, and I am sure the Minister will be very glad to remove any erroneous impression of that kind should it exist. That is one point. Another point on which I desire to obtain information is, as to whether the site bought is to be utilized for the purpose for which it was bought, that is for the purpose of a post office? I am obliged to the Minister of Public Works for his courtesy on a recent occasion on my expressing a willingness to receive information in the public interest, and here I recognize his courtesy, and I will further recognize it when he gives, as I am sure he will give, this information which I ask purely in the public interest.

Mr. OUIMET. I will give the hon. gentleman the information.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman bring down particulars as to the reformatory which is to be built, as to its cost and the plan he intends to pursue?

Mr. OUIMET. My department will have to confer with the Department of Justice in regard to what accommodation will be required, and other matters. When that is done, my officers will go to work and give the hon. gentleman very exact estimates as to what will be the cost. It will take a few days, but I will give the information.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 28th June, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. LaRIVIERE presented fourth report of the committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House:

The committee recommend that Mr. Frank Hughes be appointed on the staff of translators of the Official Report of the Debates vice Mr. A. N. Montpetit.

DOMINION DAY—ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned till Tuesday next at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Mr. WELDON moved:

That the quorum of the Select Standing Committee on Railways and Canals be reduced to 25 members for the remainder of the session.

Mr. EDGAR. No notice has been given. I object to it.

Mr. WELDON. If the hon. gentleman will look at the practice he will find that this motion does not require notice. I took the trouble to consult the text of Dr. Bourinot's work, and his ruling seems to be clear enough.

Mr. LAURIER. I think there were several precedents to the contrary in the session of 1891.

Mr. MULOCK. In 1891 a motion was attempted to be made by the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee in respect to matters that had gone through the House pro forma, and on the point being taken before the House on that occasion the Speaker declined to hear the motion under motions, and it had to go on the Order paper. On that occasion the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee had presented to the House the authority, if I remember rightly, of the Public Accounts Committee, recommending a certain course in regard to the examination of witnesses. The point was taken before the House that that motion could not be proceeded with in this informal way under the head of motions, and effect was given to that objection. The test was that where the motion was assented to as a matter of course and allowed to pass as a matter of course and was an informal motion not involving any discussion, it might fairly be allowed to come in at this stage as part of routine; but where it involved a substantial discussion, or was in itself material, in that case it could only come in and take its place as any other notice of motion. This certainly is a proposition that may involve considerable discussion, because the object of the motion would have to be discussed—it would be proper to point out the object of the motion in discussing it—and it would involve a very exhaustive discussion upon perhaps collateral matters. We have had in short form a partial discussion of the matter involved, and two days and two nights have been spent by this House in discussing what I may term a mere branch of the matter involved, and it is still undetermined. So the subsequent discussion of this motion must take a wide range, and it is unfair that a motion involving consequences so extensive should be sprung upon the House without notice to the persons interested. Not only the rules of the House but a sense of justice show the necessity of rules being applied here. There must be a reason requiring notice of motion. The reason is obviously that interests affected may be considered, and that the House may not hastily commit itself to attitudes to which it should not commit itself. We cannot be too careful in proceeding gradually and carefully in dealing with a matter such as this. Here, without notice to anybody, a motion is made, of a general character it is true, but intended to deal with a particular interest. It is impossible to ignore what is behind this motion. There is a large issue at stake before a certain committee of this House, and that issue is one of far-reaching importance, and the object of this motion is that that issue may be disposed of in a certain way. Mr. Speaker, I submit there is nothing which the majority is more bound to respect than individual rights. If we ignore the right of property, and by any laxity allow property to be confiscated, to that extent——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MULOCK. I will only finish the sentence.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not want even in spirit to evade the point of order. But we are unable to discuss this question without recognizing that it is making use of a general rule in order to deal with a particular matter, and interests are involved that will be affected in this particular by this procedure. I think the point of order is well taken by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and that this House is entitled to notice before this motion can be considered as now presented by a private member.

Mr. WELDON. I should like to read the authority, which I find in Dr. Bourinot's work, at page 744, as follows:—

When a committee cannot meet for want of a quorum——

As was the case this morning,

—the attention of the House may be called to the fact, and its interposition invoked. In such a case the House will order: That the committee be revived, and that leave be given to sit and proceed on a certain day. Or the House may order: That the committee have leave to sit and proceed with two or more members, in case there is no likelihood of a quorum. In the Legislative Assembly of Canada, 1863, a member complained to the House, that one of the standing committees had not met for some time, and would not assemble for several days to come, and requested that the House would order the committee to meet. The Speaker said, with respect to this

point: "The House could instruct the committee to meet, and it was not necessary that the member who desired the meeting, should give notice of a motion.

Practically that is the case to-day.

Mr. MULOCK. There has been no attempt to get a quorum.

Mr. EDGAR. I submit that there is no case of urgency shown. If we are going into any matter that has not been shown before the House——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not the point of order.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, no special facts can here be shown to ask an exception from the general rule, or else, if they are shown, they can be discussed. If they are to be stated by one hon. member they must be discussed and stated by another. So I propose to make the statement, that no special circumstance has been shown for an exception to the ordinary rule that notice must be given by notice of motion. The case cited from Dr. Bourinot does not apply, because it has not been shown that a quorum of the Railway Committee cannot be obtained. The Railway Committee was sitting for hours to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. There was no quorum.

Mr. EDGAR. After the committee had been sitting from 10 o'clock to 1 o'clock to-day, and when the members all got hungry, it was discovered that there was no quorum, and I am not surprised at that. But you cannot legislate for such a circumstance as that. You must give members of the Railway Committee a chance to get their lunch, and because there was no quorum, after sitting for three hours, that is not a special circumstance on which to ask this permission from the House.

Mr. TISDALE. I think I can show that urgency does exist and that it is necessary in this case to reduce the quorum.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I merely desire to do what I can to assist you in a decision on this point of order. I do not pretend to know why my hon. friend has moved in the matter, but it seems to me the point of order is well taken. The general rule, of course, is as you will find at page 373 of Bourinot: No motion can be made without notice of it. There seems to be no exception to that general rule, or at all events, the representation that my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) brings to our notice does not appear to me to be the least in point. In the legislative assembly of Canada, 1863, a member complained to the House that one of the standing committees had not met for some time and would not meet for several days to come, and he requested that the House should order the committee to meet. What the Speaker then ruled was: that the House could instruct the committee to meet, and that it was not necessary for the member who desired the meeting to give notice of motion. But that is not the motion now before the House. This motion is to reduce the quorum of the committee. It is not a motion directing that the committee should meet, or one that might be made without notice, because it is the duty of the committee to meet. Here the motion is to change a standing order of this House made in the earlier part of the session, which order fixed the quorum. To revoke or change a standing order without notice does appear to me to be quite outside our practice.

Mr. CHARLTON. In our standing orders we have reference to the matter of motions in paragraph 32:

A motion may be made by unanimous consent of the House without previous notice.

I apprehend that there is no other rule bearing upon the question and that notice of motion must be given unless there is the unanimous consent of the House to the contrary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). At page 502 of Dr. Bourinot's book I find the following:—

Under Rule 79 of the Commons, a majority of the members of a committee compose a quorum; but it is now usual, on the appointment of the standing committees, to fix it at a certain number immediately. An exception, however, is made in the case of the committees on "Privileges and Elections" and on "Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines," the latter of which is composed of a very large number compared with others. Consequently, there must be a majority of the members of these committees present before either can proceed to business. Sometimes the chairman or other member of the select committee will move, that the House order a reduction in the number of the quorum, in case it is found difficult to obtain a large attendance of the members, or this may be done on the recommendation of the committee itself.

As the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says, when we undertake to apply that exception, due notice of motion must be given.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to a precedent during the session of 1891. On the 8th of July, 1891:

Mr. WALLACE moved: That the order of the House of the 25th June last be rescinded, &c.

Mr. LAURIER. I think such a motion as this requires notice.

Mr. WALLACE. This motion is made by the instruction of the committee.

and so the debate went on and the Speaker ruled as follows:—

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing now before the House. I have ruled that the motion requires notice.

Mr. WELDON. I ask the indulgence of the House to reply to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The case I

cited in 1863 is identical with this case. I cannot see any distinction whatever although I have listened carefuly. There is a like urgency in this case. The quorum of this committee is 84, and I am perfectly certain there has never been a quorum there this year, nor do I think a member of this House has ever seen a quorum in that committee. We had a very large attendance to-day, and there was not more than 70 present. When the vote was taken the total number present was 61. Practically the reason which prevailed in 1863 is an urgent reason now, because if we cannot meet, the business will be blocked.

Mr. LAURIER. That refers to the time when we had controverted elections before the committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I moved the other day for the reduction of the quorum of a committee, and while this point was not taken, yet I do not think it occurred to any hon. gentleman to suggest that notice of motion should be given. I would like to call the attention of the Speaker to standing rule of the House No. 79 :

When a number of members are appointed to compose a committee the majority of the same shall be a quorum, unless the House has otherwise ordered.

It does seem to me, therefore, that a motion would always be in order to make the order contemplated by the House. Before sitting down, I would like to point out that the House certainly never did realize the extraordinary number of members on this committee in connection with that general rule requiring a majority to form a quorum, because in the British House of Commons five is the general number constituting a quorum for any committee of that House, a House twice the size of ours.

Mr. SPROULE. In answer to the statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition as to a motion having been ruled out of order because notice was not given of it, I find that on the 25th of June, 1891, the motion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was made without any notice. It was to the following effect :—

Mr. Mulock moved : That it is desirable that any witness called before the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, be examined under oath or affirmation touching any matters coming before them.

Motion agreed to.

There was no notice given of the motion, nor any recommendation from the committee that it should pass.

Mr. MULOCK. There was no objection.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the leader of the Opposition takes the position that it never has been done.

Mr. DAVIN. At one time it was the practice in this House for the chairman of the committee, on presenting his first report, to move a reduction in the number constituting a quorum, and there could be no notice of that.

Mr. McCARTHY. It was not necessary, because the report was a notice.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would like to call attention to this fact, that the standing committees of this House are formed upon the report of a committee appointed for that purpose in the early days of the session, that in each case the report of the committee fixed the quorum, and that this motion, which is intended to change the quorum then fixed for this particular committee, is equivalent to amending the report of that committee without notice. That is surely entirely inconsistent with every rule and practice of Parliament, and every member can see the evil results of establishing a precedent of that kind.

Mr. SPEAKER. In view of the conflicting opinions that have been expressed by hon. members on both sides of the House, I find myself somewhat at a loss in coming to a conclusion in regard to this matter. Generally speaking, the rule which has been by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), that motions require notice, is a sound rule of parliamentary practice ; but I confess that I do not think that the precedent which the hon. member has quoted as having been made in 1891, applies fully to the case now under consideration. I find the following in Mr. Bourinot's work :—

In case the committee do not report with reference to a Bill, the House should take cognizance of the matter. "It is the duty of every committee to report to the House the Bill that has been committed to them," says the best English authority, "and not by long adjournments, or by an informal discontinuance of their sittings to withhold from the House the result of their proceedings. If any attempt of this nature be made to defeat a Bill, the House will interfere to prevent it." Sometimes, under such circumstances, a committee will be "ordered to meet" on a certain day, "to proceed with the Bill." When a committee cannot meet for want of quorum, the attention of the House may be called to the fact, and its interposition invoked. In such a case the House will order : That the committee be revived and that leave be given to sit and proceed on a certain day. Or the House may order : That the committee have leave to sit and proceed with two or more members, in case there is no likelihood of a quorum.

Now, the case, as I understand it, is this : Certain Bills have been referred to the Committee on Railways, and the members of that committee say that, in consequence of there not being a quorum obtainable, these Bills cannot be reported.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. That I understand to be the statement of the case made by members of the committee. If that statement is not correct, it may alter my decision; but if it be the case that a quorum of the Railway Committee cannot be obtained, surely no hon. member of this House would say that the whole of the proceedings with regard to the Bills that have been referred to the committee should be delayed for want of a proceeding such as is proposed to be made to-day. If the statement be correct that a meeting of the Railway Committee cannot be had because a quorum cannot be obtained, then, I think, it would be in order that this motion should be put.

Mr. TISDALE. As chairman of the committee, I am prepared to state the facts. The last meeting of the committee was held the day before yesterday, when it sat from eleven o'clock till three without a quorum.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. TISDALE. If there were 84 people in the room, they were not all members of Parliament. To-day the committee met at ten, and at one o'clock, while discussing the measure which was before it on the previous day, it was counted out by motion, and I was compelled to rule that there was no quorum. These are the facts.

Mr. EDGAR. As to the question of fact, I suppose I may make a statement. I have been almost as regular an attendant of that committee as the chairman, and on no day with the exception of to-day, has the committee failed to meet and do business when it was called, and to-day it sat for three hours. I am quite prepared to agree that when the committee is duly called and is obliged to disband for want of a quorum, there is ground for interference; but the chairman of the committee will agree with me that during this Parliament there has never been an occasion when the Railway Committee was disbanded when it was called, for the want of a quorum.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that. So far as my knowledge goes, the question of the quorum has never been raised at any time during the years that I have been chairman. I have just sent to the clerk of the committee for the record of the proceedings of this morning. It was before one o'clock when the main division was taken.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think any member of this House would take exception to the motion if the facts were as stated by the hon. gentleman; but there is a great difference of opinion on that point. Apart from that, I do not think the House would object to the motion made by the hon. member for Albert, if it were made in the proper way, after notice given. For myself, if proper notice were given of it, I agree that it would be a proper motion to carry, but certainly not without notice.

Mr. DENISON. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), says it seldom happens that a committee is counted out. Then, if it was counted out to-day, that is a reason to my mind why the quorum should be changed. The fact that in this House with 215 members, 20 constitute a quorum, is a strong reason why a committee of 164 members should have a smaller quorum than 83. I think 20 would be quite sufficient, and I would vote for that number if I had the opportunity.

Mr. LAURIER. I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that if it be the case that the committee from time to time meets without a quorum, that would be a good reason for changing the general rule and that change should only be made after due notice. I do not say that there may not be reason to change the rule if it be found that the quorum is too large, but I am strongly opposed to this motion being made, without notice, to suit a special case and for a special purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. The committee adjourned to-day at one o'clock to meet to-morrow morning at nine. We are near the end of the session, when it is important railway legislation should be put through that committee, and it is for that reason we propose to meet to-morrow at nine. I am prepared to say, and I think the whip of the Opposition will agree with me, that if the quorum remains as it is, there will not be sufficient members in the city to form a quorum.

Mr. BORDEN. We are asked to change the rule for a special occasion and a special purpose. I think this House will hesitate before undertaking to accept and pass a motion of this kind without notice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that the very strongest reason that could possibly be given against your consenting, Mr. Speaker, to allow this motion to be put, has been given in the statement of the hon. member for Leeds. It is perfectly clear that what I can call nothing else but a trick is attempted to be played on the majority of the members of the committee. Every man knows that the vast portion of the members of the committee have already made arrangements to leave this town and will not be here until Tuesday morning at the earliest, and that, under such circumstances, in a matter of grave importance which has been under discussion for a considerable time, a member, should be found to move that we should do what we have very rarely done, what has not been done from the commencement of the session until the present, hold a meeting at an unusual early hour on Saturday morning for the express purpose of putting through a Bill, probably

without the consent of the majority of the members of the committtee, appears to me as gross a parliamentary outrage as in my 33 years experience I have ever seen attempted.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is one other precedent to which I did not refer when I first spoke, and it is this. On page 744 of Bourinot's book, the following will be found, after the case referred to by the hon. member for Albert :—

In the session of the House of Commons of 1877 a Bill respecting the Albert Railway Company came up from the Senate with amendments, and was referred to the Committee on Railways in accordance with the rule in such cases. As it was then near the end of the session, there was a difficulty in obtaining a quorum of the committee, and the Bill was not reported. The member in charge of the Bill moved that the order of reference be discharged, and that the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill be considered. The Speaker decided that no notice was required of such a motion, and the Bill was then taken up and its further consideration deferred for three months—several members having strong objections to its passage.

It seems to me that this, although not exactly a case in point, is one that would justify the course proposed in moving this motion without notice. I understand there is a large number of Bills which have been referred to the Railway Committee, and if a quorum of that committee cannot be had no business can be done. The result must be that the whole of the railway legislation before the Railway Committee would be stopped. I am, therefore, of opinion that this motion can be put.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We can debate the desirability of the motion, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Certainly. The motion is that the quorum of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines be reduced to 25 members for the remainder of the present session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is put, I want to have a little discussion upon it ; and I daresay that as it is an important question, a few hours may be very profitably spent, in view of the light thrown on the matter by the hon. member for Leeds. Let us understand exactly where we are. In the first place, we find that a discussion involving various important questions of constitutional law, various questions of right, has been going on for a considerable time on this particular Bill. There is no sort of doubt in the minds of any hon. gentlemen that this measure ought to be discussed and fully considered, and ought to be fully considered under such circumstances as will give a large number of the members of this House, who belong to the Railway Committee, an opportunity of expressing their views. Now, it is perfectly evident that we have, by common consent, agreed to respect Saturday as a holiday. It is more particularly desirable, in the interests of the Ministers themselves, that that should be done, because we are aware that they are far from a unit on certain important questions, because we are aware that they need—poor people—rest as much as any of the rest of us, and I, for my part, cannot be an accomplice to depriving hon. gentlemen opposite of the short interval which is to be given them to decide a matter which has exercised them, as we know, ever since a very early period of this year. As regards this question they must clearly be present, many of them, in the Railway Committee to-morrow morning. It will be obvious to everybody that we are doing a very improper thing in interfering unnecessarily with the holiday of the Ministers and depriving them of the opportunity of giving that ripe and serious consideration to questions which have exercised them for a long time—questions on which, if I am correctly informed, there were great differences of opinion, which even led to arguments not commonly recognized as likely to be used in Council Chambers. In view of all the circumstances connected with this motion, which is for the express purpose of holding a committee meeting to-morrow morning at an early hour, at which, if we sit to our usual period to-night, it will be almost impossible for many of us, myself among the number, to attend, there is the strongest possible ground to refuse assent to a motion which is evidently made, I am sorry to say, for the purpose of carrying out what is neither more nor less than a trick. I would not object so much if this committtee had been ordered to meet on Tuesday or Wednesday morning, but I object exceedingly to this motion when it is done for the express purpose of enabling a hole-and-corner meeting to be held at a period when the great majority of members of this House, no less than the great majority of members of the committee, are necessarily absent from the city or would be put to extreme personal inconvenience if called upon to attend. The object of this motion is to make it impossible practically for a quorum of the Railway Committee to be present.

Mr. TISDALE. As far as I am concerned, I would much prefer changing the motion until Tuesday morning.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The House does not meet until three o'clock Tuesday.

Mr. MULOCK. Say Wednesday.

Mr. TISDALE. Wednesday morning,then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That will remove my personal objection, and I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman is sufficiently alive to the nature of the case to make this change. If that is done, so far

as I am concerned there will be no objection.

Mr. TISDALE. I wish to say one word, notice has not been given for to-morrow. The committee adjourned and I withheld the notice until I saw what, if anything, was done in the House. Notice was given in the committee that the motion would be made. I quite agree with some of the things the hon. gentleman has said, and I wish to say on behalf of the Railway Committee, and particularly for myself as chairman, that the object of the motion is to put us in the position not merely to deal with one Bill but to deal with all the Bills before us. There are nine Bills to my knowledge, and if we do not put ourselves in a position to make progress, we cannot get through work in time. If the motion passes, I will not call the meeting until Wednesday.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see that the committee are in a position to make a report to the House. From a statement made by the hon. gentleman, the committee had not a quorum. That fact would prevent them from making any report.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not a report.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Therefore there can be no information communicated to the House on which this House can act at all.

Mr. FOSTER. The chairman does that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But he does it as the organ of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman's position is clearly untenable. Suppose that a number of members sufficient to make a quorum impossible refused to meet, there never could be a report of the committee and this House could never take action.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is quite true, but the member, as a member, can bring the matter as an ordinary subject for the action of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. While the proposal of the chairman of the Railway Committee to call the meeting on Wednesday obviates the objection to meeting on Saturday, when most of the members are out of the city and the House is not in session, there is still another difficulty in the case, in my opinion. We should exercise the utmost care in this House with regard to setting precedents that may operate in the future adversely to popular liberties and proper parliamentary government. Now, we are acting upon a motion of which no notice has been given. I take it, Mr. Speaker, from the remarks you made, and from the authority cited by yourself, that, if the fact had been admitted, which is not admitted, there would be propriety in having this motion acted upon; but the assertion made is denied and not admitted. It is not admitted to be the fact that the Railway Committee were unable to act for want of a quorum. Under any circumstances, with no fact admitted such as is necessary to justify the action, with the existence of such fact disputed and denied by many members of this Railway Committee, with the fact established that the committee has never met without proceeding to business, that it never was demonstrated to be without a quorum until to-day at one o'clock, after it had sat until its usual time for adjournment—I object to this ruling; I object to proceeding with this motion without due notice. I object to it particularly, as it is proposed that the committee shall not meet until Wednesday. If notice is given to-day, the motion can be brought before the House on Tuesday, and decided, the quorum can be reduced on Tuesday, and the committee can meet on Wednesday, as proposed; and the difficulty that arises of establishing a precedent, which, in my opinion, is a very questionable one, will be obviated. No purpose is served by putting the motion to-day, so we had better give to the question the benefit of the doubt that clearly does exist, and avoid possibility of establishing a precedent which is not in accordance with the rules of the House, and of the best principles of parliamentary government.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not want to discuss the question, but the view I take is, that the precedent has already been set under the rule of the Speaker.

Mr. CHARLTON. The motion has not been acted upon.

Mr. EDGAR. But Mr. Speaker has given his ruling, which was not appealed from; so the question is decided, I am afraid. We must assume for the present, that we were wrong, and the Chair was right.

Mr. CHARLTON. But it is a bad precedent.

Mr. EDGAR. But I am afraid it is set, and will not be altered by what we may do.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 128) to amend the Act respecting certain female offenders in the province of Nova Scotia (from the Senate).—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

NAVIGATION OF THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to inquire of the Minister of Marine or, in his absence, of the Minister of Justice, who has been acting as Minister of Marine, if the attention of the Government has been called to the fact that a Bill relating to the navigation of the great lakes and of the channels connecting with those lakes as far east as Montreal, has been passed by the American Congress? That Bill received the assent of

the President of the United States on the 5th February, and went into operation on the 1st March, 1895. The Bill, which I hold in my hand, makes provision with regard to lights, fog-signals, sailing vessels and steam vessels, and establishes a complete code of signal, and makes many important changes, as I understand, which, of course, it will be necessary for the Canadian lake marine to conform to, if we are to secure one uniform code of rules for the lake marine of both countries. Has the attention of the Government been directed to this law, and have the provisions of the law of Congress been considered, with a view to bringing the laws affecting our lake marine into accordance with them ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sorry the Minister of Marine happens to be out. I personally do not follow the legislation as closely as I did. I have no doubt, however, from my experience of the Marine Department that the officials have considered that legislation very carefully, and will bring it in due course to the attention of the Minister of Marine, and then to the attention of the Government. But it has not yet been formally considered by the Government.

THE MARKLAND MORTGAGE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to inquire of the Minister of Finance whether he can lay on the Table the mortgage given to Her Majesty by the Hon. George H. Markland ? I have inquired about that two or three times, but I have not as yet seen the mortgage or a copy of it.

Mr. FOSTER. The mortgage cannot be laid on the Table. It cannot be found. It is registered, and it might be copied.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to mention to the hon. gentleman that from information received, I understand this resolution proposes to accept a considerably smaller sum than is due to the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I wish to notify him formally that I have been informed, though I am not speaking with positive knowledge, that the property covered is ample security for the whole of the original debt.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not our information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Exactly, and that is a matter that ought to be inquired into, because we have no right to give up public property for less than its value. That is one reason why I want a copy of the mortgage at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to go on with that to-day, so far as passing the resolution, so as to have my Bill introduced, and then it might rest until we get the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we ought to have a copy of the document before us before we proceed to pass the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Before we pass the second reading ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On the distinct understanding that no further stage is taken until this document be produced, within a reasonable time to allow us to ascertain the facts.

Resolution (p. 2408) respecting the release and discharge of a certain mortgage given to Her Majesty by the Hon. George H. Markland, was read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 136) respecting the discharge of a mortgage to Her Majesty, known as the Markland mortgage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 126) respecting commercial treaties affecting Canada.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the hon. gentleman propose to go into committee on that Bill to-day ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR. Have the papers been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. The papers were brought down yesterday, but they have scarcely any relation to the Bill. They are merely formal communications that have taken place.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have no time to verify that.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think the House should go into committee to-day on that Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolved itself into committee.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think the hon. gentleman should press that motion. There is no particular reason why it should be taken up to-day that I am aware of. It is not going to be assented to this afternoon, and cannot be assented to. It has got to stand in the position of other Bills. When hon. members who take an interest in the subject have not had an opportunity of looking at the papers, I hardly think the hon. gentleman should rush the Bill through committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to take the position of forcing it through at all, but I

want to ask my hon. friend's attention to the history of this Bill. The Bill is simply to confirm the treaty. The treaty has now been before the House for two sessions, I might almost say for three sessions. Everything in connection with the treaty itself has been thoroughly and repeatedly discussed. We have done everything that was necessary in order to bring matters to such a position that the treaty should go into actual force. The House had reason to expect that it would have been ratified before we met again, but something cropped up in the meantime, and that was simply this: That in order to make sure that the treaty obligation entered into between Great Britain and the most-favoured nations would be respected, it became necessary that we should so legislate that most-favoured nations should have the same advantages, quoad these articles, as France has in our markets. There are no papers brought down yesterday that materially affect that position. All the information has been before the House for a long time, and everything has really been done except simply to take that difficulty out of the way before passing the Bill. The most-favoured nations are to have the same position in our markets as by this treaty is given to France. Therefore, my hon. friend will not say that I am trying to force the Bill. At the same time we are getting well on towards the close of the session, I hope.

Mr. EDGAR. This Bill was only introduced on the 20th June.

Mr. FOSTER. But the Bill, with the whole principle involved, was introduced in the early days of the session.

Mr. CHARLTON. It may be true, as the leader of the Government says, that the papers which have been brought down do not materially affect this Bill, but members of the House who are interested in it, have, I think, a right to claim the privilege of examining these papers, at all events, and satisfying themselves that the estimate placed upon them by the leader of the Government is a correct one. The system of forcing through legislation is not a good one, and if we do things decently and in order, it is proper to allow one day to intervene between the second reading of that Bill and its consideration in Committee of the Whole, especially where the papers relating to that Bill have not been in the hands of the House to enable members to understand the position. Having some interest in this Bill, I hope that the leader of the House will not press its consideration in committee to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not quite certain whether this French treaty can be regarded as in the strictest sense a treaty of reciprocity. I do not know what position the Government have taken as respects that. But if it be a treaty of reciprocity, there is a question involved of great importance, indeed, which should require to be carefully thought out by the legal adviser of the Government; that is, the question whether, when you make a treaty of reciprocity, what are known as the most-favoured-nation clauses, apply at all. My belief and my contention has always been that they do not, that a reciprocity treaty is a thing wholly and entirely apart, from the nature of the case, from any one of those treaties containing general clauses and general powers, and I would not like that in passing this Act we should appear to depart from that principle, or in any sense appear to recognize the fact that favoured-nation clauses made by Great Britain, or made by ourselves even, are necessarily affected by a reciprocity treaty. The point may come to be one of very great importance within a moderate space of time, and we should make no rash decision. The hon. gentleman will recollect perfectly well that his late leader, Sir John Thompson, on being interrogated on that point, appeared to entertain the same view which I myself entertained and which has been expressed by other members of this House, to the effect that a reciprocity treaty is a thing wholly and entirely apart, that a reciprocity treaty is a treaty by which we grant or sell rather certain special privileges in exchange for a consideration given to us by a particular power. It is as much, to my mind, a bargain between two nations as the exchange of a bushel of barley for half a dozen yards of cotton would be between two individuals, and the favoured-nation clause should not apply to cases involving such a transaction. I am not, at this moment, quite clear whether the hon. gentleman leading the House regards the treaty with France as a reciprocity treaty, I rather incline to think he does; but the point is one of great importance, and one on which we should be very clear, indeed, before we place legislation on the statute-book which may appear to contravene the principle I have spoken of, and which, to the best of my recollection, was confirmed by the opinion of Sir John Thompson.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has raised a point not new to the House, and as he states the interrogation was made on one or two occasions, and our late leader, Sir John Thompson, spoke on one occasion. There are, of course, two views. One is that a reciprocity treaty, as the hon. gentleman has said, is simply a treaty, in which one country sells to the other, or in which both countries sell to each other for a material consideration, something which one has and the other wants, and that the very fact that a quid pro quo is given for that, bars out the claim for like treatment to a nation which has most-favoured treaties in that respect. The two lines of thought may be called the American and British

lines. The British Government has always gone on the assumption that most-favoured-nation treaties do bind in this respect, and that so far as she is concerned, when she makes a treaty by which she gives some privilege to a foreign power, and that foreign power gives her something in return, at the same time every power which has the most-favoured-nation treaty with Great Britain, participates in that privilege. And you might take that argument a little further, and say that the third power which claimed to participate had already bought the privilege, and that the terms were stated in the treaty which had been entered into between Great Britain, and that this very power, which stipulated that if, at any time better terms were given to another power, they should be conceded to her, in consideration of what this third power was supposed to give to Great Britain at that time, she bought also whatever advantage Great Britain should give to the third power. Sir John Thompson, if I remember rightly the discussion, and I think I do, rather inclined theoretically, in his own view, to the idea that a reciprocity treaty was simply a treaty between two parties, that it was a bargain and sale; but, at the same time, he kept clearly in view before this House the distinction between that view and the British view. The Government, of course, concedes the British view. The question is outside of academic discussion, and the position is thoroughly conceded by this Government. In fact, this treaty itself began and the negotiations were carried on under the express instructions and under the express understanding that so far as this treaty was concerned, the most-favoured-nation obligations should be observed, and those powers should have the same privileges as were given to France quoad articles admitted into the country by virtue of the treaty. Negotiations proceeded on that basis, the treaty was made, based on that principle, and we propose to carry that out, and, so far as the most-favoured nations are concerned, we propose to give them, by virtue of the treaties which Great Britain has with them, exactly the same privileges in our markets as to those articles as France obtains. The hon. gentleman should scarcely take objection to that course. It certainly should be favoured by him, as I understand, theoretically, at least, the hon. gentleman and his party are in favour of the widest possible trade. These principles have already been discussed by this House, and I think the House will understand that so far as the Government is concerned, in regard to this treaty, we propose to stand by the British view.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With the permission of the House I desire to say two things to the hon. gentleman. In the first place, I doubt the historical correctness of this statement. I have not the papers before me, as I did not expect the matter to be brought up; but I believe that Great Britain, in making her treaties, has not invariably followed that rule, that she has done so sometimes, but my recollection at the present moment is that, in the last instance of a reciprocity treaty, that with France, Great Britain did not concede to other nations the privileges granted to France. That is my recollection. It is a matter that could be verified by reference to documents, and to the English "Hansard," but so far as I recollect, that was a reciprocity treaty in the stricter sense. There is an obvious inconvenience in our committing ourselves, even by an Act of this kind, to any such understanding as that which the Government has proposed to act upon, and I, for myself, dissent from it, and I would have desired the second reading carried on a division if the matter had been brought up. However, I shall have an opportunity to record my dissent on the third reading. I entertain strong views as to the extreme impolicy and impropriety on the part of the Government in allowing favoured-nation clauses made by Great Britain on her own part, without reference to us, to prevail at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not the practice to do it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not admit the right of the British Parliament to legislate for the Canadian people. Her Majesty is Queen of England, and also Queen of Canada, and on matters affecting Canada she is bound to take the advice of her Canadian advisers and the Canadian Parliament. I do not fancy the Minister of Justice will find much to dissent from in that view.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We agreed pretty closely in that view, I think, and possibly our communications with the British Government have been in that direction. I suppose they have. This matter is one which would warrant a little delay. I do not particularly object to the hon. gentleman going on, because I can take the opportunity at the third reading to raise a discussion, if need be, on this matter, although it is a little inconvenient to discuss a matter after it has gone through committee.

Mr. AMYOT. I am glad to see that the Government intend pushing through the matter as soon as possible, because a certain portion of the press has been attacking them.

Mr. BERGERON. Which press?

Mr. AMYOT. The Opposition press. That press has attacked the Government on account of that treaty. It has stated that the Government had no intention to carry out the terms of that treaty, and that the treaty

itself was a sham to deceive the public. I am glaid that this unjust attack will be now impossible, and I hope the members of the Opposition will show in the House that the attacks of their press are false.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What I have to say upon this subject may, perhaps, be said in the committee, on the first clause. The Minister of Finance has correctly stated the American view with regard to reciprocity treaties. The United States have, on several occasions, had the question before their State Department, and on every occasion they have held that a reciprocity treaty is a special treaty which gives to no nation with whom they have a favoured-nation clause, a right to the privileges that are granted in a treaty of reciprocity. The rule in the United States is exactly as has been stated by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Finance Minister. But with regard to the English doctrine, I think the Minister of Finance will find that their rule has not been uniform. In a discussion with the Government of Spain, with reference to the admission of certain products into the island of Cuba, they put the doctrine precisely as the Minister of Finance has stated it, that is: That the favoured-nation clause gives them the absolute right to any concession made to any other state, no matter under what circumstances or by what arrangement that concession has been made. The doctrine laid down in that case has not been followed in any other case. For instance, the English Government recognized the American doctrine at the time a treaty was made between England and the United States in respect to Canada. They did not insist that the products of every other colony should, under the favoured-nation clause, go into the United States upon the same terms that the products of Canada did, nor do I think the doctrine was recognized in respect to Spanish wines after the Cobden treaty. It shows that the doctrine has not been uniformly applied in England. There is this much, which I think is very clear. It is not worth while to say "good morning" to a certain party until you meet him, and, that being the case, it is not necessary that we should declare, in advance, that we will concede to every state or nation with whom England may have a favoured-nation clause, what we concede to France. If we are bound to do that under any arrangement made by Great Britain, according to the recognized law of nations, we do not need this declaration, and if we are not compelled to make the concession, then we will be relieved, and the hon. Minister will see that that provision is unnecessary.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think I can show in the committee that it is the case.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think it is possible that, when this treaty was entered into, either the French negotiators, or the negotiators for Canada could have understood what the effect of it would be, as now interpreted.

Mr. FOSTER. Both understood it thoroughly.

Mr. EDGAR. Well, I am sure the people of Canada did not, and I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did not understand it, because, according to his answers to questions from this side of the House, he could not tell whether these reductions, which we made on behalf of France, were to be in favour of all the world, or of France alone. The Minister of Finance, at that time, was not instructed, although, perhaps, the negotiators were. Now, what is the result of this? Here, under Article III., France gives certain concessions to Canada, and allows certain articles which we have to sell to be introduced into France at their minimum tariff rates. I do not complain about that, for it is well enough so far as it goes, and it might do us some good. But what do we give in return for it? In Article I, we take certain concession to France by taking off the ad valorem duty on wines, soaps, nuts, almonds, prunes, and so on. I suppose one would think that these two reciprocal concessions should balance each other. But what do we find now? We find that while we only get that reduction which France gives us, we give the reduction made in favour of France to any number of other countries, among which are, according to the statement of the Government—Argentine, Austro-Hungary, Belgium, Bolivia, Chili, Columbia, Costa Rica, Germany (Zollverein), Muscat, Russia, Salvador, Sweden and Norway, Uraguay, and probably also to Egpyt, Montenegro, Mexico, Persia, South Africa, Venezuela, Zanzibar. We get no favour, however, from any of these countries. We do not get any encouragement for Canadian commerce, but we allow them all these benefits of a reduction in their tariff by this Bill to-day. I do not know how that could possibly be considered a good stroke of business on behalf of Canada. We get a little benefit from one country, and we allow about fifteen other countries to get the same benefits from us as we give in return to this one country. That, Sir, is a very serious thing. If we are going to repeat this experiment in many cases we would have no tariff left. The protective system which the hon. gentlemen so strongly advocate is interfered with in this matter, particularly of wines, and that, perhaps, is one of the matters in

which I rather commend the increase of duty than otherwise. But the wine-growers of this country may just as well understand now, if they did not before, that while they thought they were only going to have the competition of France for their cheap wines, they are to have competition from all the long list of countries I have read, and, among others, Austro-Hungary, Germany, and Belgium, where a great quantity of these wines are manufactured. The bars of our customs tariff are taken down, the duties are reduced, and our native wine-growers are so much handicapped. It is just as well that that should be clearly understood. I entirely agree with the hon. gentlemen from Oxford and Bothwell, that we should hesitate very long before we acknowledge by our legislation the right of the British Government to legislate for Canada, or to force us to legislate for ourselves as they have done by this long list of treaties which I have read. They included us in all these treaties, except one or two, without any knowledge or consent of Canada, and we cannot get out of them. We cannot, by any appeals to Great Britain, relieve ourselves of the burdens of these treaties. It is true, they now make provisions of more or less force that Canada may be relieved of these treaties, but we know what that means. In the Berne Copyright Convention they made a provision of that kind, to the effect that Great Britain could denounce the treaty on behalf of Canada on giving a year's notice. We have asked them, by address of this House, for probably five or six years, to do that, and they have never done it. I hope the Government are still of this view, and that they are going to make absolutely sure that Great Britain will not hang this treaty around our neck any longer than we want. I think the late Sir John Thompson was anxious that, before he asked Parliament to ratify this treaty, it should be made abundantly clear that the Government of Great Britain would act at our suggestion without our having to knock at their doors for five or six years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That assurance has been given.

Mr. EDGAR. I think I saw in to-day's paper that that assurance was given by the Colonial Secretary. So far so good; but we are at present taking these burdens upon ourselves, which I have pointed out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I had not before examined this Bill with any care, because I had supposed that it was an Act to bring into operation the treaty between Canada and France; but I see that it is for a wholly different purpose. It is an Act to provide for the consequences which are supposed to result from that treaty with respect to other states than France. Now, I must deprecate the course the Ministers are taking with regard to this matter. Let me call their attention to what is stated in the Bill:

> The advantages granted to France by the treaty with that power mentioned in the said Act, with respect to its commerce with Canada, shall extend to any and every other foreign power which by reason of the operation of such treaty is, under the provisions of a treaty with Great Britain, entitled, in whole or in part, to the same or to the like advantages with respect to its commerce with Canada, to the extent to which in manner aforesaid such other foreign power is entitled thereto.

The hon. member will see that he is giving legislative recognition to a certain doctrine which the American Government, in their interpretation of international law, repudiate, and which has not been uniformly recognized by England; it has been recognized at some times, and not at other times. It seems to me, as the hon. member for South Oxford says, that the arrangement for securing reciprocity is the sale of certain privileges on the one side for the acquisition of certain privileges on the other side, and is, in that respect, wholly independent of the operation which public law would give to a favoured-nation clause. What the Government propose to do by this Bill is to give to the favoured-nation clause of the treaty which England has made with Germany the same effect as is given to those clauses of the treaty which we have made with France in respect to all imports into this country from France. If the Government had taken power to give effect to any provisions of those treaties which, by the law of nations, are found obligatory upon Canada, reserving to themselves the right to discuss the subject fully with the Colonial Office, it seems to me they would have done better than they have done by the arrangements that have been made. This Bill further provides:

> So long as such other foreign power continues to be entitled to such advantages, the operation of all laws inconsistent with its enjoyment of them shall be suspended to the extent to which they are so inconsistent.

That, of course, is a mere corollary to the section that precedes it. The third section relates to Great Britain and her colonies alone. So far as Great Britain is concerned, we have nothing to complain of here. She has put no impediments upon our trade, and, therefore, the concession contained here may be made absolutely. That is not made under any law of nations; it is made as a matter of public policy, and I am not objecting to that. But I think the first and second sections are very objectionable, because they assume a controverted principle of international law to be a settled principle. The hon. gentleman cannot say that the doctrine set up in its extreme form in Great Britain's negotiations with Spain on one occasion, is the accepted doctrine of international law, and he will not be in a position to contradict that if he carries through the first two sections of this Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of fact, I find, on looking into the Cobden treaty that, to all appearances, no such provision as is referred to or attempted to be enforced by this Bill, went into effect between the two contracting parties. The language of the treaty is, in all cases, that wines, and other specified articles, imported from France shall be admitted at a reduced rate of duty in consideration of His Majesty the Emperor of the French reducing the duty on the schedule of articles of British production. While the thing is not expressly defined in the treaty, its language would go to show that in making that treay with France the English Government paid no attention whatever to the doctrine of favoured-nations, but took practically the same view that I take as to treaties of reciprocity, and that appears to have been by the hon. gentleman's late leader. The fact, I think, will be found to be as my hon. friend from Bothwell has stated it—that the British Government have, according to the exigencies of the situation, talked both ways, and it is very impolitic for us, without any necessity, so far as I can see, to lay down a doctrine which we may find it exceedingly inconvenient to enforce hereafter, unless the hon. gentleman has a distinct statement to make to us that the British Government have refused to allow him to put this treaty into operation without such a stipulation being introduced. I do not understand that anything of that kind has occurred.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought I made a fairly explicit explanation at first, but I would ask my hon. friend to think of one or two interrogations. When we passed our Bill last year with reference to this treaty, we supposed that everything had been done which was necessary in order that the ratification should be exchanged between the contracting parties, France and Great Britain. Why, then, were not ratifications exchanged ? Why has not this treaty been in operation for the last seven or eight months ? That is one question which might well be asked.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where is the correspondence ?

Mr. FOSTER. It has been brought down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When ?

Mr. FOSTER. Last night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must point out to the hon. gentleman the utter unreasonableness of asking us to pass this Bill now. He knows that when the correspondence was only brought down last night, we could not possibly attend to it. I have not even seen it. That correspondence may contain documents with which we ought to be acquainted in order to discuss this particular measure.

Mr. CHARLTON. I urged that objection, and it was overruled by the House, and a consideration of the Bill forced on the committee. I protested then and do so now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman would read the letters or despatches.

Mr. FOSTER. They are before the House. I was just going to make a recital of what I thought I had explained before. I was stopped at the point where we had passed an Act here last year and supposed it would go into force, and was just going to answer the question why it did not. Before I do that, I want to go back to a point anterior to that, which has already been before the House and thoroughly explained and canvassed. That is the argument made by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) a year or two ago, that surely France could not have known that most-favoured nations were to have the advantage of this treaty, otherwise she would be putting herself into the position of giving us a 'quid pro quo,' and then suffer the consequence of those same concessions which were given to her by Canada being given by Canada to every other country that had most-favoured-nation treaties with Great Britain. I replied that whether the French Government and negotiators were making an improvident bargain or not was for themselves, but they entered into the negotiations and conducted them with the full knowledge that that was the antecedent condition. Instructions were, at the very commencement, sent to our commissioners, Lord Dufferin and Sir Charles Tupper, reminding them that the most-favoured-nations treaty obligations had to be respected and considered as a necessary condition in the making of a treaty. The negotiations proceeded upon that basis, both the English and French commissioners knowing it well, both Governments understanding it well, and it being thoroughly acceded to, and it was so stated in this House. The House knows, from the discussions, that it was the intention, without any doubt, from the first, that most-favoured-nations were to receive the same benefits in our markets as France, from the very fact that a solemn treaty obligation rested upon Great Britain to give these benefits to these most-favoured-nations. The question arose subsidiary to that, whether we should give the same condition to the colonies and to the United States or outside powers, and the position of the Government on those questions was thoroughly well determined. Not only did Sir John Thompson make the assertion in the House, but I myself made it—it can be found in "Hansard," and has been made more than once—that we intended to give the colonies the same privileges 'quoad' these articles in our markets as we gave to France, and that of course, we recognized the fact that the most-favoured-nations would demand and receive the same.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that that was an open question. The debate will show that.

Mr. FOSTER. That was never an open question with the Government or with the House in anything the Government said about it. Under all these conditions, the discussion took place most thoroughly in the House, and we passed our Bill and supposed that ratification would take place. But when the Bill was sent home and the ratification of the treaty came to be approached, Great Britain raised the point at once that Austria, Germany, Belgium and other countries which had most-favoured-nation treaties with her, had a right to ask that the very moment those goods from France came into this country at a lower rate, their goods of the same character should come in at the same rate. Great Britain refused to approach the ratification of the treaty until that condition was made, so that it would be so practically operative that the most-favoured-nations would have no grievance at all, but that it would be certain that the very moment the French goods of the kinds mentioned entered our ports at the lower rate, goods of the same kind belonging to the most-favoured-nations would enter our ports at that rate, without any cavil at all. We proposed the ratification of the treaty under the promise that we would make the necessary legislation in our tariff to meet that condition, and that the legislation would probably be had before trade could actually open up, but Great Britain took the ground that it was not well to run the least risk of the most-favoured-nations' goods being for a single day or week or month refused admission to our ports under the same conditions as the French goods. Therefore, the position was taken that it would be better, in order to avoid all questions, that the actual legislation should be passed before the ratification took place, and that that legislation should be definite and certain, not by proclamation, but embodied in the Bill. We at first had the idea of making our Bill a general one to meet the circumstances of any treaty that might hereafter be made; but on thinking it over, we decided that it would be better to confine this to the treaty in question and go no further, inasmuch as Parliament would always have power to pass a similar Act with reference to any other treaty, since Parliament would have to ratify the treaty before it could go into operation. So that we are doing this directly on the line of the particular contention which was urged at the time of the negotiation of the treaty, well understood by both contracting parties, and which we are now carrying out by this legislation in accord with the desire of the British Government. The matter is not a theoretical one. We may have our theoretical ideas as to whether such a treaty is simply a reciprocity treaty, and that, therefore, no third power has the right to ask for similar or most-favoured treatment, but that is aside from this discussion. If we are going to have the treaty ratified, we must respect the treaty obligations. For this is a treaty between Great Britain and France; Great Britain is pledged to third powers by treaties between herself and them, and these treaty obligations must be carried out. If we are going to have the treaty ratified at all, it can only be upon these conditions—conditions to which, I must say, the Government raises no cavil. Then, with reference to the colonies, as stated in the House last year and the year before, we propose to extend the same privileges to these as we do to France. This is for considerations of sisterhood and amity and the gradual drawing together of commercial relations between ourselves and the colonies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is quite clear, from what the hon. gentleman says, that the House was not properly advised previously as to what was involved. I interrogated the hon. gentleman myself, as to the exact extent of reduction of revenue through this treaty. Apparently, he did not know; he had the vaguest guesses——

Mr. FOSTER. About what?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As to what the extent of the reduction would be.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave the hon. gentleman statistics on that point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman did not give any accurate calculations, but only guessed at the result.

Mr. FOSTER. I brought down exact figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman did not then know how far the treaty would go, and I doubt if he understands it to-day, or has any accurate calculation as to the full extent of the loss of duty, coming down to a basis of pounds, shillings and pence. It is very clear now, that the loss will be considerably larger than the estimates he made covering French wines and other articles. Fruits from other countries, of which we import considerable quantities, will come in free, and I do not think the hon. gentleman even so much as made a statement about that.

Mr. FOSTER. These figures were brought down to the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not in any detail.

Mr. FOSTER. Why, yes; they are even printed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, what is the amount? Another point is, that some gentleman has carried off the correspondence.

Mr. FOSTER. It must have been your leader.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, it was not Mr. Laurier, as I happen to know. I applied for it since this debate commenced, and I am told that it is in the possession of an hon. gentleman on the other side.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who can be the guilty party ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to tell tales. But the correspondence is in the possession of one of the hon. gentleman's followers. We have a right to see that correspondence. The hon. gentleman says it does not contain anything particular. But I understand it is a voluminous correspondence : and, be it good, bad or indifferent, it ought to be in our hands while we are discussing this subject. The hon. gentleman must see that to discuss this treaty in detail without this correspondence, which was of sufficient importance to be moved for and brought down, is something he ought not to ask.

Mr. FOSTER. My duty ended when I brought the correspondence down. We will have to have a special committee to look after it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman might, at least, provide some means whereby it would be on the Table when it was wanted. The object is to inform the committee and the members of the House who have paid more or less attention to this subject, precisely what the ground of contention was—for, doubtless, there was some contention and dispute between the Government here and the Government in England. I really think that, before he asks us to go on, the least he can do is to find this correspondence, which, I believe, is in the hands of a follower of his own.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. gentleman suggest ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not concerned in getting this Bill through.

Mr. FOSTER. But I thought you might be interested in the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The onus lies upon the hon. gentleman to supply the necessary information to enable us to discuss the Bill.

Mr. EDGAR. According to my recollection, the replies given by the Minister of Finance to inquiries as to how far the revenue would be reduced by this treaty, related only to the reduction on our trade with France. I think the Minister of Finance will recollect that. I am sure he made some statements on that subject.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend is sure I made some statements, it is at least incumbent upon him to turn them up.

Mr. EDGAR. I am trying to support what the Minister of Finance says. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says the hon. gentleman did not make any estimates of the loss of revenue—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Except as regards France.

Mr. EDGAR. He did as regards France. But he did not attempt to make any estimate of loss of revenue as to other countries from which our importations come.

Mr. FOSTER. Most certainly I did.

Mr. EDGAR. I fancy that, in the item of nuts, prunes, &c., France is not by any means the largest exporter to Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is a document on the subject. I am afraid my hon. friends are not at all careful. They are exceedingly desirous of information, hankering for it, in fact. But when it is before them, they are like well-fed creatures——

Some hon. MEMBERS. What kind of creatures ?

Mr. FOSTER. Human creatures. When food is placed before them, they refuse to eat, and when it is all before them, they cry for more. Here is a paper brought down in the session of 1893, in which my hon. friends will find the statements of importations for three years of the articles named, from all countries, the value and the duty. And I have here statements with reference to the last fiscal year, and other years, on the same subject. This has been a matter of record.

Mr. EDGAR. What objection is there, then, for the hon. Minister to tell us the facts ?

Mr. FOSTER. I should think it almost an insult to give my hon. friend information that has been before him for almost three years.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. Minister has discovered it this moment himself, if he would but admit the truth. What is the reason he cannot get up and tell us the facts, even if they are in the blue-book ? What is the loss of revenue on these articles ?

Mr. FOSTER. I supposed you were making legislators of yourselves here, and were ready for any discussion.

Mr. ALLAN. I would say that there is one clause of this treaty that I approve of, and that is the clause relating to the termination of the treaty. I believe the Government should take the necessary steps in order to bring about the termination of it as soon as possible. As regards some sections of the country, at least, the effect already has been very damaging indeed. Although this treaty has not been brought into force yet in the section whence I come, we have felt its disastrous effects already. I allude to its influence upon a very important industry in this country, the grape-growing industry,

one that has attained considerable proportions during the past few years. The effect of the passing of this treaty was simply this, that, while farmers or grape-growers used to sell their grapes at 3 or 4 cents a pound last year, large quantities of grapes on Pelee Island and elsewhere were actually sold at ½ cent per pound, for $10 per ton. So low became the market for grapes that the large wine growers of the Island withdrew almost entirely from the market. The price was so low that the farmers were not able to obtain for them more than the price I have named, half a cent per pound, on the average. In fact I know personally that large quantities of grapes were consigned on commission on which there was absolutely no return. Now, that is the effect of the French treaty in the county of Essex, and I suppose it has a similar effect in the Niagara district. And what good will this treaty do? Under the old tariff, Canadian products were admitted to France quite as low as they are now, without developing any considerable trade with France. When this treaty was introduced, the hon. gentleman utterly failed to show that it would be beneficial to this country to any extent, while upon the grape-growing and other industries it has been very injurious. I hope the Government will exercise the power retained in the treaty, and give notice at an early day of its termination.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe that this missing correspondence is in the custody of a gentleman who has unfortunately left the city, and it is locked up somewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. We can send the Serjeant-at-Arms after him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You had better do it, and get us another copy, or adjourn the debate.

Mr. FOSTER. We will have it before we take the third reading.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I thoroughly sympathize with what the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Allan) said with regard to the effect of this treaty on the Canadian wine-growing industry; and when the main treaty was up before, I took occasion to suggest some provision which would ameliorate the condition of the grape growers in Essex and other wine-growing districts. They petitioned the Government at that time that if this treaty were made, the Government should do something for them in the way of giving them free alcohol for the fortification of their wines. The Government at that time promised to take the matter into consideration, but we have never heard from them since. I would now like to ask the leader of the House whether he has any intention of meeting the views of the wine growers. They are certainly a native industry, and they come under the idea of a protective policy. They are certainly entitled to consideration in this matter, because they are about to lose a large portion of their trade, and unless there is some compensation they will be sufferers, and with them the country also will be a sufferer by this treaty.

Mr. McGREGOR. In the county of Essex, of which I have the honour of being one of the representatives, there is a very large extent of ground taken up by the growing of grapes. We went on with this industry in good faith, thinking that the Government would act as they had been doing before. The policy of this Government has been, as I understood from the leader, to increase the tax on the rich, and to lessen the taxation on the poor. But in the matter of this wine duty, the policy has worked just the other way. We find that the duties have been increased on hardware, sugar, and a large number of other articles consumed by the poorer classes of people of this country, and now we find that the duty is taken off wine. But that reduction of duty works in favour of the rich rather than the poor. Take a case of fine wines costing $18 to $20, 30 per cent is taken off, being a reduction of $6 to $8 on each case. Consequently the effect is to increase the taxation on the poor and to take it off the rich. Now, there is a large amount of money invested in this industry. We have in this country more than 5,000 acres in grapes, and there is a large amount of money invested in plant that is used for the purpose of making wine and of taking care of those grapes. It is true that the quantity of wine made in the country is not large, but this fact has to be borne in mind, that where grapes are grown, if, unfortunately, they are affected by the frost and rendered unmarketable for table use, they can be converted into wine. In the county of Essex, which I represent, this treaty will materially affect us in more ways than one. I may say that when we took up this matter last session, we did not take into consideration the fact that there were thirteen other countries besides France that would be allowed to send wine into this country at the reduced duty, and some of them would send us as much wine as France. Consequently the loss of revenue would be very large, and our wine producers would suffer seriously in consequence of the admission of these cheap wines. Therefore, I think the Government ought to consider this matter from this point of view, before they conclude to pass this Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. members from Essex (Mr. Allan and Mr. McGregor), because I think they are instructive, and I sympathize with them. As a protectionist I entirely sympathize with the view taken by those hon. gentlemen. If we are to develop the wine industry in Canada, we shall have to apply the same system to

it that we have applied to other industries, namely, protect it. As a consistent protectionist, I may say I do not, and never did, take very much stock in this treaty. But now that we know that of necessity it has a wider scope than at first sight it seemed to have, I rather sympathize with the remarks of one of the hon. members from Essex that we should look forward to a time for terminating this treaty. Now, the cheers that my hon. friends have received from those around them, are to me very edifying, because they illustrate what we have seen here again and again, that wherever a Reformer's constituency is interested in a protective tariff, and you touch that protective tariff with your little finger, you would almost imagine, from the outcry raised against it, that you had touched the ark of the covenant. I think that is instructive. But I must say, as a consistent protectionist, that I do not think this treaty is a very great advantage to Canada. With respect to the question that has been under discussion, it seems to me it is one that we cannot affect here by any legislation of ours.

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

A Message from His Honour the Deputy Governor, by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod :

Mr. SPEAKER :

His Honour the Deputy Governor desires the immediate attendance of this House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went to the Senate Chamber.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Honour the Deputy Governor was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :—

An Act respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.

An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company, and to change the name of the company to the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to grant certain powers to the Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Company of Algoma (Limited).

An Act respecting the Hamilton Distillery Company (Limited).

An Act to incorporate the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the St. John River Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Deschenes Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Red Mountain Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Camp Harmony Angling Club.

An Act further to amend the tenth chapter of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths.

An Act respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Penitentiary Act.

An Act to incorporate the Ottawa and Aylmer Railway and Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Manitoba and North-west Loan Company (Limited).

An Act respecting the Eastern Assurance Company of Canada.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting Dominion Notes.

An Act for the relief of Mary Bradshaw Falding.

An Act for the relief of Helen Woodburn Jarvis.

An Act to incorporate the James Maclaren Company (Limited).

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.

An Act respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Sick Benefit Society.

An Act further to amend the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society Act of 1885.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).

An Act respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Honour the Deputy Governor, as follows :—

May it please Your Honour :

The Commons of Canada have voted the supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the public service. In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Honour the following Bill :—

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1895, and for other purposes relating to the public service,

to which I humbly request Your Honour's assent.

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words :—

In Her Majesty's name, His Honour, the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

Mr. DAVIN. I think, if possible, the Government should take steps to urge the Imperial Government to release Canada of its obligations under the favoured-nation clause, and that in future, if possible, we should be placed in a position so as not to

be bound without our own consent. When this measure was before the House last year, it will be seen from the speeches of Sir John Thompson, and others, that it went through with the feeling in the mind of Sir John Thompson and supporters of the Government, as well as members of the Opposition, that in case it should be found that the treaty did not work well for Canada, notice should be given to put an end to it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has made allusion to the alleged inconsistency of the members for Essex County, who, while belonging to the Liberal party, and professedly opposed to protection, yet object to the removal of protection by the Government from the special industry which is carried on largely in their own county. I do not think the position taken by those hon. gentlemen is against their profession. They assume that the assertion of the Government is true, that its policy is to afford protection to native industries; and, admitting that to be the policy of the Government, they assert that the conduct of the Government, to be consistent with its professed policy, is to prevent the injury of the domestic industries, or adopt a policy which would not discriminate against those industries, and, proceeding on that assumption, they take the ground that in Essex there is a large grape-growing interest, and that the Government, to be consistent with its profession and policy, should not sacrifice that interest. I do not see there is anything inconsistent with their professed principles on the ground taken by them. They merely desire to hold the Government to the proper discharge of their self-assumed duties under its own protection policy, and they assume, if that is to be the policy of the Government, if the Government is to be governed by its professions of principle, that it is acting inconsistently with its profession in these cases. In Essex there is in the island of Pelee, 5,000 acres suitable for grape growing, and there is not a spot on this continent where grape growing can be more successfully prosecuted than in that island; all grapes ripen there, and also in Essex County. All along the shore of Lake Erie, and in that section of Ontario between Lake Ontario and the mountain, extending from Hamilton to Niagara, there is an admirable grape-growing region, and if the Government is to protect home industries, as is claimed, the industry which has grown up there can be fostered by the policy, which it professes to believe is the true policy, this is certainly an interest that need not be injured now by a treaty which has so far not resulted in any advantage to Canada, or to any portion of the Dominion.

Mr. DAVIN. The very language used by the hon. gentleman, for instance, such terms as "sacrifice," implies the proposition of protection. The very contention he made that these parties are injured by the treaty is a contention that is born of the general principle of protection; and if the hon. gentleman was consistently, and if the hon. members for Essex were consistently opposed to the National Policy, still more, if they were consistent advocates of free trade, as it is in England, would they support this position?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). As a consistent protectionist, I desire to ask if the Government intends to do anything for the wine-producers in Essex and throughout the country whose interests have been seriously affected. These interests have been affected by the act of a protectionist Government, and, that being the case, the Government are in duty bound to do something for those people, and they can do so, as the grape-growers and wine-producers have pointed out, by granting compensation in the shape of free alcohol for the fortifying of their wines. I therefore think the Government should make a declaration now, in their own interest and in the general interest of the country, that they are prepared to meet the wishes of those people and apply a remedy for the injury which the Government is doing them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for West Assiniboia has quite forgotten that the hon. members for Essex were not specially calling for protection. They were not pointing out that protection was required. What they set forth was that there was the policy of the Government, and it was against the interest they represent. A heavy tax is placed here on the alcohol used by them. In France, the alcohol used by the wine-producers is free. Here there is a heavy tax placed on sugar. In France there is no tax on sugar used in this industry. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that if we removed the tax from sugar and from alcohol to these persons' interests, it would be affording protection? That is what is asked by the wine-producers in the petition which they presented some time ago. The hon. gentleman would scarcely say that that is demanding protection: such action points in an opposite direction.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). That is legitimate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). On the same ground the hon. gentleman should give the farmers a chance in the tobacco-growing business.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I am ready to do that.

Mr. ALLAN. It is certainly highly amusing, if it were not so absurd, to hear the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) lecture any hon. gentleman in this House upon consistency in relation to tariff questions.

He is a gentleman who has himself repeatedly talked on the one side and voted on the other.

Mr. DAVIN. You cannot give an instance.

Mr. ALLAN. You have only to turn up the records of "Hansard" to see my statement confirmed.

Mr. DAVIN. Will you give a single instance?

Mr. ALLAN. A dozen instances. I might mention to you binder twine, and many other items of interest to the North-west on which you pursued just such a course.

Mr. DAVIN. You cannot give a single instance.

Mr. ALLAN. I have always been an advocate of a revenue tariff, and although I have heard before just such remarks as were made by the hon. member (Mr. Davin) with reference to this wine duty, yet it seems to me they are exceedingly absurd. If there is one thing that all classes agree upon--revenue tariff men, protectionists and free traders—it is that wines and liquors are proper subjects for taxation and duty. That is agreed everywhere. We are protesting here against a treaty that is injurious to this country, and the promoters of that treaty have failed to show that it has been, or will be beneficial in any degree to Canada. The hon. gentleman says that we are inconsistent, because the tariff on wines specially affects our constituency, and that therefore we oppose its reduction. Why, Sir, I will take even broader ground. Take the duty on corn. I say that so long as protection is the policy of this country there is no inconsistency in our opposing the singling out of certain articles particularly important to one district, for less-favoured tariff treatment than is given to other articles. That is a doctrine I have always adhered to. There is a duty on corn and a duty on pork, but we always had a duty on pork, even previous to the infliction of the National Policy. So far as the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) in relation to wines are concerned, people would have to be very thin-pated indeed to take stock in such arguments as he used. There are few people who can be so easily gulled in the county of Essex. The county of Essex does not ask any particular favour at the hands of the Government. I am satisfied that they would vote overwhelmingly to be placed in the position they were before the National Policy became the policy of Canada. They have always been in favour of a revenue tariff, and the Liberals in that section of the country have never taken any other. If the National Policy had any justification whatever, it was that the farmers of this country were to be benefited by a duty on agricultural products; and it is impossible for any one to prove that, with the single exception of Indian corn, which we do not raise a sufficient quantity of in this country, protection would benefit the farmer, taking one season with the other. It is certainly very amusing to see the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) rising in his place to lecture any hon. gentleman on inconsistency in reference to the action he takes on tariff questions.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member (Mr. Allan) has made a statement in this House which he ought to be able to substantiate. He says that I have spoken one way and voted another. I challenge him to give a single instance of that, and I say that he cannot do it. That statement has been made in the Grit press, from which it has evidently been taken by the hon. gentleman. There is absolutely not a tittle of foundation for it. I defy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Allan) to substantiate his words.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was the leader of the Opposition he was thinking about.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). We are drifting away from the subject of the French treaty into a matter which is of more personal interest to the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) than it is to the public of this country.

Mr. DAVIN. It was one of your own friends who introduced the subject.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). With respect to this treaty, there is just this difficulty to my mind. We came to an understanding with France, by which we gave her certain concessions and were to receive other concessions in return therefor. It now appears that the concessions we have to make to secure this treaty are much broader than appeared on the face of the first negotiations. Take, for instance, this question of wine. Outside of the question of protection altogether, we have now the statement that it is not at all confined to the wine that we import from France alone, and that in consequence of the favoured-nation treaty clause of the mother country, and in consequence of our kindly feeling towards the other colonies, the practical effect has been to reduce the duty on the importation of these wines from many other countries as well as from France. The result amounts to this: Under the original treaty as presented to us, the concessions were stated then to be much larger on the part of Canada than on the part of France, and that objection is increased ten-fold now. At a time when, above all others, it is undesirable that the finances of Canada should be hampered by further reductions of revenue, we find that we have to make still wider concessions. What are the facts in connection with the development of the wine industry? Take the Australian provinces as an example, and you will find from the official returns that the exports of wine from

Australia to Great Britain, for the first five months of this year, were 230,000 gallons, as compared with an export to Great Britain for the same five months of 1895 of 150,000 gallons. I do not need to recall to the House what we were doing last year when we had the colonial representatives here, and were entertaining the representatives of these colonies. We are feeling it in our pockets to-day to the extent of $120,000 per annum, and for what are we doing this? We are doing it to develop the trade of Australia, and to enable the Australian producers of wine who have natural advantages we do not possess, to compete with the Canadian wine production. We are, in fact, bonusing the Australian wine-grower to enable him to deliver his wine cheaper in our market. That is in the interest of developing trade, I grant you, but it is a one-sided interest, and under existing circumstances, I agree with the hon. gentleman from Essex, that the earlier we give notice of the abrogation of the treaty the more satisfactory it will be for the Canadian people.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is one feature of this question which I do not think has been touched upon, and I fancy that a great many people of this Dominion were not aware of it when it was first proposed. At the inception of this treaty a great many petitions were presented to the House by the temperance people in opposition to the reduced duties on wine proposed here. The extended scope which is now to be given to the treaty by this Bill, not only reduces the duty on French wines which have a mixture of alcohol in them, but that same privilege of reduced wine duties is now extended to the colonies, and to the many countries with which Great Britain has a favoured-nation treaty. Now, I do not think it was at all understood.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was expressly stated.

Mr. McMULLEN. This treaty will result in the importation into Canada of a lot of adulterated French wines. In addition to that, I notice that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) proposes that we should go further and assist our own wine-producers by allowing them to have alcohol free of duty in order to adulterate their wines and make them more intoxicating.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Not adulterate, but fortify.

Mr. McMULLEN. And encourage the use of intoxicating liquors. In the face of the very strong temperance sentiment which exists in this country, and which is constantly growing, the Government are legislating in the very opposite direction.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I advocate free alcohol for the wine-growers in order that our Canadian wines may be sold in our own country at no disadvantage in competition with French wines. French wines and wines produced in the United States are fortified by free alcohol, and if we allow French wines to come in at the rates proposed, we shall be simply giving the whip hand to our competitors. This alcohol is used, not to make the wine intoxicating, but to put it in such a condition that it will keep; and we have Biblical authority for saying, "Take a little wine for thy stomach's sake." I would again press for an answer to my question. A year ago the leader of the Government told us that they would consider the petition of the wine-growers. They surely have considered it and reached a decision, and I would ask the Finance Minister to give us some assurance to-day that the Government have not made up their minds that they intend to consider the claims of the wine-growers of western Ontario.

Mr. GIBSON. I am sure that the hon. member who has just taken his seat does not appreciate the value of the wine made in the province of Ontario, because the wines imported from France will not bear comparison with it. Wines are made in France from liqueurs, sugars, and almost everything else, except the grape, while our native wine, as made in the Niagara district, will compare more than favourably with port wine imported from Spain. The hon. member for East York and myself, with some others, interviewed the Government on this subject when Sir John Thompson was Prime Minister. On that occasion the Controller of Customs twitted me with being a protectionist, so far as wine was concerned, because I said that if anything would bear having a duty placed upon it, it was wine. But the Government now propose to allow the wines of France to come into competition with the pure wines produced by the grape-growers and wine-makers of the Niagara peninsula, and the county of Essex. The effect will be that this industry will be destroyed, because we know, as a matter of fact, that light wines are to-day sent from France to Montreal for less money than the same kinds of wines can be sent for from the county of Essex by rail to Montreal. I see the Finance Minister laughing, but he knows very well, because he has sometimes a moment of weakness——

Mr. FOSTER. I was imitating you—I was taking a smile.

Mr. GIBSON. You do not smile very often, I believe, but when you do I am told you take brandy on shipboard. However, if the hon. gentleman would come to the Niagara peninsula I would give him a native wine that would do his heart good, and that would compare more than favourably with the wine that he wants to import from France. I say, without being a protectionist, that if there is anything the

Government should prohibit, it is the light wines of France and other European countries coming into competition with our native industry, and I will show you why. It is the unmarketable grape that is sent to the wine-press. In that way our farmers are enabled to get from the wine-producers $20 a ton for the grapes that cannot be sent to market. By allowing this treaty to go into force, the Government will be cutting off an industry of great importance to the Dominion, particularly to the part of the province of Ontario which I have the honour to represent.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I wish to read to the House the petition of the wine-growers. After petitioning against the ratification of the treaty, they say, if it is to be ratified :

That the wine manufacturers of Canada earnestly demand some special legislation enabling them to use spirits under similar restrictions as those governing the United States and other foreign wine-makers.

On the preamble,

Mr. FOSTER. I want to amend the title of the Bill by making it read : "An Act to amend the French Treaty Act of 1894." I wish to say to the hon. member for East York that if he will repeat his question before the third reading of the Bill, I will give him an answer. I intended to answer him this afternoon, but I wished the Bill to go through when it got started.

Bill reported.

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

After Recess.

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. COATSWORTH moved that the order, "House again in committee on Bill (No. 54) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company," be discharged, and that the said Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL RADIAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the International Radial Railway Company.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I move that the following clause be added to the Bill :—

The maximum passenger rate allowed to be charged over the track or tracks of the said company shall not exceed 2 cents a mile.

Mr. GIBSON.

The representation has been made by the promoter of this Bill, that this proposal of mine is unfair because it applies only to one road. In reply to that, I have to say that one single clause added to a small Bill in Albany in connection with a minor road was sufficient to have the 2 cent a mile rate apply to the entire New York Central Railway Company system, and the result was, that every other railway in New York State which is a competitor of the New York Central, had to accept the 2 cent a mile rate. It did not require a general Act in this instance, and it does not require a general Act to obtain many things, and this is exactly a case in point. If you make one road accept 2 cents a mile rate, all the others must accept it, if they wish to be competing lines. This road, which it is proposed to build, will run through the best-settled portion of the province of Ontario, and some of the lines marked out by it run through a section of country not well supplied with railways, but very largely populated, and, if it be the fact that it has a large population in its territory, and that railways can now be built for very much less than formerly, it is high time that railway companies should recognize the fact that, as everything else has come down in price, the rates of railway travel should come down. As I told the House the other night, there is not a thing in common use which has not fallen in price with the exception of railway travel. Everything in use during the last forty years has come down one-half in price, or one-third, or even more. Railway travel forty years ago was over 3 cents a mile, and it is the same to-day. Freights have come down enormously, and why should not the ordinary traveller be recognized, as well as the freights ; surely, he is entitled to the same consideration. But, apparently, he receives no consideration in this House or in this country. The State of Michigan has made great progress in this respect. They have tackled the question of railway travel over there, and they have compelled the roads to recognize a rate of 2½ cents per mile. They have done it in a rather indirect way, but they have done it effectively. Any road that has gross earnings of a certain amount is compelled to sell a thousand-mile ticket for $25.

Mr. INGRAM. They do that here.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). They are not compelled to do it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They sell those tickets here for $22.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). If they can do so, why should they reject this proposal that they should give 2 cents a mile passenger travel. It is said that we, as a country, have entered into a contract with these roads to allow them to establish themselves in this country, and until they have become paying concerns, we have no right to interfere with

their traffic arrangements. To that we simply say, that, if these roads had been well managed, they would be paying concerns to-day. But, as a matter of fact, they have not been well managed.

Mr. INGRAM. How do you know ?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I will give the hon. gentleman several instances of their mismanagement. In the first place, they were constructed extravagantly. And of all the roads that were constructed and promoted extravagantly, there is no better instance than the Grand Trunk Railway. Again, these roads have entered into most extravagant alliances, and to-day they are barnacled by all sorts of concerns that cause them heavy loss. In the first place, they have gone to enormous expense in purchasing roads in a foreign country and in gobbling up branch lines and building unnecessary lines, as they claim, as feed lines or for competition. These lines have been unprofitable, and therefore, the whole system is unprofitable. But, because of that, the people who use these railways should not be held liable and should not be compelled to pay large sums beyond what is necessary to compensate the railways for the services performed. The Grand Trunk is barnacled in its telegraph contract, it is barnacled in its cartage contract, it is barnacled in the way of the purchase of its supplies. Another great barnacle is, that it has undertaken to pay the bonds of roads in the United States which it claims are necessary as feeders. And the greatest barnacle of all on our railways is in the cheap rates they give on through traffic. The great grain merchants in Chicago, great houses like Armour & Co., have grown enormously rich within the last few years, and have become a great power, and what is the reason of it ? The reason is, that they have got such low rates on traffic for their western produce through Canada that the Canadian railways have only been enabled to make ends meet by maintaining their old passenger rates. If they charged this foreign traffic at a higher rate, and if they gave some consideration to the Canadian farmer, they would be doing justice in the case ; but, on the contrary, they have devoted all their energy, all their consideration, all their benefits to the through traffic of the United States, and have done nothing to encourage local traffic and local travel.

Mr. INGRAM. Rot.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; it is not rot. Again, the railway companies have lost money through their relations with the express companies and the sleeping-car companies. These are barnacles that have made great profits for their shareholders, and in that way the traveller is heavily taxed for the benefit of these concerns. And the railways, while they claim that Parliament ought to have some consideration for them that they have not been making money, have been spending immense sums in guaranteeing the bonds of railways not needed in this country. We all know there are hundreds of miles of competing lines in various parts of Ontario which have been declared unnecessary, which have been built at immense cost to parallel existing lines, and which, if they are kept running, must be kept running at the expense of the ordinary passengers. Now, we say that it is time that the ordinary passenger should have some consideration shown him. The railway companies have had their opportunity ; they have had these lines in their hands for years, and they have made nothing out of them. Now they ask us to justify them in their past mistakes. We say it is time that the bull was taken by the horns, that the railways were compelled to pay some consideration to the travelling community. And then, as I said in the House the other night, wherever railway travel has been reduced in price, the greatest good has resulted to the public, and I contended, when I argued the case in connection with the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Bill, that in New York State, where they adopted this 2-cents a mile rate, the New York Central Railway is to-day the most profitable railway in America. It is the road whose bonds stand the highest, it is the only road that has four tracks, and it has succeeded in compelling all the other companies to recognize the 2-cents-a-mile principle. I wish to read a telegram I received the other day from Buffalo :

> In answer to your telegram of this date, the New York State law fixes local rate on New York Central main line two cents per mile. No other trunk line in New York State has this rate locally, but of course they make the same rate to competing points.

This is from the passenger agent of the New York Central. This great line in New York State has made more money and carried more passengers than any other in the state, notwithstanding that it has seven great competing lines parallel with it. Surely, we ought to make an attempt to establish the same rate in this province, where a similar state of affairs prevail. The province of Ontario is very much similar to the State of New York. It is true, that the New York Central has a great deal more travel, put, comparatively speaking, that state and our province are very much alike, and we ought to try the experiment here. And, talking of experiments in legislation and experiments in the matter of railways, I wish to draw attention to what Bagehot says in one of his works on government and the constitution. He says there is nothing like experiments in legislation ; if you believe in a thing, try it. Do not try it over the whole country, but pick out the place where the conditions are most favourable, and try your experiment there. I ask the House to compel this road, which has gone to no expense, which is to run through a well-populated

part of the country, to make the experiment of 2-cents-a-mile railway travel. Surely, no harm could be done by that, for they are out no money now.

Mr. INGRAM. Why discriminate?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). We are not discriminating; we are asking them to accept a new set of conditions; and, if they accept them at the start, they cannot claim that any injustice is done to them. Take the case of England. There the 2-cents-a-mile rate has been adopted. The result of that policy has been to popularize railway travel, to increase the profits of the companies and to contribute very greatly to the convenience of the general public who use these railways. In favour of the 2-cents-a-mile rate, we have not only the argument that it will contribute to the convenience of the people, but we have the argument that it will increase the revenues of the railway companies, and enable them to pay larger dividends to their shareholders. It may be asked then, why we do not let the companies recognize this fact and reduce the cost of travel? The answer is, that they have hitherto refused to reduce their rates. In England, where this rate was imposed, for years and years they refused to recognize it in effect; they did in form. They treated those paying a penny-a-mile rate as if they were cattle, gave them poor trains and uncomfortable cars, and ran the trains at night and at inconvenient hours. But, in spite of all, through the strength of public opinion, they were compelled to give the public paying the penny-a-mile rate reasonable accommodation, and that is the most popular form of travel in England to-day. If we go to Hungary in Austria, where the state has taken control of the railways, and where they have vindicated the right of the people to regulate the railways, especially in regard to their tariff, the reduction in the rate there has resulted in two great things: the number of people who travel on the roads has been many times increased, the revenue of the road has been enormously augmented, and the roads have become profitable concerns. We may be told that these are populous countries. Certainly they are, but the price there is much below the price in our country, and the mileage there is much larger than the mileage in Canada. So that if these countries have succeeded in conferring a benefit on their people by reducing the cost of travel, why can we not make the experiment in Canada? Why cannot we try it on one or two roads in Ontario? It is not going to hurt any one. Why is this House so anxious about the shareholders of this projected railway, in which not one dollar is put up? Why don't we tell these people: You must recognize the rights of the public; you must give some concessions to the public in return for the concessions we give to you to build the road, and in giving you the opportunity to make money. If you want to run a railway in Canada, you must run it on the lines on which railways are run in England, in Germany, in New York state, in Hungary, and in many other countries. Let us say to them: You can take your charter, you can have your privilege, but it is on the condition that you recognize the fact that railway travel must come down in price, or we shall compel you to be the first company to inaugurate that rate of travel. It won't hurt them. They know the conditions put upon them when they start in; and if we do not make a start in connection with one company, it will never be made in this country, but the companies will continue to rule the people instead of the people ruling the companies. Now, I do not wish to go much further in the discussion of this question on the present occasion. I have a much stronger case in regard to another railway whose Bill comes before this House, but at present I shall content myself with saying, and I call upon the members to support me in saying, that in establishing this new company we should compel it to recognize the fact that railway travel must come down, and that they must reduce their rates to at least two cents per mile as the maximum; and that on condition of this reduced rate, they may go ahead with their line and see what they can do in reducing the exorbitant tax which the people are now forced to pay.

Mr. SPROULE. In seconding this resolution, I wish to say that I do so because I think it is in accordance with a principle we should adopt, and in no railway, to my mind, is it more applicable than to the one under consideration. If you look at this Bill you will find that it suggests one of two things: Either that it is designed for the purpose of locking up that section of country for the next five years, and holding it under the control of one corporation, who may take charge of it, building from time to time short sections of twenty miles each and turning them to useful account, holding out their privilege as a threat against other railway corporations who might wish to invade that country; or, on the other hand, that it is intended to be an electric railway through that district of country. Now, in looking upon the map you will be struck by this fact, that you can scarcely go ten miles in any direction there to-day without striking a railway. It is not because there is any need for an additional railway there that this charter is asked for. A short time ago I had occasion to go through that section. I had to travel about twenty-seven miles to get to a certain point, and I went on three different lines of railway to get there, and we seemed to be crossing railways all the time. Therefore, to my mind, in regard to the wants of the people and the carriage of freight, there is no more need for

an additional railway in that country than there is for the fifth wheel of a coach. Then, I say that it suggests to us that there is some other scheme behind it, and what is it? It seems to me, in view of what has taken place lately in railway enterprises, that it means a radial railway for the purpose of getting control of that section of the country, to build a railway in small sections, and then running them as they can get possession of electric railways in the various towns. Why do I say so? Because I find, according to this Bill, that it takes the city of Hamilton for the starting point, and we know that the city is traversed at present by lines of railway in almost every direction.

The company may lay out, construct and operate lines of railway of the gauge of four feet, eight and one-half inches, radiating from a central point in or near the city of Hamilton to the following terminal points :—

Now, let me read the terminal points :

(a.) To the town of Waterloo in the county of Waterloo, passing through or near the towns of Galt, Preston, and Berlin, with a branch from some point on the said line between Hamilton and Waterloo to the city of Guelph, in the county of Wellington ;

Now, this takes up lines between these towns : Galt, Preston, Berlin, Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph.

(b.) Also to a point on the Niagara River in or near the village of Fort Erie, in the county of Welland, passing through the counties of Wentworth, Lincoln and Welland, with a branch from some point on the said line to a point on the shore of Lake Erie, near the mouth of the Grand River, passing through or near the village of Dunville ;

Now, this is through another section of country that is already more than amply supplied with railway accommodation. Then, the next clause says :

(c.) Also to the town of St. Marys, in the county of Perth, passing through or near the city of Brantford and the town of Woodstock, with a branch from a point on the said line to the shore of Lake Erie, in or near the village of Fort Burwell.

Now, you will notice there are three main lines, and at least three branches, and that these three main lines and these three branches include nearly all the important towns and villages in that south-western peninsula. Then we go on to the other part of the Bill, and it gives us an additional reason for believing that this is really the intention of the promoters. Why? Because in the provisions for commencing operations they ask for certain powers :

Notwithstanding anything contained in the Railway Act, the provisional directors, for the purpose of commencing construction of any section of the said railway not to be less than twenty miles in length.

They may commence any portion of the twenty miles in length. As long as they block out a section of twenty miles on any of those proposed lines between any of those towns, and

So soon as 20 per cent of the $200,000 of the capital stock, or such larger sum as is equal to $2,500 per mile of such section, has been subscribed, and 10 per cent paid thereon.

or $4,000, they can commence operations. They may build that section from or to any one of these towns. In another clause of the Bill they disclose their hand a little more clearly, by asking power to amalgamate or make running arrangements with the street railways in those towns, and those street railways, most of them, are electric railways to-day, and they will be all electric railways in a short time. They were asking here a provision which was denied them, to make the street railways part of their line. Now, then, they go on to say :

Before commencing construction of a second section of the railway measuring not less than twenty miles in length, 25 per cent of $200,000 more of the unsubscribed capital stock, or such larger sum as is equal to $2,500 per mile of such section, shall be subscribed, and 10 per cent paid thereon as aforesaid.

In like manner the construction of any further section or sections of the said proposed railways measuring not less than twenty miles each, may be commenced as aforesaid when not less than $200,000 of the capital stock of the company, in addition to all capital stock of the company already subscribed for sections previously commenced, as hereinbefore provided, or such larger sum as shall be equal to $2,500 per mile of such section, has been subscribed, and 10 per cent paid thereon as aforesaid.

That is $5,000. Does not that show the plan which the contractors or promoters intend to follow. Already there is between Galt and Preston an electric road, four and a half miles in length, and I am told it is one of the best paying investments in western Ontario. This has given a new idea to speculators, and I presume the intention is to get possession of the south-western peninsular, where there is an immense population and a great many towns and villages ; they hope to secure this control for the next five years for the purpose of connecting these towns and villages, as they from time to time raise a little capital and find it desirable to extend the project, and make it a paying investment. So practically we may look upon this as a huge electric railway scheme. I have already given facts sufficient to make out a strong case of suspicion, because further railway accommodation is not required, and there are already roads there, and so there is no reason for building the road except the fact that these new electric enterprises are spreading rapidly throughout the country to-day, and are paying enterprises. Why is this amendment specially applicable to this Bill? Because all the electric railways are now charging a lower rate than 2 cents per mile. If I take the electric road in Toronto, what do I find? There the people travel six miles

for five cents, or less than one cent per mile, yet there is no better paying investment there than the electric road. They are willing to carry a passenger round the city or its whole length for 5 cents. Some persons may, no doubt, say that the reason why this low rate pays in Toronto is because it is a city with over 200,000 inhabitants. But the road from Preston to Galt passes through an agricultural country, and yet shrewd men have invested their capital and have built the road, and although it is four and a half miles in length, the charge is only 5 cents, or about one cent per mile. The owners of the road are nevertheless satisfied. At Walkerville there is an electric road three miles in length, for which 5 cents is paid. In every instance the rate charged is less than the hon. member for York proposes, and yet it is sufficient to induce the investment of money in these enterprises which in every instance return poor profits. If that is the case, it is specially proper that we should carry the amendment so that the rate shall not be more than 2 cents per mile, which, as I have shown, is higher than that charged on electric roads. I come now to Ottawa. The electric cars carry a passenger from the Union Depot to Rockliffe, which I am told is about five miles, for 5 cents, and back again at the same rate. There is no city at Rockliffe. Ottawa is a comparatively small city, having about 47,000 people, and yet the investment is a paying one and the owners are satisfied. They do even better than this, for they grant six tickets for 25 cents, or less than 4 cents for five miles, and between 5.30 and 7 o'clock they give eight tickets for 25 cents. Yet these rates pay, and the owners are willing to give them, and have done so without the application of outside pressure. If these roads pay at these rates, and the best evidence that they do is by a practical experience as shown by their returns, and if they pay even when they run between small towns and through an agricultural country, such an enterprise between Hamilton and Dundas, Galt, Guelph and Elora, and connecting these towns must pay as well as a line between Galt and Preston. There is no reason why it should not do so, for the district is well populated and the towns are comparatively large; and if the scheme is ever carried out, as I believe it is intended, and these towns are connected, and the promoters of this Bill thus acquire street railway rights throughout this territory, if another company comes to this Parliament and seeks incorporation for a road there we shall be met with the same objection as was presented in the Railway Committee to-day, that an investment of capital has been made, that this company has certain vested rights and that Parliament has no right to interfere with them until the five years granted them to build the road have expired. We should be cautious in acting on these matters. If the project were one to build railways in Manitoba where such did not exist, to build a radial railway extending from a central point, north, south, east and west, I could understand it; but a road starting in Hamilton, which is called the hub of the universe there, and I give the city credit for enterprise and activity, for it is one of the finest cities in Canada, would prove one of the finest paying speculations, and this House should adopt the amendment proposed by the hon. member for York compelling the company not to charge more than 2 cents per mile. If we go to the railways themselves, what is our experience? The hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) has told the House that when the proposal was made to limit the rate charged by the New York Central to 2 cents per mile, it was opposed on the same ground as that taken by hon. members opposed to this amendment. It was said that the money invested in railways gave no adequate returns, that if the rates were reduced men would no longer invest in railway enterprises. But the amendment was carried in the legislature. Those in favour of the amendment said that more people would travel. We know that such is the fact, and proof is to be seen in every excursion. It is an undeniable fact that this corporation, which has been for years operating between Suspension Bridge and New York, with branches radiating in different directions, is the best paying railway on the continent. There was, no doubt, some reasons why this amendment should not have been inserted in the Railway Bill before the House the other night, but no Bill brought before Parliament has furnished stronger reasons for having incorporated in it this amendment than the present Bill under consideration, for the reasons I have given. There are many other reasons that could be advanced, but I do not wish to appear to talk out the Bill. I should like to see the Bill pass, but I want a full and free expression of the opinion of members on the subject, because I believe there are many hon. members who believe as I do, that the adoption of this amendment will prove no detriment to the enterprise and will not prove likely to reduce the earnings of the road after it is put in operation, and as this will be an electric road, and no electric road is charging more than 2 cents per mile, the amendment moved by the hon. member for York should become law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have listened with some considerable interest to the discussion on this question, and I feel bound to say that, theoretically considered at all events, there is no reasonable doubt that where we create railway corporations, and more particularly where we create railway corporations running through a country already well served, this House has full and ample right to attach just such an amendment as this suggested. More than that, I am not at all sure that the time has not

come when we should introduce such amendments into Acts obtained for new roads. If a new road is going to be introduced in such a region as the Niagara peninsular there is no doubt whatever that the promoters of it and the parties who subscribe must see their way very clearly, and I believe there is a great deal of truth in the allegation made by the mover that were a cheaper rate given the railways would be compensated by the increased travel. I think that has been pretty abundantly shown by the experience in England and other countries. I have not had very much time to examine the details of this amendment, and it is possibly rather awkward to discuss a matter of this kind sprung somewhat suddenly on the House in respect to a particular road. I would suggest to the hon. the mover (Mr. Maclean) that it would conduce better to his purpose—which, I presume, is to have a full expression of opinion from the House—if he were to introduce his amendment on the third reading of the Bill. I think, speaking from recollection, that where a similar clause has been introduced in the case of English railroads, that all that has been required is that there should be one train each way per day.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). In New York state it is not so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking of the English tactics. They have a parliamentary train, as it is called, on which the rate is one penny a mile, but that, however, must have been from a very early period of railroad history in England. I believe that the train has been found to be profitable enough. I think it would probably serve the hon. gentleman's purpose better if he would bring this motion on third reading rather than in committee. For myself, I have considerable sympathy with the proposition he has laid down, and while I see grave difficulties about interfering with roads, which have already been constructed, and which are burdened with heavy debts: and roads which are not paying anything like a decent interest on the amount of capital—and foreign capital at that—which has been put into them: I must say that in the case of new roads constructed under present conditions, I cannot but feel that there is very fair ground for taking some such step as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) suggests, and insisting that some reasonable rate, which it is for the Government to consider, should be introduced for the bulk, at any rate, of the traffic.

Mr. MASSON. I was surprised to see the hon gentleman (Mr. Maclean) discuss the question now, as I understood he would wait until the third reading of the Bill

Mr. SPROULE. If the third reading is to be forced on to-night it will have to be discussed now.

Mr. MULOCK. It would hardly be advisable at this stage, and on a partial discussion, to vote down a proposition that is to be introduced later on. The sense of the House should be taken on the proposition only after a full discussion. I will not take up the time of the committee further than to say that I sympathize with the movement in question, and in addition to the arguments that have already been advanced, it appears to me that a statutory limitation such as this will have the effect of developing greater economy, not only in the management, but in the initial cost of the railways. Heretofore, we have been in the habit of incorporating railways and allowing them to water their stock, and their nominal capital finds its way at par into the hands of the general public, and at par become a charge for all time upon the earning power of a railway, which, after all, is a monopoly to tax the people. It is impossible to regard a railway so far as it concerns the people that are served, by it other than in the enjoyment of a monopoly. Geographically, it excludes all others from the same territory, and, that being the case, it is our duty at the initial stage, such as this, to put in conditions that confront the investing public. Nor does this proposition differ in the slightest degree from the present statute law respecting railways. A provision of the Railway Act entitles the Governor in Council to reduce railway tolls when a railway has already been incorporated. That is decidedly a more severe mode of treatment than the proposition now before us, because the proposition involved in this motion is to put this condition in as part of the charter, so that the investors know in advance, at least the outside earning power. That cannot be said in reference to the provision of the law which entitles the Government, without the sanction of the proprietors, to reduce their tolls. I think, therefore, that ceeding in the right direction, and I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) is pro- that he will not allow it to be formally defeated, but will either take the substantial opinion of the committee now, or else have the proposition—unprejudiced by being formally defeated—brought up at a later stage.

Mr. DENISON. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) referred to the English railways having a penny a mile rate. I know that was in existence twenty-seven or twenty-eight years ago when I first went to England, and I am quite satisfied that it must have been incorporated in the original charters to railways. If the English Parliament would do that so many years ago, not knowing what the result of railway traffic would be, it is much more necessary for us now to start out on a new line. We have been going, in Canada, on a three-cents a mile rate, and it has been urged by some hon. gentlemen

to-night that we should not make an exception in the case of this particular line. That seems to me, a very poor argument. If we are ever to commence limiting the rates we might as well commence now. We have got to commence on a new line some time or other, and why not begin at once. As has been pointed out by previous speakers, this company has practically covered the whole of the Niagara peninsula, and also up to Guelph and Brantford. The Ontario Government have recognized the principle that railways should not be allowed to earn too much, for I find this section in one of their Acts respecting electric railways, passed last session :

Tolls and fares to be levied by the company as nearly as possible shall be so fixed and regulated, that after paying "working expenses," the balance of annual receipts shall not exceed 8 per cent, or $8 on every $100, on the total capital stock of the company actually paid up in cash and then issued and outstanding ; and if in any year the gross receipts from tolls and fares shall be such, that after deducting therefrom the "working expenses" there shall remain an amount exceeding ten per cent of the total amount actually paid up in cash on the capital stock of the company then outstanding, then all such excess shall be placed to the credit of a special account to be called "the surplus tolls account," provided that in no case shall the fares exceed the maximum rates prescribed by subsection 7 and 8, of section 43 of this Act.

That shows the desire on the part of the legislature of Ontario to control and regulate the earning power of these railways. I also see that in section 7, the Bill says :

The fares to be taken by the company for each passenger shall not exceed five cents for any distance exceeding three miles, and shall not exceed 1 cent per mile for any additional distance. Children under ten years of age shall be carried for three miles for three cents, and for any additional distance at the rate of half a cent a mile.

Lately, in Toronto, when we were making a new bargain with the Street Railway Company, we exacted the condition that between the hours of five and half-past six o'clock, in the morning, and five o'clock and half-past six in the evening, passengers should be carried for 3 cents. The result is, that a passenger can travel on the belt line 8 miles for 3 cents, or at less than ½ cent a mile ; or he can travel from West Toronto Junction, down Dundas Street, along Queen Street and King Street, to the Woodbine, a distance of 7 or 8 miles, for 3 cents. At any other time of the day, by buying the bunch tickets, he can travel the same distances for 4 cents, or, if he pays cash, for 5 cents. I believe the road incorporated to run from Beamsville to Grimsby is also tied down to city rates. If ever there was an opportunity when we might, without injuring anybody, make a start in this direction, it is in this case, when we are incorporating a new line. There may be arguments against applying this provision to old lines where vested rights exist ; but in this case, if the company do not want our charter as we propose to give it to them, they are not obliged to take it.

Mr. MASSON. After the discussion that has taken place, I do not feel disposed to let it go unanswered ; and, as the time is so short, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY—DISMISSAL OF LIEUT.-COL. LAZIER.

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

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia a matter that was a subject of discussion last year ; I refer to the dismissal of Lieut.-Col. Lazier, of Belleville. I do not intend to discuss the matter to-night ; I only wish to make a suggestion. I do not ask the hon. Minister to reply to-night ; I do not think it would be reasonable to expect him to do so. The hon. Minister may remember that Lieut.-Col. Lazier was summarily dismissed from the service, and, when the matter was brought up in the House, the then Minister of Militia, as the hon. gentleman will see on referring to " Hansard," defended the action which resulted in his dismissal. That action seemed very severe and cruel. He was dismissed on a report, without inquiry ; and the then Minister approved of what had taken place, and in fact delivered judgment, so far as the head of the department could, in advance of the inquiry. The result of the inquiry was to reinstate Col. Lazier, and, therefore, it is fair to assume that his dismissal was not justifiable. Now, I ask the Minister, on behalf of Col. Lazier, if he deems it proper to do so, to investigate the circumstances connected with his dismissal and reinstatement; and, if he finds that he can do so, to as publicly relieve the colonel from the charges of which he was accused on the floor of the House, and which must have been foundationless. Although he was reinstated, the language of the Minister of Militia on that occasion is on record, and is not as yet withdrawn officially. I ask this to be done as a matter of justice to Col. Lazier, and I think it will be so regarded by the militia generally, who are not supposed to be under as strict martial law as members of the regular service. I need not say that in making this suggestion, although I do so cheerfully, I am not making it voluntarily, but at the suggestion of persons who are interested in having the charges against the colonel withdrawn.

Mr. DICKEY. As the hon. gentleman intimated, when he began, I have no personal knowledge whatever of the matter to which he alludes, and, therefore, I am not in a position to express any opinion about it. I will

certainly, as he desires, have the papers laid before me, and give the matter my best consideration, and make any amends honourable which may be fair in the premises. I do not wish the hon. gentleman to understand me as promising that, because it entirely depends on what I find in the papers.

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

(In the Committee.)

Three lines of steamers to run between St. John and Halifax, or either, and the West Indies and South America.. $80,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe there is a reduction here of $23,000, to which I have no objection, but I wish to know under what circumstances it is made.

Mr. FOSTER. The subsidies, when arranged about five years ago, included three lines. One ran from St. John to British Guiana, touching at the West India Islands and the islands in the Carribbean Sea, making some eight or ten ports of call. The second ran from Halifax to Jamaica, and the the third from Halifax to ports in Cuba. For these three services we paid $103,000. This year we have entered into an arrangement by which one of these services is dispensed with, namely, the service of Cuba. Owing to their peculiar tariff conditions and the advantageous position they gave the United States as compared with us, that did not prove a very profitable route. It has been dispensed with, and the services going on are the round service from St. John and Halifax to British Guiana, calling at the islands in the Carribbean Sea, and the service from Halifax to Jamaica. The service to Cuba being dropped, we saved that amount of subsidy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did the old contract expire ?

Mr. FOSTER. It expired, and a new contract was made, subject to a money vote in Parliament, which contract was laid on the Table some two or three weeks ago.

Mr. FORBES. What length of time does it cover ?

Mr. FOSTER. Five years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Same bonus ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and same parties.

Steam communication during the season of 1895, from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.... $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain the reduction of $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. We had a contract over a period of years which expired last year. We then entered into a provisional contract for one year, giving $12,000 for the double service between Shediac, Summerside, Pictou, Charlottetown and Georgetown. This year we had entered into a contract for a period of three years, terminable at the end of any year at the option of the Government, for which we give $10,000.

Steam communication during the year 1895-6, from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Gaspé Basin, Quebec and Dalhousie, N.B..... $12,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the conditions of that service ?

Mr. FOSTER. The steamer Admiral is on that route. It runs from Dalhousie, coasting along the Baie des Chaleurs, stopping at the principal ports. It serves that long section of coast there which is without railway communication. A railway does run a distance along the bay, but it is not completed to the end of the mouth of Baie des Chaleurs. It runs twice a week.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the owner of the steamer ?

Mr. FOSTER. The same owner as the last three or four years.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were tenders advertised for ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and he was the only tenderer.

Steam service during the season of 1895, between Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, daily ; between St. Peter's and Port Mulgrave ; between Grand Narrows, East Bay and Irish Cove..... $7,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see you have struck out the words "between St. Peter's, Irish Cove and Grand Narrows." If you reduce the service the subsidy should be reduced.

Mr. FOSTER. In the contract entered into with the Bras d'Or Steamship Company for the current year, the routes have been somewhat changed, and the service referred to as between St. Peter's, Irish Cove and Mulgrave is now a distinct service, but run in connection with the other routes, and it seemed advisable to strike out the words.

Steam communication during the season of 1895, for not less than 32 full round trips between St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S., via Yarmouth and other way ports..... $7,000

Mr. BOWERS. This was formerly $5,000. Two years ago the Hon. L. E. Baker wrote asking me to try and get the Government to grant $2,000 more and have the steamer call at Westport and Freeport. The members for St. John, Lunenburg, Queen's, Yarmouth and myself waited upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce, now the Premier, and placed the matter before him. He pledged himself to put in the $2,000 extra. As I understand the hon. Minister, when

Hon. L. E. Baker was here this spring he made some objections to making these trips. If the hon. Minister would insist that these calls should be made at Westport and Freeport when it is not foggy, they would be made without any trouble. We do not wish the steamboat to stop when it is foggy weather. There is not more fog there than there is at any of the ports on the south shore of Nova Scotia, such as Lunenburg, Lockeport and Barrington. There is not more trouble in stopping at Westport than there is in stopping at these ports on the south shore. If in making the contract with the Yarmouth Steamship Company it was made a condition that they should stop at Westport and Freeport when fair, there would be no trouble in giving the communication. I do not wish to ask anything unreasonable, but I think communication with these ports should be given.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can say that this is the estimate that has been given. It is impossible, I think, to make such a change to the conditions as proposed.

Mr. BOWERS. I do not ask for any change this year, but for the future.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister will take it into consideration, no doubt.

Steam communication from the 1st of July, 1895, to the 30th June, 1896, between St. John, Digby and Annapolis.. $12,500

Mr. McMULLEN. Who has this contract ?

Mr. FOSTER. The steamship "Monticello," owned by St. John City Company.

Mr. BOWERS. I notice a new boat run by the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company twice a day to St. John. Can this new boat carry passengers and collect fares where this other boat has a license and Dominion subsidy ?

Mr. FOSTER. There is nothing to prevent them carrying passengers, and nothing to prevent the passengers paying if they wish to do so.

Steam communication for the season of 1895, to 30th June, 1896, between Pictou, N.S., Murray Harbour, Georgetown and Montague Bridge, P.E.I..... $1,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That seems a comparatively small subsidy. What service is rendered ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a small subsidy ; but the service, though not very large, is very useful. It is carried on by the Three Rivers Steamship Company with the steamship "Electra" giving a regular steam weekly service between Pictou, N.S., Murray Harbour, Georgetown and Montague Bridge, P.E.I.——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has Montague got a bridge, too ?

Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. FOSTER. That has no connection with the political bridge—calling thereat on all voyages from Pictou and on all voyages returning.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What size of steamer is this ?

Mr. FOSTER. Her tonnage is not given in my notes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If this subsidy is sufficient for the service in question, it would seem that the other subsidies are on rather a gigantic scale. I should say there was not enough difference between this service and that mentioned in the item last voted to justify the payment of ten times as much for the one as for the other. The comparison suggests that steamships hailing from St. John are rather more favourably dealt with than steamships from other parts of the maritime provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be an easy rule of judgment to apply, but I think my hon. friend will scarcely think it a fair one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Prima facie, it would appear so.

Steam communication from May 1st, 1895, to June 30th, 1896, between Grand Manan and the mainland..... $4,000

Mr. BOWERS. Why has this been reduced ? I understand the boat does not pay its owners now, and is run under great difficulties.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to be the amount of the contract.

Steam communication from April 1st, 1895, to June 30th, 1896, between Port Mulgrave, Arichat and Canso, and between Port Mulgrave and Guysboro', and from April 1st to November 30th, 1895, between Port Mulgrave and Port Hood $4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe there is a reduction there, how have you affected it ?

Mr. FOSTER. They get $5,000 per year, but this vote is for only part of a season. The other part is the supplementary estimates for the current year.

Amount required to pay the Allan Steamship Company for Ocean Mail service between Great Britain and Canada $126,533.33

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to this item, but I think this is a proper occasion on which the hon. gentleman should explain to us, so far as lies in his power, what is the position of the negotiations with Mr. Huddart or his company with respect to the proposed twenty-knot service of which we have heard a good deal, but which appears to have declined to materialize. I should like a full, comprehensive statement—I do not want a history —of the present state of the negotiations.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid I shall have hard work to keep myself within the hon. gentleman's definition. For a full and comprehensive statement of the negotiations I would refer my hon. friend to the revised edition of "Hansard." In "Hansard" for the last three years will be found the state of the negotiations fully declared up to the end of last session. Nothing has transpired to vary very much the conditions of that question up to the present, and chiefly on this account. As my hon. friend knows, about a year ago, we had an intercolonial conference in the city of Ottawa, at which certain points with reference to intercolonial and Imperial trade and communication were taken up, and a strong resolution was passed by the conference in favour of a continuous line of steam communication, taking in the Pacific and the Atlantic by way of Canada. Resolutions of sympathy, and even more than sympathy, with that proposal were passed. Lord Jersey afterwards made his report to the British Government, he having been commissioned to sit at that conference as a representative of that Government. That took a certain amount of time, and it was found impossible to push the scheme, in fact it was inadvisable to attempt to do it, until the report of Lord Jersey should have been made, and the British Government should have had an opportunity of giving some attention to that report, and of giving an answer, in fact, to the representations which were made as to how they would look upon the scheme. Lord Jersey's report was made in due course, about January of this year, and was very favourable indeed, as my hon. friend knows if he has read that report, as no doubt he has. The British Government have been considering it. My hon. friend may have noticed not long since that in the reply of Lord Rosebery to the delegation that waited upon him to urge the matter upon the favourable consideration of the Government, his views were entirely sympathetic, as were also those of the Marquis of Ripon, Colonial Secretary. I think his statement was of this tenor, that the subject was now before the Government, and that he himself and the Marquis of Ripon were sympathetic with the movement, and they hoped that any action of the Government would tend to aid the spirit of the resolutions, would be in the line of the resolutions, which were proposed by the intercolonial conference. The British Government have not, however, yet given their decision with reference to the matter, although in answer to a question in the House not long since, it was stated that the matter was being forwarded with all possible speed, they were getting information, and having reports made by the Post Office Department and some other departments. However, their reply has not been given, and I suppose it is not likely that any reply will now be given until the elections have taken place and the new Government are seated in power there. However, that has all had the effect of preventing it from being considered; and it was impossible for that reason alone, even if the conditions of the money market had not had an influence, for Mr. Huddart to do anything with his scheme beyond continually working at it, as I suppose he has been. I suppose the question might properly be asked as to whether the temporary arrangement has been continued. It has been continued in Mr. Huddart's case. As to the question of how much longer it will be continued, we are waiting, and have been willing to give as much time as possible, until the decision of the British Government should have been made. It is a question whether any set of capitalists could take up the scheme, or really be prepared to say what they would do, until the mind of the British Government had been made known with reference to it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does this involve to us in incidentals?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Excuse me. There are $750,000 to be paid for the Atlantic service. But coupled with that, and particularly so far as assistance by the British Government was concerned, there were other propositions looking to increased assistance to the Pacific service, and likewise to a cable service. How do we stand with respect to those two propositions? Besides supplying $750,000 a year to the fast Atlantic service, are we expected to increase the subsidy to a Pacific service? What is our subsidy to the Pacific line at present?

Mr. FOSTER. Our subsidy at present, I think, is $125,000 a year. That is statutory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But that ought to appear in our Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand that in the $37,000,000, or whatever it is we are asked for, that $125,000 does not show?

Mr. FOSTER. I see it is not here. This is statutory as well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But our estimates are expected to include statutories. Now if, as I understand—and I have looked over the estimates tolerably carefully—the hon. gentleman has omitted that from the total amount chargeable to consolidated fund, it is quite evident that our charges ought to be increased by $125,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not understand how, in his department, such a very obvious error should have occurred.

Mr. FOSTER. It never has been placed in the Estimates, I find.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If he passes his eye over the ordinary summary, he will see that all the other charges authorized by the statutes are duly put in, amounting to $18,942,000. It is a grave blunder, whoever is responsible for it, and, of course, the Minister of Finance is responsible.

Mr. FOSTER. I must take the responsibility.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That an item like that authorized by statute has not appeared——

Mr. FOSTER. It has not appeared from the first.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The fact of the matter is that with that addition our estimated expenditure would be up to $37,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. You have to add just that amount to it, without doubt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that he can alter these estimates, but I would certainly recommend that in the future that it be put in. Is there anything else in the same shape?

Mr. FOSTER. Not that I know of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this $125,000 to the Pacific to be increased?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not so sure. My hon. friend will recollect that in the Act authorizing the payment, the Government was authorized to subsidize a monthly service at so much, or a fortnightly at so much.

Mr. CHARLTON. How much more?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not recollect. I think it was in the Act of four years ago. As regards the question of the hon. gentleman, our liabilities and our possibilities of aiding the Pacific service are defined in the Act. If we have a fortnightly service, we are authorized to give a certain subsidy; if we have a monthly service, we are authorized to give a certain subsidy; and it depends upon the frequency with which the service is needed, and our ability to pay, whether we shall incur a larger amount or keep it less. There is no coincident obligation as between the Atlantic weekly fast line and the Pacific line, to make it necessary that we should follow a fast Atlantic service with a fortnightly service. But, of course, if trade develops, and it is found to be advantageous to do that; it might be done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Speaking from recollection, I think that the British Ambassador, or the British representative, and likewise the Australian commissioners, have made it tolerably clear that any assistance they might give would involve the necessity of helping the Pacific service.

Mr. FOSTER. No. I think not. The proposal that they did make formerly was that the Atlantic service should be accelerated on condition of their helping on the Pacific.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What about the cable?

Mr. FOSTER. The cable has no connection at all with the steamship services, so far as the subsidies are concerned. That stands apart entirely by itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But have we made or held out any inducements in that direction?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend probably knows what has happened, because it is detailed in the reports of the intercolonial conference; all that has happened is either detailed or outlined there. Since the intercolonial conference has held its session, in accordance with one of the resolutions of that conference—I am speaking from memory—tenders were asked for. In order to get information as to the cost, there were two methods which could be employed, one of which was to make a survey of the probable lines that would be followed across the Pacific Ocean. That survey, according to one of the resolutions of conference, was to be undertaken by the Australian colonies, Canada and Great Britain bearing equal shares of the expense. Another alternative proposition was that the cost practically might be approximated by simply calling for tenders, and the amount of tender would show what responsible construction companies would charge for the work. That suggestion was acted upon, and I believe, at the present time, such is the condition of engineering and scientific knowledge in that matter, together with practical methods of laying cable, that a survey is not at all what it used to be, that a cable is laid, practically, at the same time the vessel makes what limited amount of surveying is necessary. So I think it is practically settled that the cost of the undertaking will be ascertained by the tenders put in by responsible companies, and that it will not be necessary to go to a large expenditure for making a thorough survey of the Pacific. A portion of that ocean has already been surveyed by the British Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What subsidy is Canada expected to give towards the cable?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing is settled at all in regard to that. The only obligation that Canada has assumed by the promise of the Government is this: That in the event of a survey to ascertain the best route for a cable being made, jointly by Great Britain, the Australian colonies, and Canada, we should pay one-third of that expense. That expense, of course, will be small; but I feel certain now that this will not take place, and that it will not be considered necessary. Therefore, this country is not bound in any way to any money sum.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You have been informally excluded from the Sandwich Islands.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, from having it as an independent, or rather a British point, entirely out of the control of a foreign power. Of course, the Sandwich Islands would be very glad to have the cable stop there as a commercial matter, but it is in the line of policy to have it stop at a neutral place, or rather at a place controlled by the British Government. It is the general belief that Fanning island, further along towards the Australian colonies than the Sandwich Islands, will be selected, as it is quite available, and practicable for the working of an ocean cable.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How far is it from the Sandwich islands ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know the exact number of miles, but it is quite a distance. Scientific men say it is perfectly well distributed, as between the two continents, so to speak, so as to make a practical working assured.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it an inhabited island ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I think there are some natives on it. It belongs to Great Britain.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice in the summary of the amount that all that is authorized by statute for mail subsidies and steamship subventions is $73,000. The item referred to is $125,000. How does this error creep into the summary.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know about the summary. We voted, last year, a total of $416,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This shows a decrease, when, in reality, there is a large increase.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Certainly, if $125,000 was voted by statute.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it in last year ?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not know. But if $125,000 was voted by statute when only $73,000 appears in the summary, instead of a decrease this year there is an increase.

Mr. FOSTER. The same remark would apply to the sum voted by statute last year, and the sums would balance.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The amount voted last year, statutory and otherwise, was $416,000. It is given in the table as amount voted and authorized by statute. No objection was raised by the Minister. Here we have put down only $73,000 as authorized by statute, whereas the Minister admits that $125,000 was so authorized.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will look at the summary he will see that it is simply a summary of what appears in the Estimates, and the sum of which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and myself have been speaking, does not appear in the Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what purpose is the $73,000 ?

Mr. FOSTER. For the China and Japan service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. An independent subsidy.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before leaving the question of the fast Atlantic service under consideration, I must express my opinion that the Government made a mistake in offering such a large subsidy for a fast Atlantic service, especially for such a fast service as the Minister called for. I believe we have thereby hindered the improvement of the service we now have. We certainly have not encouraged the company to go on with the improvements they have been making from year to year. I believe the Allan and the Dominion lines in past years were engaged in making considerable improvements in their vessels with a view to keeping pace with the demands of the trade, and since this proposition was made for a fast Atlantic service, further improvements have not been carried out. Those companies are in doubt to-day as to whether Canada is going to carry out the proposed fast Atlantic service or not, and thereby we have been hampering and hindering the companies that have served us so well and faithfully in the past. I do not think that justice is being done to existing lines, and if it is not the intention of the Government to complete, immediately, arrangements for a fast Atlantic service—and I earnestly hope they will not do so, in view of the enormous cost involved by the subsidy—they will allow the matter to stand over, and do justice to those companies that have been endeavouring to serve the country faithfully and well for a number of years. The action of the Government has hindered improvements in the present lines of steamers. They are in doubt to-day whether it is wise to go on with improvements to meet the demands of the passenger traffic as well as the freight trade, and the longer the companies are kept in suspense, the worse it is from their standpoint, and also as regards the country's interests. It is desirable that this question should be settled at the earliest possible moment, and I earnestly hope that it will be settled by rescinding the statute, and allowing the present lines to carry out their improvements and to continue to give that fairly good service to the country which they have rendered in past years, perhaps not such a fast service as we might like, but we are limited in population, and we have difficulties to contend with in establishing a steamship service similar to that running

to United States ports, and it will be some years before this country can afford to pay the very heavy subventions it is proposed to give in order to rival lines to American ports.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to add a word to what my friend (Mr. McMullen) has said with regard to the policy which the Government intends to pursue in reference to the fast Atlantic service. I have always believed that the policy of the Government in subsidizing parallel lines of railway and kindred matters has not been in the public interest. We have in the Allan line an old-established concern, which has done efficient service for the money received, and the Government has had no reason to find fault with the manner in which that company performed its contract. A large amount of Canadian capital is invested in it, and the proposal of the Government to subsidize a fast line, at a cost of $750,000 a year, inferentially amounts to a proposal to render the property of the Allan line worthless, and thus to make a Canadian enterprise a failure. The proposition to subsidize a fast line costing us $750,000 a year, is a proposition which exceeds the means of this country, and which proposes to give facilities that really the country does not require. The Allan line, with the increased efficiency which would follow an addition to its subsidy, is ample to give this country all the steamship and postal facilities with the mother country that we need. I repeat that the proposition of the Government is calculated to destroy the property already existing in a steamship line which is essentially a Canadian enterprise.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) states that Canada cannot afford $750,000 a year to obtain a first-class fast Atlantic service. That is not the opinion of the Parliament of Canada, because we have repeatedly voted this amount. I would remind my hon. friend that in years past the provinces of old Canada, Ontario and Quebec, paid for their trans-Atlantic service a sum of $500,000 a year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $416,000 is the amount.

Mr. KENNY. At all events, if in days long past it was advisable to pay that large sum of money, I contend that it is wise and prudent for us, in order to divert traffic to our country, to offer such pecuniary inducements as will secure for Canada the most efficient service. This matter has been so frequently discussed that I am unwilling to delay the committee, at the closing days of the session. I must remark that in any arrangement which we shall make for an Atlantic service, it should be essentially a Canadian service; a service which throughout the whole year shall have its terminal ports within our boundary. At present the Allan and Dominion lines, in the winter months, make their principal expenditure in a foreign country. I therefore hope that whatever service we may arrange for shall be solely a Canadian service.

Mr. FOSTER. That is in the Act.

Mr. KENNY. I am very glad to hear it. I desire further to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the reduction of $32,000 made this year in these steamship subsidies, is nearly all on the West India service. The Minister of Finance has explained to us that for reasons peculiar to the Island of Cuba, it was thought advisable to discontinue the service to that island. These subsidies were given with the object of developing trade, and if trade does not follow, I quite recognize that it is not wise for us to continue them. However, whilst the trade of Cuba has fallen off, the trade of our eastern and western provinces has largely developed with the island of Hayti, and it is within my knowledge that application has been made to the Government for a subvention for a steamship service between the Dominion and that island. This is a very economical year, and the Finance Minister, in a moment of economy, has reduced these subsidies by $32,000, but I trust next year he will take this matter into his serious consideration, and will see his way clear to subsidize a steam service with Hayti.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) in regard to this fast Atlantic service. I did not favour it when it was first proposed, nor when it was adopted, but I am not disposed to enter into a discussion of it now, because I believe it will be an abortive attempt. I quite agree with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that this proposal stands in the way of the improvement of the existing steamship service, which has conferred substantial benefits upon the country. I believe that our whole experience shows that for a considerable portion of the year, steamers cannot run rapidly up the St. Lawrence. The ice sinks there and disappears from the surface, but the self-registering thermometers which are used by the steamers indicate its presence so that they are obliged to run very slowly in the earlier part of the season, on account of this danger. If you subsidize a fast line of steamers between England and Canada, you have at best but one steamer per week, and for postal purposes you are obliged to send your letters via New York for six days in the week. You accomplish nothing in that direction, but you interfere with our ordinary steamers, which are running on the Atlantic. You are not only subsidizing a line of steamers built abroad for the purpose of entering into competition with those that are owned by your own people; but, by holding out this subsidy, you are seriously impeding the

improvement of these two lines, which may be regarded as domestic lines, and so long as the offer remains, and there is an expectation that it will be acted upon, that impediment to the improvement of the present Atlantic service will be continued. I am quite confident that with a moderate increase in the subsidy to the Allan line, you could get steamers which would run with as much rapidity as the safety of the route permits. That arrangement, I believe, would prove more advantageous to the country than what you propose.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to prolong the discussion on the matter, and I do not think it would be wise for us, after the principle has been settled by the House, to debate the Government policy over again on an item of the Estimates. I do want, however, to speak on one point which my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) made, fairly enough. He states that so long as the offer remains, and the scheme which that offer was supposed to promote has not been successfully obtained, it has the effect of preventing improvement in the existing lines. That is a legitimate criticism to a certain extent, and I will meet that criticism in two ways. In the first place, it does not prevent the improvement of the class of vessels which carry the great bulk of Canada's freight, that is, the better freight vessels, which also carry passengers, and which, with the modern improvements are cheaper and better freight-carrying vessels. I believe it will be found, as each year goes over, that the problem of ocean carriage will be worked out in two ways—that there will be a differentiation of vessels, and the passenger traffic will be largely conducted by simply passenger vessels, on which the amount of freight carried will be exceedingly small, while the great pro portion of the trade of the country will be carried by improved freight vessels. But I think it has been pretty well proved by experiment that you cannot very well combine the two. Therefore, I do not think the criticism of the hon. gentleman has the weight that he supposes. In the second place, I would meet the criticism thus. Our policy has been announced and has been supported by the House, that it would be of inestimable benefit to Canada to have a fast line making connection between our ports and the ports of Great Britain, and that it is worth while to sacrifice some time and some effort to bring that about, and if, in the meantime, there is to be some disadvantage, against that is to be set the great advantage that we believe the scheme will ultimately bring to us. At the same time, I believe that the criticism has weight in this respect, that the project should be pushed as quickly and as definitely as possible, and not be allowed to hang too long. I think the argument is perfectly legitimate, that has been advanced, that it has been found impossible to get the scheme definitely taken up until the British Government have an opportunity of saying what their view is in regard to it, and how far they are disposed to carry out Lord Jersey's report. When that is done, the decks will be clear, so to speak, and it will then be possible to tell in a comparatively short time just what we can get, and how we can get it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is the further point, the inutility of the line for the postal service.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend pleads that we should never have an improved service because it will not be a perfecr service, and, therefore, we should not take the first step, it will be a long time before we have a line of fast steamers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another side of this question which the Government of Canada do not appear to me to have pressed sufficiently vigorously. Whether this expenditure of $750,000 is defensible at all I doubt, for various reasons; but, waiving the question whether our position is such as to justify us in spending that amount of money to obtain a twenty-knot service, I have no faith whatever in a uniform twenty-knot service being maintained; and the statements made by the hon. gentleman went very far to show that there is an extreme probability that the contract will be so drawn that while we talk of twenty knots, we shall not receive anything like it, or more than a fourteen or sixteen-knot service. If the contract is drawn in the way that the hon. gentleman and the papers laid before the House indicated that it would be drawn, we shall not get a twenty-knot service at all. But the point I wish to press—and it is a point which I impressed on the British Government a good many years ago—is that if this matter is taken hold of by us, with the view of establishing a service that would be largely Imperial in its character, with the view of developing closer communication between Great Britain and the colonies, we should expect, as a matter of right, not as a matter of favour, the British Government to keep up their end of the stick much better than they propose to do. If we provide a fast service they should give us, if not a monopoly, at all events, a large share of the whole postal service, I think that would be their simply duty; I do not at all approve of the way in which they have dealt in the last twenty years with applications made by the present and preceding Government on that subject. When I came into contact with the British postal authorities, I found among them a great deal of ignorance in reference to Canada, and a disposition not to get out of their old grooves no matter how clearly it could be proved that swift communication from British port to British port could be developed. I hold that in one shape or another,

either by sending a large amount of their mail matter, as they properly could, by such a line, they might well lend us substantial assistance, and it is their duty to do so. I would, therefore, impress very strongly upon the Government that they might very well make a demand upon the British government that, if we ever go into this business, they should help us substantially.

Mr. FOSTER. In addition to that—and I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has brought it up—I wish to say that I believe the British government will be disposed to deal generously with us in the matter of postal service and subsidy.

Mr. KENNY. I am quite sure that the British government will not deal in that manner with the Government of Canada unless we have an efficient service; that is the first condition they will impose. My hon. friend from Bothwell does not seem to have much confidence in the Canadian route or in the efficacy of a fast service. Let me say to him that of all the steamship lines engaged in the north Atlantic service during the past year, the Cunard is the only line that has retained the number of first-class passengers. Owing to the depression in commerce which has prevailed on both sides of the Atlantic, the number of people travelling across the Atlantic on pleasure or on business has been very much reduced, and all the steamship lines have felt that very seriously except the Cunard line. The greater success of the Cunard line is simply due to the fact that the two fast ships of that line, the "Lucania" and the "Campania," are so much faster than the other ships on the Atlantic that they have attracted the passenger traffic. I contend that the more traffic we can divert to the Canadian route the better, not only for Canada generally, but for the different steamship lines engaged in the service. There has been on the part of some Canadians as well as on the part of the American public, a certain prejudice against the Canadian route: and we all know that many Canadians go to New York when they desire to cross the Atlantic, solely for the reason that they get a better ship there. As regards the passenger trade, let me point out to the hon. member for Bothwell, what I dare say has come under his notice, that all this year the steamers sailing from the St. Lawrence have had an unusually large passenger list, which simply means that the route is becoming more popular, and that people who formerly went to New York now go by the St. Lawrence. Further, that a considerable number of Chicago people find it more convenient and agreeable to take the Canadian route, and the steamer passenger list from Montreal is larger than at any previous time in our history. I would just say to my hon. friend to try and have a little more confidence in his own country. I am quite sure that the fast Atlantic service will be a benefit to Canada, as any improvement in any service must inure advantageously to the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would just say to my hon. friend that I have confidence in the country, but not in every hair-brained scheme presented for the consideration of the country and put forward as though it were the only means of promoting the interests of the country. I am satisfied there is the improvement which the hon. gentleman mentioned. Even with the very slow steamers which run now on the St. Lawrence, he admits that the passenger traffic is very fair indeed. Such steamers as could run with perfect safety on the St. Lawrence, run by men thoroughly familiar with the St. Lawrence route, would do very much better under a company such as the Allan or the Dominion Company than a company running one vessel a week from the port of Montreal to an English port. The Minister has said that we ought to have a fair share of the postal traffic. He surely does not expect that the English Government are going to hold back the letters of business men for six or seven days in the post office in order that they may be sent by a Canadian fast steamer. That would be absurd. No Government could live forty-eight hours which would attempt it. The letters must go by the first steamer that sails, and by a fast steamer in preference to a slow one; and the amount of postal communication we would get would not be appreciably great when we have only one day in the seven, while other steamers are leaving every day. No doubt, whatever the interests of the country would be better served by an improved line running fifteen or sixteen knots an hour than by an attempt to incur a very large expenditure for a steamer once a week, run at a very high rate of speed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have no doubt that if Canada had a fast line of steamers, we would get very much more postal matter than we do to-day. I know from departmental information that most business men address their letters from the old country via the route selected by themselves, and it is the invariable practice in the English post offices to send the letters by the routes so marked. The only portion of the correspondence which comes to us is that which is not so marked; but if we had a fast line, I have no doubt we would get the bulk of the correspondence which is now expedited from the old country to Canada. To my mind, it is of great importance to Canada, within the limits of what we can afford, to pay for an improved service. As the Minister of Finance has said, one of the most interesting points in the discussion which took place between the Australian delegates and Lord Jersey representing Imperial interests, and this Government, was this very point, and we were all agreed up-

on the great importance of establishing this fast line.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Postmaster General informs us that if we had this weekly line, the result would be that a large portion of the correspondence, which is now marked via the American lines, would be marked via this line and come this way. I consider that a preposterous statement. A mail one day in seven would hardly secure the mail matter for the second or third or even fifth day following the departure of the steamer. At the utmost, we could hardly expect to secure more than two-sevenths. I am willing to admit that possibly letters written one day before the sailing of the steamer might be held back by those who have patriotic motives, in order to go by the Canadian steamer, but, at the utmost, we could not secure more than two-sevenths. The statement of the Postmaster General is entirely devoid of foundation. He tells us that we need an improved service within the limits of what we can afford to pay. That we admit. The country needs postal, steam, and railway facilities, and facilities of all kinds, within the limit of the amount we are able to pay; and if the Government would keep within that limit, we on this side of the House would have but little to say. But when the Government propose to spend $750,000 per annum for a fast service once a week, they are exceeding the limits of what this country can afford to pay. We are vastly exceeding the limits of what this country can afford, and vastly exceeding any advantge we are likely to get in return for this great expenditure. The sum of $750,000, capitalized, is a very large sum. We have already, as has been pointed out, a steamship service, which, if not commensurate with our wants, can be made so by the appropriation of a comparatively small sum of money, in addition to that already granted. We have two steamship lines established; and a proposal to subsidize this fast line service is a proposal to make these two domestic lines unremunerative, and the Government ought not to propose any such arrangement.

But all this is looking to an Imperial scheme—for it is an Imperial scheme. We have a stretch of railway across the continent, and we propose to have a fast steamship service from England to Canada, a steamship service on the Pacific, and a Pacific Ocean cable. For what? To carry out a great Imperial scheme. It is a good scheme on paper. It would be a good enough scheme in practice, if we had abundance of money. But we are exceeding our ability to pay. We have ideas with regard to what we want to do that are commensurate with a population of 10 or 15 millions of people. We pay an Australian steamship subsidy of $125,000, which it is proposed to increase to $250,000. Now, what is the amount of trade with that country? What prospect have we of developing a trade that will justify this increase of $125,000 in our expenditure? We exported to Australia last year $322,000 of goods. Of this, $201,000 was from British Columbia, and mainly lumber. You do not need a steamship line to convey lumber; it would not go by steamship line anyway. So that for the steamship line we have a trade of a little over $120,000. And we are paying a subsidy of $125,000—a subsidy in excess of the total value of the exports from Canada that can by any possibility be carried by the steamship line. We pay more to facilitate the trade than the whole trade amounts to. We talk of a steamship line to South Africa. I am surprised that the matter was not mooted before this. It has been spoken of by Sir Cecil Rhodes. We have an export trade with British Africa of $45,000. The trouble is, Mr. Chairman, that the Government have ideas altogether in excess of the ability of the country to pay. They have got a grand Imperial scheme. They are to develop trade with the West Indies, with Australia, with South Africa, and they are willing to expend millions of dollars in the attempt to realize these expectations and carry out these plans. We have a country alongside of us that we could develop trade with. We do not need to vote any money for steamship subsidies or railway subsidies in order to develop that trade; that trade will take care of itself. All that that trade asks is, that the burdens upon it shall be removed, that the shackles shall be stricken away. But the Government disdains and scorns that trade; they will none of it. They will amuse the people with schemes for developing Australian trade, South African trade, trade with Jamaica and with British Guiana; they will vote subsidies to promote trade with various portions of the world far removed from Canada, trade with which cannot be developed to an extent at all commensurate with the cost of developing it. We have gone too fast; we are too deeply in debt; we are unable to meet our expenditures; the Government is being carried on under conditions too expensive for the country, and it is time we should call a halt. We have been running up our debt million by million, and we have actually to-day a net debt of very nearly $275,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Where will you get to before you finish? You have been as far as South Africa, and now you have returned here to the question of the debt.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will strike bedrock before I get through. We have a nominal net debt of $250,000,000. We have a lot of assets we cannot realize on, and we have liabilities pending that cannot be exactly capitalized. But the net debt now must be actually about $275,000,000. And yet these subsidies are proposed that will add largely to our debt, and will ruin two existing Canadian lines. It is time this whole scheme of infatuation and desire to spend money for

the advancement of such purposes was brought to an end. And I think this is a good time to discuss that matter. My hon. friend the leader of the House said that the matter had already been discussed and that this was an inopportune time to discuss it again. It is never an inopportune time to discuss a matter of this kind under a vote that is pertinent to the subject. It is well to have confidence in the country, as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) says, but it is also well to have an interest in the country and a desire to give the country a chance to recover from the difficulties in which it has become involved.

Examination of Masters and Mates..... $5,000

Mr. FLINT. I suppose that it would not be worth while to discuss this matter with the hope of inducing the committee to either increase or diminish this amount. But this seems to be a most proper time to speak of a matter which was discussed last session. I refer to the fees charged to masters and mates for passing their examination for certificates. Up to last year the fee for ordinary masters was $10, and for ordinary mates $5 ; for coastmaster, $8, and for coastmates, $4. I think it was last session that an amendment was brought in by the Minister of Marine by which these fees were raised. At the time, I objected to this as an undue tax upon that class of men, and pressed the Minister of Marine to leave these charges at the old rate. But the committee and the House changed the rates from $10 to $15 in the case of an ordinary master, and $5 to $10 in the case of an ordinary mate ; the rates for coastmasters being raised from $8 to $16, and for coastmates from $4 to $8. I wish to repeat the protest I made against this increased tax upon this very deserving class of people. They can ill afford the charge. It is one which I think the Government does not require to make, and it is a great hardship upon a hard-working and not very highly remunerated class of our fellow-citizens. These young men who are preparing to pass the examination for masters and mates, have to remain at home a longer or shorter period in order to prepare for the examination, which is largely technical, and does not in all particulars appertain solely to their abilities as sailors. This delay at home takes them from their avocations, and thus causes them loss, and the examination itself is a cause of expense, if they do not happen to reside in the town or city where examinations are held.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are the fees more than enough to cover the cost of examination ?

Mr. FLINT. It is very difficult to tell what relation the fees bear to the total expense of conducting these examinations, but it appears to me that the Government ought to take into consideration the advisability of reducing these fees to the old standard.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have had considerable correspondence from seafaring men, all complaining bitterly of the charges. Had I been aware, when the Bill was passing through the House, of the feeling entertained by that class against these charges, I should certainly have taken more time in impressing upon the attention of the Government the desirability of not touching upon that subject. When another opportunity arises I shall call the attention of the House more pointedly to this matter, and I shall press upon the Government that it is desirable at the earliest moment to reduce these fees to their old standard.

Lifeboat Station, Seal Island..... $500

Mr. BOWERS. Why is this amount reduced from $2,000 ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The reduction is made more particularly, I think, because our agent utilizes the fishermen. They have a fishing service for $500, and we take advantage of that to make a reduction, at the same time maintaining the efficiency of the service.

Mr. BOWERS. Are the fishermen living on Seal Island the whole year round ?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). There are some fishermen living on that island, and some who live upon the main, and who fish from the island. An arrangement has been made with these people to man the lifeboats there. They remain a longer period than the fishing season ; and inasmuch as they are fishing there under privileges, they also look after the lifeboat station for a much smaller sum than has heretofore been paid. The master and crew that have been appointed, are very efficient men.

Mr. BOWERS. Do they live there the whole year ?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). No ; they have been living on the main, but the arrangement is now that they remain there the whole year. The greater portion of the season they fish from the island.

Mr. BOWERS. The reason I mention this is that during that part of the year when it would be most dangerous, during the months of November and December, they would probably not be living on Seal Island, and that is just the time they are required to be there.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is just the time when they are there.

Tidal Service..... $10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is done for this sum of money ? We have had the item for several years, but without any full statement ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The memo. I have here is that Mr. B. Dawson, assistant engineer, is in charge of this service. He was appointed in 1894 at a salary of $2,000. As

sistance in the survey of the current, establishing tidal stations, and tidal observations carried on, are all paid out of this vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where is this survey conducted ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Along the Gulf of St. Lawrence. A special survey is made from Gaspé.

Mr. BOWERS. Last year there was considerable talk in committee over the matter, and it was concluded that as soon as the Government could find opportunity and means, it was desirable that tidal observations should be made at the mouth of the Bay of Fundy. There is no part of the bay or the tidal waters where there are more wrecks than in the vicinity of Seal Island and Mud Island near the entrance to the Bay of Fundy; and I should suppose it would be incumbent on the Minister to have observations made there.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We are giving special attention to that subject now. We have a very practical gentleman there, Captain Douglas, who is now making inquiries.

Maintenance and repairs to Lights, &c... $230,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do you make this decrease of $35,000 ? In what way was the saving made ? Was your predecessor spending too much money ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman will understand that there are two votes generally, but only one this year for the coming year. Under the heading of maintenance, considerable repairs are sometimes required, and minor lights may be established. But under the heading of construction of new lights there is a separate vote this year. I am sorry to see the reduction of $35,000 in that service. It is going to make it very inconvenient for me to do justice to the service, but I will do the best I can. I cannot do the same amount of work that was done last year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In making up his estimates, does the hon. gentleman cite where this reduction will take place, what places shall receive less expenditure ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That would be impossible. The estimate is based upon such a service as we had last year. I am asking for a less amount this year, and therefore we have to cut down expenses to the lowest figures all along the line.

Hydrographic Surveys, including surveys on Georgian Bay, and re-survey of Anticosti $16,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What progress is that survey making in Georgian Bay ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is pretty nearly completed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why does Anticosti require a re-survey ?

Mr. FOSTER. There has been no survey there for a long time. Now that Georgian Bay is nearly completed, attention is to be paid to Anticosti.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to Anticosti, I do not remember any explanation having been given before. I should imagine that the island had already been pretty fairly surveyed.

Mr. FOSTER. Changes have taken place in the currents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The actual formation of the land must be pretty well known and defined.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am informed that the work is being done at the request of the Imperial Government.

Nova Scotia—Fishery Overseers and Guardians $20,000

Mr. FLINT. Has the salary for the inspector in the western counties of Nova Scotia been reduced as compared with the salary received by his predecessors.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think so. I am in favour of the principle that if an officer is appointed at a certain salary and by length of service advances to the maximum, his successor should also work up.

Mr. FLINT. That is a very good rule in the majority of cases in the Civil Service: but with respect to these officers, who are not political friends of mine, I have always been of the opinion that they have been inadequately paid. The session before last I called the attenion of the Acting Minister of Marine to this fact, and he was inclined to agree with what I said, that their duties are onerous, occupying their whole time, and calling for a high degree of capacity, and I then pressed on the attention of the Minister the advisability of considering their compensation. Although disposed to question salaries wherever they appear high, I think $900 for the work which the officer performed almost under my own eyes was not enough, and this circumstance tended no doubt to the difficulties to which that officer became involved. The Minister should take into consideration at as early a date as possible the advisability of giving these officers sufficient compensation to place them above temptation, and the necessity of in any degree impairing the efficiency of the office.

Mr. BOWERS. I called the attention of the Minister last year to a new appointment made in Digby County, $500 for a fishery officer in Digby town. The Minister seemed to think he was very fortunate in obtaining the services of this gentleman as fishery overseer. He has held the office now for a year, and has no doubt drawn his

salary; but I have yet to ascertain what his duties are, and what he has done. I live in his fishing district, but I have not seen him yet. It was thought strange at the time that this lawyer should get the appointment. If this amount of $500 had been given to the inspector of the county instead of the amount voted being divided between the two offices, the duties would be more efficiently discharged. The Minister should look into the matter.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will make inquiries.

Manitoba—Fishery Overseers $2,500

Mr. MARTIN. What is the reason of the reductions.

Mr. COSTIGAN. A reduction has been made all round.

Mr. MARTIN. There has been no reduction made in Ontario, none in Nova Scotia, a slight reduction in New Brunswick, a slight reduction in Prince Edward Island, and a large reduction in Manitoba. Out of the reduction of $10,000, $2,000 is made in Manitoba. There must be some reason for this action, and some explanation should be given. If the Minister does not wish to give an explanation, very well.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not wish to be discourteous to the hon. gentleman, and I am most anxious to give any information asked. I thought I would try and get along with this amount for Manitoba and have the service carried out with it, though we could easily expend a much larger sum. You cannot appoint fishery officers in that country on all the waters for anything like the amount. There is a large amount of inaccessible territory, that you cannot protect by the appointment of officers, and which, because it is inaccessible, cannot be frequented by poachers.

Mr. MARTIN. That might be an explanation why the department had not increased the amount; but if I can gather anything at all from that explanation it is that they are decreasing the area of protection. If inspection has existed over a larger portion of the territory, then what part of the territory is the Government abandoning?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The estimate is a bulk estimate for protection of all the fisheries. For instance in one salary—I am not saying it would account for this reduction because it might come out of last year—the inspector is now both inspector and overseer of the hatchery and gets the one salary.

Mr. MARTIN. That has been the case since the hatchery was established.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not more than a year since the change was made. We have adopted a system of paying guardians for the day's work they do in patrolling, and for which they keep a diary instead of the old system of paying wardens a small salary.

British Columbia $7,900

Mr. MARTIN. There is another decrease there.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am awfully sorry about those decreases, but I cannot help it. I knew a discussion would come up about them.

Mr. MARTIN. Just as I supposed, the department does not seem to have any idea with regard to the reason of those pretended reductions. They say: We were voted $4,500 for Manitoba last year and we can easily do with $2,500 this year, and then they go on and spend $4,500 and come down with supplementary Estimates next year. Surely if the department has investigated the matter they ought to know in what particular this money can be saved.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can see quite a difference between giving an explanation on an increase, and giving an explanation on a decrease in the Estimates. You are bound to show why you make your increase, but when you make a reduction you do not spend the money at all, and it is pretty hard to explain why you do not spend it. The hon. gentleman says it is only a pretended reduction, but I am quite satisfied that what he complains is that it is a practical reduction.

Mr. MARTIN. I have made no complaint at all. I merely want the information.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We should know whether these reductions are made upon any intelligible calculation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They are based on a mathematical calculation.

Mr. MARTIN. Then we should know what the reason of the reduction is. Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg are very large areas, and there is whitefish in every part. If the Government can afford to leave a certain area without inspection, why should not the inhabitants of other portions be in the same fortunate position? I am not criticising adversely or favourably the proposition of the Government, but I want to know what their proposition is. Is the inspection of Lake Manitoba to be abandoned altogether, or is the inspection to be so much less all round?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman is anxious to get the information I will give him a satisfactory answer. My impression is that the hon. gentleman is looking forward to arranging these estimates in the future himself. The hon. gentleman would like to have a liberal estimate. We are cutting down the Estimates so low that when he has to deal with them he will have to increase them, which will be very difficult for him to do after the cry he has raised for years.

Mr. MARTIN. I have not criticised it adversely ; I think it is all right.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is one reason which I think the hon. gentleman will accept. We did not expend the amount of money taken by the last vote, and it is a reasonable proposition to say that we shall have the same service, and will not require so large a vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGT. That is a reasonable explanation, the only reasonable explanation we have got yet.

Building and maintenance of fish-breeding establishments and lobster hatcheries... $40,000

Mr. BOWERS. Is it intended to build any lobster hatching establishment in the western part of Nova Scotia ? That is just the place where it is most needed—where lobsters when grown bring from 20 cents to 30 cents a piece. Why hatch lobsters in Pictou County, where they bring only 2 cents a pound, and not in Yarmouth or Shelburne, where they bring 10 cents or 12 cents a pound ? Would it not be better to encourage lobster fishing where lobsters bring a big price and where the industry is of the most benefit to the people than where it is of no value ?

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 2nd July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 137) to amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade (from the Senate).—(Mr. Foster.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That for the remainder of the session Government Orders have precedence on Wednesdays, after questions put by members, and Wednesday's order of business under Rule 19 be made the order of business for Monday.

Mr. CASEY. I think, Mr. Speaker, that private members who have introduced what is really public business have not been well treated this session, and this motion if carried will place them in a worse position than they ought to occupy. It will be remembered that, contrary to what has been the usual custom, the Budget debate was continued from day to day, and absorbed several Wednesdays in the earlier part of the session. Another Wednesday since then was devoted to the discussion of a motion of want of confidence. Of the few Wednesdays that private members have had, almost the whole time has been taken up by one or two Bills. For instance, the discussion on the Sabbath Observance Bill was entered into at a length which did not seem to be intended for criticism, but more for the purpose of obstruction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASEY. I think it is quite in order to say that, in discussing the business of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Casey) is wrong. It is not in order to make that statement.

Mr. CASEY. I have constantly heard the term used without retraction.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CASEY. I withdraw, according to your ruling, Sir, as to the fitness of the word. I will say, however, that the discussion of this Sunday Bill by members on the other side of the House appeared to be undue and excessive, and more than was required for the purpose of due criticism. For many other reasons the time allotted for public business introduced by private members has been unduly shortened. I claim that even under the ordinary rules of the House, insufficient time is allowed for legislation of this kind. Much of it, such as the question of prohibition and other questions, is quite as important as legislation introduced by the Government. At the present time there are on the Order paper a large number of important measures, which, if this resolution passes, will have no chance whatever of coming before the House. The first Bill on the paper, respecting weights and measures, was introduced by Mr. Wilson on the 22nd of April, and will not be considered if this motion is adopted. There is also a Bill by the member for East York (Mr. Maclean), to promote the safety of railway employees ; another by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson), to amend the Railway Act, introduced on the 29th of April, and another to provide better security for railway passengers and employees introduced by myself, all of which are of considerable importance. This legislation as far as it concerns railway employees was brought before the House in my own case, and no doubt in the case of the other members, largely at the request of the organized railway employees who are most in-

terested. It is legislation which should be discussed by the House.

I have another Bill on the Order paper since May 2nd to provide for drainage across railway lands, which was suggested by petitions from different municipalities calling attention to the serious grievances which now exist in this respect. The people are unable to drain their lands, in consequence of the obstructions put in their way by railways under the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and they ask for relief. These are samples of Bills which will be prevented from getting a hearing, although they were put on the Order paper in good time, and although the promoters of them have missed no opportunity of bringing them before the House. There are a number of other important Bills to which the members interested in them will probably draw attention. I think the Government could spare another Wednesday when some of these Bills could come up for a second reading with brief discussion and be afterwards discussed in committee.

Mr. SPROULE. In the main I agree with what has fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Owing to the exceptional circumstances at the beginning of this session very little time was given to the consideration of Bills in the hands of private members beyond that occupied by one or two Bills, especially the first, because the second is still on the paper. It does seem strange that we should have reached the closing days of the session and have been able to deal with only one Bill among the thirty-six public Bills in the hands of private members which are on the paper. I do not understand why private members should not have a little more courtesy and more consideration shown them in their efforts to promote legislation for the general benefit of the people of the country. There have been from time to time very many important public Bills on the paper, but somehow, when the date of the consideration of public Bills is reached, owing to a late sitting the night before, or owing to the Government proposing an early adjournment, we have not been able to reach them; and now, if the Government take next Wednesday, there will probably be no more reached this session. Some of the Bills on the paper are of considerable importance to the people. I have three on the paper, one of which has been pressed for two or three years—the Bill regarding the adulteration of honey. The men engaged in that line of enterprise are very strongly in favour of this Bill. I introduced it last year, but it was put off from time to time, so that I was unable to get it to a second reading or have it discussed on its merits. This year it has been on the paper since 2nd May, and up to the present time I have not been able to reach a second reading, although the men engaged in the manufacture of honey have looked forward with a good deal of interest to the passage of the Bill. But strange to say, although they have pressed it in every way, some of them coming here to promote its passage, there has been no opportunity to have it read the second time or to have it discussed. I think some means should be adopted early in the session for giving more time for the consideration of public Bills in the hands of private members, so that they would not simply be put on the paper as a notice to members of Parliament and to the country, and then never be reached or considered.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think that at this period of the session the motion of the hon. gentleman is an unreasonable one. At the same time, it is very much to be regretted that this session when the Government have practically no legislation at all, it will be impossible to place on the statute-book, or even to bring to a second reading, more than one measure in the hands of private members. I think, Sir, it is not an unfitting occasion on which to draw attention to what appears to me to be a very unsatisfactory rule of the House, that is, when the debate on a notice of motion stands adjourned, it is put that under the head of Public Bills and Orders. That seems to me a most unreasonable rule in every way. For instance, the whole of the 'ast private members' day was occupied with a discussion of an adjourned motion by Mr. Flint for an address to His Excellency. A motion goes at the head of Public Bills and Orders, if the debate stands adjourned, by reason of the hour having been reached, when the proceedings for that part of the day go over, it goes to the foot of the paper, which is not of so much consequence, if the debate is on motion adjourned. I would direct the attention of the Minister of Justice to a Bill that stands in my name, if this motion is to be carried, I mean the Bill (No. 16) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. It is a Bill for the amendment of the same Act standing in the name of the Secretary of State; and as we are not very far from a general election, this Bill appears to me to be of sufficient importance for the Government to take it up and deal with it. It is not a controversial Bill. It deals with two subjects: one is the doubt that exists as to the meaning of the law permitting railway companies to carry voters; another is in regard to personation. Both are matters as to which, I think, there would be no objection, as there ought not to be, on either side of the House. I think we ought also to have from the Government, at this stage, a statement as to the probable length of the session. Up to this hour we have not heard whether the Hudson Bay Railway scheme is to be proceeded with, and we have not heard whether there is to be any remedial legislation, and very much depends on both of these measures whether the session is

to end at an early day or not. If the session is to be prolonged, I do not see why Wednesday should be taken from us yet.

Mr. BRYSON. I desire to call the attention of the Government to a Bill which I placed on the Order paper on the 26th of April, and which I have never had an opportunity of reaching. It is a very important measure on behalf of railway employees, and will, I believe, meet with the general approval of the House. It is a very short Bill, having only one clause, and I hope the Government will see fit, if they take Wednesday, to place it on the Government orders. It is unnecessary for me to go into details to show why this Bill is necessary; I can only assure the House that it is very much wanted in the interest of labouring men on the railways of this country.

Mr. LAURIER. I thought the hon. Minister of Finance rose a moment ago to answer the question put by the hon. member for North Simcoe.

Mr. FOSTER. Which question?

Mr. LAURIER. I shall have to repeat it for the information of my hon. friend. I am sorry he is not so astute as I thought him to be. My hon. friend from North Simcoe asked if we were to have any legislation with regard to the Hudson Bay Railway, or if we were to have remedial legislation in reference to Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the statement which was made by my hon. friend on my right, that at this stage of the session, the Government are not unreasonable in pressing for Wednesday, will be acceded to by the whole House. We are within a few days, I hope, from the end of the session. Public business has gone on under the rules of the House, and although under the rule my hon. friend spoke of, Public Bills and Orders have sometimes gone below motions which were undisposed of, yet that has been in accordance with our practice. It may be inconvenient in some respects; it may be convenient in others. My hon. friend who spoke last laid some of the fault of the Wednesdays being taken away from private members to the Budget debate. I need only ask my hon. friend's attention to former sessions to recall to his mind the fact, as shown by the records of "Hansard," that the Budget debates have always gone on de die in diem until finished, and seldom have they passed over a less range of time in discussion than this year. That, at any rate, has been the general rule. My hon. friend was also, I think, wrong in his statement that the Sunday Bill took up a great deal of the discussion this year. The discussion was very short, and it was short because the Minister of Justice transferred the two principal clauses of that Bill to his special committee on amendments to the criminal code. I may say that all the Bills involving amendments to the criminal code were taken to that committee, and are now in process of mastication, and probably digestion. We will see by and by, what will come from that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Claws and all?

Mr. FOSTER. The claws will probably be eliminated when the Bills come out. With reference to other Bills, they have been passed over, in some cases, because the members who had charge of them were not prepared to take them up when called, and, for that, of course, the Government cannot be held responsible. There are, however, some other Bills which have been spoken of by hon. gentlemen since this motion was made. The Government will look at those and see whether there are any which it will be possible for them to take up this session. With reference to some, that may be possible; with reference to others, it may not be possible to have legislation this year. Some of those, however, may embody principles of so much importance that the Government may take them up with the view of thoroughly looking into them and seeing what legislation may be advisable another session, when we come back again to Parliament. So far as the business of the House is concerned, I think it is all upon the Order paper. If anything else is to go upon the Order paper, it will be something very important, but which may come up by way of incident, and with reference to which it may be found necessary to have some legislation, incidentally. This I say in order to show the House what is about the state of business, so far as the business of the Government is concerned. I make one reservation, and that is with reference to remedial legislation. We have been blamed for coming so near the end of the session and having no legislation or announcement with reference to that. It was scarcely possible that we could have reached it. The papers from the Manitoba legislature and the government came into our hands only this morning. That will be taken up, and the Government will be able, I think, in a very short time, to intimate to the House what course it proposes with reference to that subject. With that single limitation, what I have stated holds good. We are through fully two-thirds of the main Estimates, and the most contentious portions of them have been voted, judging by the discussions which have arisen in former years. I have no doubt, looking at the state of the Bills, many of which will not cause lengthy discussion, that it is quite possible for the House to get through with the business on the Order paper, and be ready for adjournment, I should think, early next week—all this subject to the proviso I mentioned a minute ago.

Mr. LAURIER. Since the motion is to carry, the hon. gentleman might think well of adopting the method followed in former

years, by transferring to Monday the business of Wednesday.

Mr. FOSTER. That is in the motions.

Mr. MARTIN. Do I understand the leader of the House to state that there is no measure affecting the Hudson Bay Railway, or the company known under that name, with reference to the Order in Council, in connection with that enterprise ?

Mr. FOSTER. I made my declaration as inclusive as it possibly could be, and I think it is sufficient to satisfy my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to.

POSTMASTER AT STE. ANGELE DE MONNOIR.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON laid on the Table of the House the return ordered in connection with the discharge of Mr. Loiselle, ex-postmaster of Ste. Angèle de Monnoir. He said : I stated on a previous occasion, that when the return which was ordered by the House was brought down, I would make a statement, and I shall now proceed to make that statement. I protest, as I have protested on former occasions, against laying upon the Table of the House any report received by the Postmaster General from his inspectors : and I do so, not because I am the one occupying the position of the Postmaster General at present, but because I feel that, within my experience of that department, it will be impossible to administer it properly, as it should be, if these reports be given to the public. These reports contain information which the inspectors, were they not protected by the confidential nature of their reports, would never attempt to give to the Postmaster General, and hence, if they are to be made public, it will be impossible for him to get the information which he ought to, and does now receive for the purpose of administering the department as it should be administered. In reference to the discussion—if I may be permitted to refer to it, and I do not look upon the reference as one to a previous discussion, but as simply a statement, which I ask permission of the House to make—I would say that I do not read the statement made by the late Sir John Thompson, and which was referred to on a former occasion, as it has been interpreted by the House, although I submit to the better judgment of the House. The leader of the House, at that period, Sir John Thompson, said :

> If these papers are in the department they will be brought down. If not, an order of the House cannot cause them to be produced.

The interpretation which Sir John Thompson gave to me, and which I completely concur in, is that these confidential reports do not belong to the department in the sense of being liable to an order of the House. That is why, according to my judgment, Sir John Thompson said that any papers which were in the department would be brought down. I am perfectly willing to admit, as I have done on every occasion, that I have submitted to the order of the House against my own judgment, as I think every member should submit to the order of the House. But I was led to submit to the order all the more readily from the fact that the episode under discussion did not occur while I was administering the department over which I now preside, but occurred under one of my colleagues who is still a member of the Government of the day, and who has no objection to producing the report which I am placing on the Table in accordance with the order of the House. I again wish to say, and I think those who have held a similar position to that I occupy will agree, that if these reports were to be placed upon the Table of the House, it would be quite useless to have inspectors to be sent from one place to another investigating the wrong-doing or alleged wrong-doings of officers of the department. This is the reason why, Mr. Speaker, I claimed the indulgence of the House the other day when I said that in bringing down that report I would ask the House to permit me to make a statement—which statement I have now made.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works when I may expect the papers relating to the Portage la Prairie post office site ?

Mr. OUIMET. I sent a memorandum to my deputy with regard to this return. I have reason to believe that the papers are now ready.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask the Finance Minister if we are likely to get the return regarding superannuations before the close of the session ?

Mr. FOSTER. That depends somewhat upon the time of the close of the session. I have so often said, that it seems scarcely necessary to say it again, that the preparation of the return is proceeding with all possible despatch. It is a large return, and takes time.

THE FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved the second reading of Bill (No. 69) respecting the voters' lists of 1895.

Mr. LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This Bill is only to postpone the revision of the lists and to legalize the present lists for any elections that may be held meantime.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend is new in his present office; he has had only for some weeks at best the management of the State Department; and perhaps it might strike him that he would do better to abolish the Franchise Act altogether rather than repeat the farce every year of introducing a Bill to dispense with the revision and to have the lists revised only when there is to be a general election. We are to have an election, I do not know at what time, but at no very distant time at all events. Now, in the regular course of affairs, we should have a revision of the lists. If we had the provincial system, we should have the new lists of the provinces. Suppose the elections should take place this summer, immediately after the session or this fall, those elections will be held upon the lists already one year old. A number of citizens have come to the voting age, but these will be disfranchised in the coming election. Sir John Thompson last year introduced a measure which, I am sure, would meet the approval of both sides of the House. The principal feature in it was the adoption of the provincial lists—the list prepared in every province for the holding of local elections. The only objection I have heard to the adoption of that system was that in some of the provinces, the province of Nova Scotia, for instance, certain public employees were debarred from voting. I have no objection, for my part—and I think it was a provision in the Bill of Sir John Thompson—that there should be a provision in the Bill that in every province where public officers have been deprived of the right to vote, they should be placed upon the lists for Dominion purposes and have the right to vote in Dominion elections. Under such circumstances, I would appeal to the good sense of both sides of the House. Hon. members, no matter on what side they may be, must agree that since we have these Bills every year dispensing with the revision of the lists, the proof is clear that the present law does not work satisfactorily, for if it did work satisfactorily we should not have a Bill of this kind year after year. And if they will only give thought to the question, I think they will come to the conclusion that the measure proposed by Sir John Thompson was a wise one and should be adopted. I would commend this to my young friend now at the head of the department. He has in this an opportunity to distinguish himself and to do a good thing for the country at large.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am obliged for the kind advice given by the hon. gentleman in such a pleasant manner. Let me assure him that it will be received in the same way and given careful consideration. But, Sir, so far as this Bill is concerned, it is simply to postpone the revision of the lists for the present year. As to the allegation that these lists will be a year old when the election is held, my hon. friend seems to have taken upon himself the authority of prophecy as to the date at which the elections will be held.

Mr. LAURIER. No, no; the revision took place in June of last year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend is wrong. The lists were completed on the 1st March of the present year, so that at present we are only a couple of months away from the final revision. It would be impossible to get lists any newer, except under some system of registration such as is in vogue in the United States in connection with the elections there; and there are many objections to that system, both as to the practices that are engaged in under it and as to its expense—the fact being that it makes practically two elections, as hon. gentlemen know. Further, as a result of the trial of this system in Canada in the cities of the province of Ontario under an Act passed at the instance of Sir Oliver Mowat, we have facts which justify me in saying that it is a very expensive system indeed. As to the broad question of the franchise, I do not think the House will hold me justified in entering into any lengthy discussion of it this afternoon. I can only say this: A Bill was introduced, as my hon. friend has said, by Sir John Thompson last year, which, it was thought, would remove the expense of a duplicate system—the Dominion and provincial franchise. It was thought when that Bill was introduced that it would be received by the provincial governments as an evidence that this Government were anxious to have the franchise of the Dominion and the province harmonize as far as possible, and that there was no desire on the part of this Government or this party to perpetuate the double franchise as it now exists if any fair and equitable basis for a union can be arranged for. But, instead of the provincial authorities showing any desire for a solution of the difficulty, we have not only had a perpetuation of their system—which as my hon. friend admitted, disfranchise many men who ought to be on the lists—but we have had the provincial lists made more obnoxious since the introduction of Sir John Thompson's Bill. However, I am not going to discuss the broad question, as it may be better discussed on some other Bill, this Bill being designed only to legalize the existing lists for another year. I may say further that my attention has been called by some of the revising barristers to some points which they have thought of importance. In some of the electoral districts the lists for some of the polling divisions have more names than the law actually allows. It is not regarded as a very serious defect, nor is it believed by the Justice Department that it would render those lists illegal, but out of abundant caution, the suggestion of sev-

eral revising barristers, it has been decided to ask the House to adopt this clause, which I shall move when we go into committee:

The lists of the voters prepared under the said Act and amendments in the year 1894-95, as finally revised and certified, and as amended or corrected on appeal, if there has been any such amendment or correction, shall be valid, and shall avail for the purposes of the said Act and amendments, notwithstanding that a revising officer has not complied with the provisions of section 23 of said Act, as amended, or that any prescribed form has been departed from, or that anything has not been done within the time or within the manner prescribed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the fact that we had such a Bill before us on this occasion is an evidence of the unsatisfactory character of the measure to which it relates. If the measure was a proper one, and one felt to be so by those who still defend it, there would be no necessity for having a suspending Bill, or Act, except once in three or four years when the Bill is allowed to go into operation. When you look at the voters' lists in any constituency, you will find that upwards of 10 per cent of that list is changed every twelve months, so that where you have 5,000 voters on a list, you have at least 500 persons at the end of twelve months entitled to go upon the list, and nearly the same number who ought to be taken off the list, in that particular constituency. I may say that the list in my constituency was revised in 1891, it was again revised in 1894: and during that period of time, on a list numbering about 7,000 voters, upwards of 2,000 were upon the list of 1891 that required to be struck off, and very nearly the same number of persons were entitled to go upon the list. This fact is sufficient to show the House how very large the change is in every constituency in an exceedingly short time; and unless there is a revision every year, you will always have an election held on a list which does not represent those who are legally, in the abstract, entitled to vote. Now for what reason does the hon. gentlemen propose this Bill? Simply because the present law is odious in the popular estimation. It puts the community to a great amount of trouble and a very large expense, and the Government do not wish to incur the unpopularity necessarily incident to the proper operation of a measure of that kind. I think, Sir, there is one thing that the hon. gentleman has overlooked, and that is that the Government last year agreed to a proposition, through the Prime Minister, from which on the present occasion they have resiled. The Government on that occasion committed itself to the principle of adopting the qualification which is fixed by the local legislature. Of course, such a measure does not rest solely upon local legislation. It is the authority of this Parliament that makes the list one for holding the election of members to the House of Commons. The hon. Minister has said that the local legislatures have not approached the Dominion on this subject in a conciliatory spirit. Why, Sir, there was nothing in that measure requiring them to approach the Government at all. They are undertaking in every province to prepare a list of those persons qualified to vote at a local election, and the presumption is that the parties who are qualified to vote at a local election will also be qualified to vote for a member of the House of Commons in an election held by the federal authorities. Now, the question of referring this matter wholly to the local legislatures and accepting the lists which they prepare, is purely a question of convenience. We favour their lists, not because they are better qualified than we are, to say who in the abstract is entitled to vote, but because they have necessarily the municipal machinery to prepare a list, which we have not. How is the list prepared in the case of a provincial voters' list? Why, it is prepared by the municipal authorities, representing both political parties, and these authorities are capable of preparing a proper list because they are personally known by and personally know the voters who ought to go upon that voters' list. That being so, there is a complete list prepared by the local and municipal authorities. When you go to England you have exactly the same rule. The revising officer revises; he does not make a list, he revises a list made by the parish authorities. And so we have in the province of Ontario a list prepared by the municipal authorities which the revising officer may properly revise. What do we do here? We have no municipal machinery, we appoint no local parties for the purpose of preparing a list. We appoint one man for the whole constituency, who, under no circumstances, can be acquainted with more than a very small fraction of those whose names ought to go upon that list. He has no personal knowledge, he can have none; and so he is obliged to have recourse to evidence of another character which the local authorities could in a large degree dispense with. Well, I am not going to discuss that matter further. Now, with regard to the hon. gentleman's proposed additional clause, it seems to me it goes further than the hon. gentleman intended, and if I rightly understand it, would validate everything, no matter how irregular, that might have been done by a revising officer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We can discuss that in committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then I will wait till it is regularly before us.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the hon. gentleman rather overstated, unintentionally, I have no doubt, the proposition that Sir John Thompson made in his Bill. I certainly

understood that Bill very differently in a most important part of it. Sir John Thompson expressly declined to hand over to the provinces the right to regulate the franchise of this House. While he admitted that the basis of the franchise was to be provincial, he expressly reserved the right—and in some of the provinces it would be an immense right, as we know from the discussion that arose on the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills)—that we should add to those lists all such men as we saw fit, that were not allowed to vote by the provinces. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but if he will read the Bill he will see I speak by the book. I say further that highly as I regarded Sir John Thompson's capacity, and highly as I respected his ability and his fairness, if he had proposed any law that did not reserve us those rights, I for one, would have voted against it. The whole principle of the distinction is this: that the House of Commons of Canada shall and must retain to itself the right to say who shall vote at the elections of its members, and not allow this right to be acquired by the different provinces. It will be found that in Ontario there is not so much to complain about as regards the disfranchisement of certain persons as in several of the other provinces, where not only are special officials disfranchised, but also many voters who in no sense can be treated as officials of any government. Sir John Thompson distinctly gave the House to understand, and the Bill was in the same direction, that while as far as possible it was desirable to assimilate the franchises of the Dominion Parliament and the local legislatures, yet this should be done only on certain conditions and under certain safeguards. In the Bill he retained the right of the Dominion Parliament, or the Government of the day which is the mouthpiece of the Parliament, to appoint the officers who were to revise the list and to decide the qualifications of those who should go upon the list. He retained both of those safeguards, and the criticism so far as it came from this side of the House, was to the effect that the saving of expense, so far as the general question was concerned, would be very small in comparison with the whole expenditure. I am quite free to say that the only objection, and I say this advisedly, to the franchise law as it now exists, is its expense. I am not going to say that it is not expensive, but I assert this clearly, and emphatically, that however much it may cost, it will pay the people of the country well to make that outlay rather than surrender the right of the Federal Parliament to pronounce who shall and who shall not vote at the election of members for this House. I call the attention of the House to the statement made by the Secretary of State, which amounted to an invitation to the provinces to co-operate with this Parliament. I would even go further, and ask the Secretary of State to open communication, if it has not yet been opened, with the provincial authorities in order to ascertain if they would place at our service, conjointly or otherwise, the powers and assistance of the municipal authorities, and then we could evolve a plan which, while it retains this principle of which I have spoken, and which, however expensive it may be, I am prepared to defend rather than surrender that which means the very existence of the election of members to this House, might result in conjoint action by the federal and provincial authorities with a view to agree upon some joint and fair mode of preparing lists for both elections. I will now refer briefly to the law of Ontario, with which I am acquainted, and if it is inconsistent with that of the other provinces hon. members from those provinces can point out the difference, if they deem it important. In Ontario we have three schedules composing the lists for the local legislature. The first, includes those who can vote at municipal elections and local elections; the second, comprises those who can only vote at local elections, and the third, comprises those who can vote only at municipal elections. If the local governments would put at the service of this Parliament and the Government their municipal officers, we could add a fourth schedule, comprising those who can vote only at Dominion elections, and so make a complete list each year, and divide the expense. Then we could obtain in this way a complete list; we would neither have the provinces declaring who should vote at the Dominion elections, or the Dominion deciding who should vote at the local elections, and at the same time we would be saving a great expense which is now involved in preparing the electoral lists. My view is, that this is the proper way of proceeding, and I hold there was a great deal of force in the statement of the Secretary of State that the provincial authorities have in no way shown any desire to grant any concession in this regard. I believe that in this country, the Government of which comprises Federal and local Parliaments, each legislative body should approach the other. I do not care to what political party they belong, and make recommendations with a view to joint action, so long as these are made in the interest of good government and in the direction of improving our institutions. The lists for the provincial elections are prepared by the municipal authorities. I am not going to enter into a discussion of that question, because we had an illustration during the discussion on the motion of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), showing how unfair are the disfranchising clauses adopted by many of the lower provinces, clauses which I do not believe hon. gentlemen opposite would agree to adopt. No doubt

there is a good deal to be said in favour of disfranchising officials of all governments. I am not, however, in favour of adopting such a course. I am in favour of all officials, except those connected with the administration of justice and holding similar positions, voting at both the Dominion and provincial elections; at the same time there is a great deal to be said in favour of disfranchising officials of all governments, but when such a law is applied to men who are in no sense officials, as has been done in some of the provinces, such action is most unfair. So I say that the hon. gentleman, while expressing his views, did not present the full view necessary to give the House a fair idea of the whole question, and I repeat that I am prepared not only to support the view presented by the Secretary of State, but to urge on him to hold out the olive branch to the authorities of the different provinces, and to communicate with them so as to see if we cannot, while preserving at any expense the right to say who shall vote for members of the Dominion Parliament, adopt some system whereby, in preparing the electoral lists, we may save this large expense and adopt some method that would be fair to both the provincial and the Dominion legislatures. One word with regard to the present Bill. I do not agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). In my opinion, you cannot make a list too sure after it has once been revised, because when we go to an election with a list and vote upon it, we all wish that the majority of the people whose names have been recorded shall decide it, so as to end the troublesome questions that are sure to arise if the Dominion lists are abandoned. It was on the 28th February that these lists became law, and it was only a short time previous to that that parties could appeal, so that unless we go beyond the end of this year, if we fix the same term again, we cannot possibly have a new list. Therefore, I have great pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not want the hon. member (Mr. Tisdale), nor any one else in the House, to belittle the importance of the admissions which were made last session by the late Sir John Thompson as to the mistake that has been made by the Conservatibe party for so many years, in objecting to the use of the provincial franchise. I am aware that it was not proposed that the creation of the Dominion voters' lists should not be controlled by Dominion officers; but I would like to read a few words of what Sir John Thompson himself said last session on the subject of the provincial franchise. He said:

> The change is also proposed in this Bill which I indicated a few days ago, that the questions upon which so much difference has arisen in the past as to the basis of the franchise, shall be adjusted by adopting the franchises of the several provinces. While I admit that this is a new departure, I deny what has been so widely asserted that it is in any important or practical degree a surrender of any principle that we have contended for in times past. The number of differences which exist between the provincial franchises and the Dominion franchise as established by our own Act, are so few as not to be worth the contest and the expense which are involved in keeping them up, and the adoption of a general system which will apply both to the local and Dominion legislatures, has recommendations as regards simplicity and facilities for economy, which cannot exist under a dual system such as we have been keeping up for the past few years.

Then he used an expression, which very much applies to the Bill under consideration when he says:

> It is obviously one of the most desirable features in connection with any system of franchise, and to my mind an essential feature, that the system to be adopted will be such that it can be put into operation every year. While under the system which we now propose considerable difficulty and labour may arise, fully as much perhaps as would arise in a revision under the law as it now stands—while I admit, I say, that considerable difficulties will arise, in making the new list, the first list, I do claim for the principles of this Bill, and for its detail, that they will introduce into the electoral system a degree of simplicity which will make the working of that system very easy and simple in future revisions; so that I think there can be no doubt that the revision can be expected to take place every year.

Why, Sir, that was one of the contentions that we have made from this side of the House ever since these postponements of revision, these annual postponements of that expensive operation, have been taking place in this House. Then, Sir, there follows from Sir John Thompson, a very frank acknowledgment of error which I commend to hon. gentlemen opposite. I am surprised that this Government did not resuscitate the legislation that the late Premier introduced last session and carry it through, instead of bringing down this wretched makeshift measure to postpone the revision of the lists, which we have before us to-day. Sir John Thompson also said last session:

> We have arrived, after the experience of eight or nine years, at the conclusion which I have stated, that it is not worth the effort to keep up the divergencies that exist between the two sets of franchises, the franchise as we have it now, and the franchise as it exists in the various provinces.

Even if the Government have not been able this session to bring down a repetition of Sir John Thompson's Bill. I am surprised, Sir, that we have not had the slightest indication from the Ministry that it is their intention to propose such a measure in the future.

Mr. MULOCK. There is one provision in this Bill that I approve of. It is that which proposes that the revision shall not be proceeded with this year. But it does not go far enough. I thing it should go to the extent of providing that the revision of the

lists under this Act should never again take place. The poor Act appears to have no friends now. Last year the leader of the Government condemned it, and to-day we have had a feeble condemnation from the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), who thinks that the time has arrived when all the Canadian legislatures should unite to extend the olive branch to each other and adopt some uniform system. It has taken the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) ten years to make that discovery, although for three long months in 1885 that idea was presented to him and his friends by members of the Opposition. However, the Government and their friends resisted it then, and instead of their being now animated by a desire to see the olive branch extended, they are rather afraid of seeing the birch branch applied to them at the hands of the indignant electors. That has probably brought about their conversion. What is there to recommend the franchise measure? Nobody will offer a word on its behalf, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite persist in keeping it on the statute-book. The lists have been revised four times under it, and five or six Acts of Parliament have had to be passed to suspend its operation. It has formally been condemned five times by Act of Parliament. The revision of the lists has cost the public treasury over one million dollars, and I presume it has caused an expenditure of at least as much more on the part of persons directly concerned in the revision. It is a pure waste of public money, except in so far as it may be an advantage to those who are employed under it provisions. Now, Sir, it is measures like this, entailing such a useless waste of public money, that have brought our expenditure to such an extent that public opinion has been awakened to the propriety of cutting it down. I propose an amendment, seconded by Mr. Choquette, which if adopted will be in the interests of the public. I move:

That all the words after "that" in the motion be struck out, and that it be resolved: "That it is desirable that the Government introduce a Bill providing for the repeal of the Electoral Franchise Act."

That Bill should provide for any little details such as my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), referred to. It could repeal the Franchise Act, and at the same time, if there are any little injustices here and there, they can be considered and dealt with in that Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think that amendment is out of order. There are at least three Bills on the Order paper having the object in view covered by this amendment. It occurs to me at the moment, Mr. Speaker, that under these circumstances the amendment is out of order. I merely rise to take the point of order.

Mr. MULOCK. There are some Bills in the name of private members which may or may not accomplish the purpose in view. I am not asking that any private Bill should be proceeded with, but what I say is, that it is the duty of the Government as a matter of public policy to put themselves in a certain position on this question, and if they do so then there will be a chance of the question coming before the House. It is the duty of the Government I allude to, and not to what private members may do.

Mr. CASEY. The resolution of the hon. member (Mr. Mulock) is not one declaring that the Franchise Act should be repealed, but one declaring that it is the duty of the Government to take charge of such legislation. That cannot be taken as a motion on the same object, as is dealt with by a Bill on the Order paper.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that the rule which the hon. Minister of Justice has invoked is hardly applicable to this case. Where the House has ordered a Bill to be read on a particular day, and it is put on the paper to be read on that day, you cannot take it out of the order. But that does not stand in the way of a member suggesting, to another measure, an amendment which is not in exactly the same words, though it may produce exactly the same effect.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is not an amendment to the Bill, as amendments are ordinarily understood. It is not an amendment to any clause.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You may amend a Bill in everything except the preamble; you may substitute a new clause for every clause in the Bill; and my hon. friend has proposed a substitution of other clauses for those now before the House. That, I think, is perfectly in order.

Mr. EDGAR. A member who has given notice of a motion cannot anticipate that motion by moving the same thing when the House is going to go into Supply. That is quite a different principle. Here is a substantive measure before the House, and a Government measure at that, and if the motion of my hon. friend would be in order at this stage of the Bill, as I believe it is, then the mere fact that some other member has chosen to place a Bill on the Public Bills and Orders, surely cannot prevent his moving it. If that were so, it would be quite easy for any members to so utilize the rules of the House as absolutely to prevent discussion on almost every important subject during the session, by loading up the Order paper with all kinds of fictitious Bills to cover those subjects by anticipation. Therefore, I think it is impossible to hold that this motion is out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend gets whatever force is in his last point only by assuming that there will be unfair dealing; and under our rules, no matter how rigid or strong or sensible they are, there

may be unfair dealing. I do not think it is fair to argue on the assumption that our rules would be taken advantage of for that purpose. What is the object to be attained by private members putting on the paper, notices of their Bills? It is to give notice that on a certain day they will be prepared to take up a particular proposition and discuss it in the House, for example, that the Franchise Bill shall be repealed. Now, on a motion for the second reading of a Bill for an entirely different object, my hon. friend moves what will do exactly the same thing—precipitate upon the House the whole discussion as to the repeal of the Franchise Act, and if his motion should carry, it would effect just the same object as the Bill proposed by a private member. So it seems to me that if this be in order, my hon. friend is able to take the House unawares, whereas the rule of the House is for the purpose of the House being advertised as to when a certain measure will be brought up for discussion.

Mr. McCARTHY. It seems to me the question is this. The House has ordered that the Bill introduced by the hon. member for North Norfolk shall be read on a certain day. That Bill is for the purpose of repealing the Franchise law. As I understand the rule, neither the hon. member himself nor any other hon. member can anticipate that order of the House; and the question is: Is the motion of the hon. member for North York identical with the Bill of the hon. member for North Norforlk for the repeal of the Franchise law? It appears to me it is not. The Bill is to repeal the Franchise law; and the House has ordered that to be read a second time on a certain day. The motion made to-day declares that it is the duty of the Government to introduce a measure for that purpose. The two things are essentially different.

Mr. FOSTER. The result is the same.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not the question.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the hon. member for North Simcoe this question: Suppose the Government were to introduce a Bill to repeal the Franchise Act, and it were now submitted for a second reading, is not the test whether that second reading would be in order or not? I suppose it would?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not exactly the question, as I understand it. I had occasion to look into the question last year, and it seems to me that the rule is as I have stated. An order having been made, the House is to suppose that that order shall not be discussed until it is reached. Therefore, the question is: Is the motion of the hon. member for North York identical with that order? Because, by varying a word, you may alter a motion, and have it discussed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the House allow me to read a few lines from May's Parliamentary Practice, which led me to take the objection I did. On page 279, under the heading of restriction on amendments, it says:

> As the conduct of the persons mentioned on page 263 can only be debated upon a substantive motion, embodying therein a specific charge, reflections upon their conduct cannot be brought before the House by way of amendment. Nor, following the principle laid down regarding motions (see page 264), can an amendment be moved which revives a question already decided, which anticipates a motion or amendment of which notice has been given, or matters contained in an Order of the Day, or which is inconsistent with words in the motion which have already been agreed upon.

I agree with the hon. member for North Simcoe that the pith of the whole question is: Is this substantially the same question as that on the Order paper? If so, the amendment would be out of order. If it is not, it would be in order.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman's reasoning were correct, a second Bill could not be presented on the same subject, whereas we have already two or three Bills on this same subject. The true plan, I think, has been laid down by Dr. Bourinot, in the second edition of his book, page 644:

> In 1854 Lord Lyndhurst stated the rule as follows:—
> "While the Bill is still pending, and until it is completely disposed of, there is nothing whatever to prevent another Bill for the same object being introduced." Lord Lyndhurst also quoted a memorandum from an eminent officer of the House of Commons (Sir T. E. May), to this effect: "No objection can be raised to the introduction of a Bill into the House of Commons on the ground of there being a similar Bill already before the House. Indeed, we have at present two India Bills before us—Lord Palmerston's and Lord Derby's—awaiting a second reading. It is the rejection, and not the pendency, of a Bill that creates a difficulty as to the ulterior proceedings.

Mr. FOSTER. We ask only that proper notice should be given, and the House not taken by surprise.

Mr. MULOCK. This motion is quite relevant, and notice not necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion that was made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in amendment to the motion that Bill (No. 69) an Act respecing the voters' lists of 1895 be now read a second time, is as follows:—

> That all the words after "that" in the said motion be erased, and the following substituted therefor:—That it is desirable that the Government should introduce a Bill providing for the repeal of the Electoral Franchise Act.

The result of this motion, if carried, would be an instruction to the Government to introduce a Bill for the repeal of the Franchise Act. It seems to me, from the authori-

ties quoted by the hon. gentleman for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) and from other authorities which I shall read, that it is quite within the competence of the House to have several Bills before it dealing with the same subject, and have the same object. I find among the decisions of Speakers of the English House of Commons, the following on the point named. Mr. Speaker Brand says :

The House determines whether it will have two Bills before it on the same subject.

Notice given of a motion to abolish the Vice-regal Court, and to constitute legally an officer in lieu thereof.

Objection taken by an hon. member, that he had a Bill with the very same subject for a future day.

Mr. Speaker said that it was a matter entirely for the determination of the House, whether it would have before it the two Bills on the same subject. If the House thought proper, it could so determine.

It is quite competent for the House to have before it at the same time, several Bills for effecting the same object. If one of such Bills were rejected by the House a proposal to proceed with another Bill substantially the same would be irregular. The rule as to the same question twice offered does not refer to Bills under consideration, it being open to the House to take whichever Bill it prefers, or consolidate them if it thinks necessary. As I have already said, the motion of the hon. member for North York, if carried, would be an instruction to the committee to introduce a Bill to repeal the Franchise Act ; and as, according to the precedents which I have just quoted, it seems to me that any number of Bills might be submitted for that purpose, I think that this motion is in order.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is very patriotic with regard to the expense, which he admits to be the inevitable consequence of the Franchise Act. He does not care how much it costs as long as this House asserts its right to control the making of the Dominion lists. He is as patriotic as was the late Artemus Ward, who was willing to sacrifice all his wife's relations for the sake of maintaining the union. It does not cost the hon. member for South Norfolk much to have his lists revised, and, apparently, he does not care how much it costs the country. We are very willing to have that statement put forward in support of the Franchise Act by a member on the Government side ; we are very willing to hear them admit that they do not care what it costs as long as the principle of the Act is sustained. But the hon. member for South Norfolk is not in accord on that point with his late leader. Sir John Thompson, as already pointed out, objected to the expense of that Act, and he objected to that expense because it prevented the revision of the lists every year. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) read several extracts from the speech of the late Sir John Thompson on his Bill of last year. I may add one or two more, to show that he contemplated an annual revision as the outcome of his then proposal to adopt the provincial franchises as the basis of the Dominion lists. He said :

While it is not only possible, but very probable, that the revision of this year (1894) will be followed by a revision next year, prior to dissolution, still——

Then he goes on to refer to the question of redistribution. He evidently contemplated a revision every year. Towards the end of the debate on the first reading of the Bill, he pointed out that while the revising power might be retained by the Dominion officers, it was the local lists which were to be used as the basis of the revision. He said :

But, if any man comes forward and says : I am not on the local lists, but I am entitled to be put upon it, we ought to include him, though he did not get his name inserted in the local lists, and even though he failed to be included, or failed otherwise to make his application to be put on the local lists. Hereafter, when the list is once formed, we shall have the advantage of the lists to start from, that is to say, very recent lists. We shall have the advantage of the more recent local revision, and, to my mind, these two circumstances together will make the construction of the list from year to year very rapid and very simple, and, if I am correct in this assumption, we shall succeed in lessening the expense very much indeed.

It is clear that Sir John Thompson contemplated distinctly that the local lists should be taken as the basis of the Dominion lists, and should be revised by him in the sense that he would put on that list such persons as were entitled by local legislation to be upon them. His Bill also, no doubt, made the exception, which has been alluded to here to-day, that certain officials disfranchised by the provinces should be allowed to vote, but the whole drift of his measure was towards unifying the Dominion and provincial lists, and having practically only one franchise in each province for the two Houses. Now, the principle of revision is very different from the principle of construction. The present Act provides that the Dominion officials shall construct the lists. They shall take certain materials, of course, from the municipal officers, and out of that material, according to methods fixed by this House, according to qualifications settled by this House, they shall proceed to construct their own lists.

It may be supposed that uniformity of legislation would secure uniformity of practice and uniformity of qualification throughout the different provinces. It does nothing of the kind. The regulations adopted by the revising officers in different counties have been so wide apart that the basis of qualification is different, not only in different provinces, but in the adjcining counties. The interpretation of small details with regard to the method of putting in applica-

tions, and so forth, is so different by the different revising officers, that there is nothing approaching uniformity in the practice in that respect; so that we have the worst kind of diversity, not as between provinces, but as between different constituencies, and at the will of the revising officers appointed by the Government here.

With regard to the abstract question as to who should settle the basis of representation, I am inclined to go a little further even than my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and to say that I think it is right the provinces, and not the Dominion, should fix the basis of qualification. I think that each province, having different conditions peculiar to itself, different habits, and so on, amongst the people, is better able to say which classes of its people are fit to exercise the franchise than this House could possibly be. I think the Quebec Assembly knows better what is satisfactory to Quebec than we do. I think the Assembly of Ontario knows better what is satisfactory to Ontario that we do.

And I think, as a matter of abstract right and advisability, the provincial assemblies are the ones which should fix the qualification of the electorate.

But, further, my hon. friend from South Norfolk says that the principle that we should fix the basis of the franchise is such a vital principle that he does not care if it does cost the country $300,000 a year to keep it up. How did we get along for the eighteen years between confederation and the time of passing the present Franchise Act? Where was this great principle all that time? Was the country going to the dogs for the want of it, was there anything so very bad in our legislation at that time that could be traced to a false basis for our franchise? We all know that that is absurd. One principle was in force for eighteen years and the other has only been in force for ten years; and yet my hon. friend from South Norfolk says that the latter is the vital one that every patriot should subscribe to. But that is absurd and it is worse than talking absurdity to urge such a thing upon the House.

I am glad that the late leader of hon. gentlemen opposite had a mind to rise above such petty ideas of statesmanship, had a mind clear enough to understand that the present Act was an expensive, cumbrous, ill-advised means of obtaining undue privileges for the Government of the day, whatever that Government might be, and a mind large enough to propose a change, a reversion to the old principle which prevailed from confederation to 1885. I am glad that one member of that party—one who seems to have been in it but not of it—had breadth of mind enough to make this proposition. I am sorry his death has removed from the party apparently the only one who had sufficient breadth of mind to take the view he did of this point. He stated most particularly when that Bill was withdrawn last year that he intended to reintroduce it this year and that he hoped it would pass—that he hoped to make it law this session. He has disappeared, and with him every desire among gentlemen opposite for the reform of the Franchise Act. If he had lived my hon. friend from South Norfolk, my hon. friend the Finance Minister, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and all the rest of them would have been found endorsing his proposal to adopt the provincial franchises, would have been lauding that principle to the skies as the only proper and just one. But now they have fallen back upon the petty tactics of the caucus and declare that no revision is good unless it is made by Dominion officers and on a Dominion basis.

The hon. Secretary of State, in moving the second reading of the Bill referred to the system of registration in force in the United States, which he said had been tried in certain cities in Ontario and which he was able to show had been unduly expensive. If the hon. Minister was able to show that—and at all events he did not show it—he ought to have done what he was able to do and ought to have shown—what most of us were not aware of—that that system of registration was unduly expensive. I think it was a great success, and I think it was the duty of the Government, when suspending the Franchise Act—in view of the fact that an election must come on in not more than a year's time—to provide such a system of registration as would have enabled the present list to be brought down to date for the purposes of that election. The introduction of such a Bill as this year after year is a confession that the Franchise Act is a law that cannot be enforced from year to year. The Bill leaves the lists for the general election open to the objection that they will be, as my hon. leader has said, at least a year old. Although the revision was not finished until the end of February, the list was based upon the assessment which took place more than a year ago, the same assessment on which the provincial lists, now a year old, were based. The bulk of those on the present Dominion lists were qualified over a year ago, and a large number who have become qualified since that time have been left off. If my hon. friend would supplement the Bill with a proposition providing for the registration of those who have become qualified since, by some cheap and simple system of registration, he would do himself credit and would confer a great benefit upon the country. That would be a great deal better than the suggestion of the hon. member for South Norfolk that he should negotiate with the provincial governments and see what could be done to work up a joint, patch-work list. I think under the circumstances, and in view of the confession made by the introduction of this Bill

that the Franchise Act has been a failure, it is my duty to vote for the amendment of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock.)

Mr. McISAAC. I desire to remove the erroneous impression that seems to prevail generally on both sides of the House, that in the province of Nova Scotia those who are disqualified from voting in the provincial elections would be debarred from voting in federal elections if the provincial lists were used. The provincial lists in Nova Scotia are made up first without regard to the Act disqualifying Dominion officials in that province. All parties who possess the real estate income or other qualification are put upon the lists. Those names remain there, and the only occasion when the disqualifying Act of the province operates, is when a provincial election is held. A., B. or C., whose name appears on the list may go up to vote, but if it turns out that he holds an office under the Dominion Government, which disqualifies him, he is debarred from voting at the election. But his name still remains upon the lists and these lists are used now in the province of Nova Scotia not only for provincial elections but for town elections and for municipal elections all over the province. These parties are not disqualified except in provincial elections. Why, Mr. Speaker, up to 1887, the very same lists were used in the province of Nova Scotia for both provincial and federal elections. The last general election for the Dominion held under this system was in 1882, and on that occasion the Dominion election and the provincial election were held on the same day. In Nova Scotia, A B or C, a Dominion official, entering the poll to vote for provincial candidates, was informed that he was disqualified, but he stepped into the next booth, where exactly the same lists were used and was at perfect liberty to vote in the Dominion election. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the Act disqualifying Dominion officials from voting in provincial elections, that Act does not apply here, for it could have no effect in federal elections. In other words, if the present provincial lists of Nova Scotia were used in Dominion elections, Dominion officials who have the necessary qualifications of property, income, &c., would be qualified to vote. So that in that respect the lists are as fair for one side as the other. The electoral lists in all cases are made up by the officials appointed by the municipality, with the only exception that the court of appeal is the sheriff of the county, and he may belong to either political party, and several of the sheriffs in Nova Scotia now belong to the Conservative party.

Mr. McCARTHY. For my part I am not inclined to adopt any resolution which will indicate that we are willing to hand over to the local legislature the fixing of the franchise for electors of this Parliament, The reason of the Franchise Act at the time we adopted it, no matter how ill it has worked since, was that this Parliament thought we ought to have control of our own franchise, that is, the franchise of electors of this body. At the same time I am quite free to admit that this Franchise Act has been a most expensive measure, and the expense is so enormous that unless some better scheme is devised, we will be forced, I think, to repeal it. Now, I heard with great pleasure the speech of my hon. friend for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and I agree with all he said except that it appears to me we have got the authority now, without any consent at all from the municipal bodies to utilize the municipal machinery. I cannot understand why we may not pass a law by which we should direct the municipal officers—I am speaking, of course, more with reference to my own province; I do not know exactly what the machinery is in the other province—to make up a list for this Parliament at the same time they make up a list for the provincial and municipal bodies. In point of fact it seems to me that the way we do it now is needlessly expensive. I have seen a suggestion, which I adopt as meeting the case, that opposite the name in the first column should be put other columns showing where each man was entitled to vote, and for what purpose. Now, in the municipal list a man may be entitled to vote in the municipality in which he lives as a municipal voter, and even if a municipal voter, he may not be entitled to vote on certain money bills. So that there are now three lists made up with reference to the qualification of electors for local as distinguished from Dominion purposes. Now, why cannot four lists be made, or rather, why could there not be four columns opposite each man's name, and in the first column opposite his name let it be indicated whether he is entitled to vote for Dominion, municipal or local purposes, or for money bills, and so on. That being done, we pay our share of the expense, appeal being left, as in the local procedure, to the county court judge, not as a revising officer at all, but as a judicial officer. That would save all the expense. You would always have a list ready, we would not have to postpone a dissolution of the House, which sometimes is inconvenient, because the list is stale; and we would not have to go through this form year after year, which really is a stultification of our own proceedings, of suspending our lists. Certainly the lists ought always be ready, and a dissolution at any time under our system may become necessary, and the lists ought always to be ready, and in the way I suggest, they always would be ready. I do not at all agree with the view that we have not ample power to do that now. I recollect the late Chief Justice Dorion saying that this Parliament had power to direct the officers of the local

government to do anything that we required to be done.

Mr. MULOCK. We do direct in the Act now.

Mr. McCARTHY. They do not cease to be subject to this Parliament because they are employed by the local legislature. It will be in the recollection of the legal gentlemen in this House what a contest there was at one time as to whether we had power to direct provincial judges to hear election trials, and in the end it was determined that this Parliament had full power to direct provincial judges to determine trials in connection with elections of our own members. Now, holding these views, I cannot vote for the amendment of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), but I would like very much if this amendment could be amended to this effect:

That the law should be repealed, with the view of simplifying the procedure of determining who are entitled to be placed on the voters' lists, and utilizing for that purpose the municipal machinery by which in the provinces the voters' lists are made up.

If it was amended in that way, I should vote for it with great pleasure. The reason I cannot vote for it now is that I do not desire in any way to withdraw from the views I have always held, that we have a right, that we ought not to part with, to fix the franchise of the electors for this Parliament. I understood my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to hold the view that we exercised that right originally. What we did originally was to establish that the electors fixed by the local legislatures should be our electors. We have always exercised that control, and from time to time we have changed it; therefore it only comes to be a measure of procedure. Certainly the enormous cost of the Franchise Act is rapidly bringing public opinion to such a state that if we do not adopt some amendment of this kind, we will be forced, I am afraid, to fall back upon the provincial bodies without the power that we ought to have in fixing our own franchise.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman has raised a constitutional question, a question that is far from being solved, and one which would necessitate the attention of the minds most learned in our constitutional law, that is, the power of this Government to direct municipal corporations and their officers, who are merely the creatures of the local government, to do certain things. As the municipal law and institutions come under the jurisdiction of the local legislature, municipal corporations and their officers created in virtue of and in conformity with that law, are merely creatures of the provincial governments.

Mr. MULOCK. The present Act does order them to do certain things.

Mr. OUIMET. I do not think it does.

Mr. MULOCK. It orders them to deliver up voters' lists, and exhibit their assessment roll.

Mr. OUIMET. No, it only directs the revising officer to obtain from the secretary-treasurers of the municipalities the assessment rolls, and that right is exercised by the revising officer in the same way as any other individual who is willing to pay the fees fixed by law. Now, so far as I can express an opinion at the moment on such an important question, I would say that this Government has no power to direct any of these municipal or provincial officers to do certain things, or to subject them to penalties in default of their doing those things. But even if we could do it, we would have to pay these officers for any work desired from them. These municipal officers, who, as I have said, are creatures of the provincial government, have been directed by that government to do certain work, which work is covered by the pay they receive as municipal officers. But they are not paid to do our work. That settles the question of cost. The jurisdiction of the provincial legislature on these officers, but we have none, and consequently is unquestionable. We could not force these officers to do work for us against their own free will and without paying them their price, no more than we can force any individual to accept a judgeship or any other office, if the work or the salary do not suit him. In the same way, we could not direct the municipal council to oversee or revise the work of their officials. The hon. gentleman's proposition would not meet the present difficulty. The principle has been laid down and accepted by every one in this country—except, perhaps, by those hon. gentlemen who never submit to anything that has been adjudicated upon by the people of this country—a principle that has been approved by the majority of this House and afterwards on several occasions confirmed by the electors of the Dominion, viz., by the people, that this Parliament should have a franchise of its own, that it should regulate and operate it, even if it cost a good deal of money.

Mr. MULOCK. You will not find one elector in a thousand to approve of it.

Mr. OUIMET. I know very well that hon. gentlemen opposite will never admit even that this party has been maintained in power by the people, although it has been in power seventeen years, except under false pretenses. It is a very easy explanation to offer; but it is not very complimentary to the hon. gentlemen themselves, or even to the electors, to say that their votes have been won in an illegitimate way for the last seventeen years. The principle has been approved, and it must be maintained. It has been

adopted of necessity to resist the attempts made by the Liberal Provincial Legislatures to destroy this Government by disfranchising their friends and supporters. That conspiracy was organized in the Quebec Interprovinical Conference of 1886. They agreed there to use every means to drive from power this Conservative Government, and in order to attain that end, they have disfranchised a number of people who from their standing, knowledge and interest in the country should have the right to vote at Dominion elections. Is there anything to be said against the Dominion franchise? Is it not free to every man who has any visible interest in the welfare in this country, and who from that interest or knowledge is qualified to vote, to exercise the franchise? Is it not true that our franchise is as near manhood suffrage as it can be made? While in the provinces numbers of people are deprived of the right to vote because of their political convictions, and because they differ from the views held by the local government. Our Franchise Act, compared with the Franchise Acts of the provinces, is the most equitable, liberal and generous that can be framed, and it would be too bad, and the country would disapprove of it if we were to allow the franchise of the Dominion to be tampered with at the whim of the rulers in the local legislatures. A long argument has been made out of expressions of opinion that Sir John Thompson, our late Premier, gave vent to last year. What was in the mind of Sir John Thompson? It was this, that in order to minimize, if it were possible, the cost of the revision of the list, we should take as a basis for the Dominion lists, the provincial lists. There was no question of abolishing the revising officer. It was suggested that the revising officer should take the provincial list and build up a Dominion list by adding to it all the names of those entitled to vote at Dominion elections, not by limiting his work to the electors as qualified by the provincial law, but by adding to the list all he knew who would come within the Franchise Act of the Dominion. After that work was done, a revision became necessary. After that revision was made, the printing of the list was to be proceeded with and completed, and every one knows that the great cost connected with the lists is the printing of them. How can you utilize the local lists if you are not going to print them? How can you go into a revision without having a revising officer? Even if we were going to adopt, instead of the present franchise, manhood suffrage, a system of registration would still be necessary. What would be the cost of a system of registration? Do we not know that the cost of registration in the United States is much larger than even the cost of our own lists. When Sir John Thompson came to work out the details of the measure he discovered that it was useless to attempt it, that it would not decrease the cost of the lists, that it would only embarrass matters. The hon. gentlemen will not find in the speech delivered by Sir John Thompson that he ever dreamed of abandoning the Dominion franchise. When he came to the details and endeavoured to reconcile the principle of a Dominion franchise, which is the principle that has been adopted by a majority of the people, with provincial franchises, he realized that it was impossible within the time at his command to reconcile the differences existing and prepare a measure the details of which would render it fairly workable. That was the main reason why the measure was abandoned last year, and when hon. gentlemen opposite say that Sir John Thompson gave away the whole system of the franchise as we have it now, they are not correct. He did not abandon the principle upon which our party stood since 1885. It was a necessity that this Parliament should protect itself against the unfair attacks of the provincial legislatures, and the only reproach we can make as regards the present law is its cost, but if we want to preserve the principle we cannot do so at less cost than the present law entails. It may be a cost of $140,000 or $150,000 for every revision, once every two or three years.

Mr. MULOCK. $200,000.

Mr. OUIMET. That would not be too much to preserve the liberties of the people, the power given to the people to send here representatives of their own choice, and not representatives who would be the choice of the local legislatures. The present Bill is just to save the cost of another revision for the present year. It cannot prejudice any one, because the revision would not be likely to be completed before the 1st of April when the natural life of this Parliament would be very near its termination. For practical purposes this new revision would be quite useless, and if the cost of revision is so objectionable to hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not see why they should wish to have it incurred. I do not know when the elections will come any more than any other member of this House, but I know they must come at the end of this Parliament. The Government would not be justified in incurring the expenses of a revision when such revision would serve no practical purpose for the next election.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not think the Minister of Public Works has quite fairly represented the views of his late colleague (Sir John Thompson). I remember very well how the Franchise Bill of last year came to originate. I spoke to the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) on the subject, and subsequently he told me that Sir John Thompson would like to discuss the Franchise Act with me. We discussed the

subject together. I need not repeat what his views were on the subject, because they were disclosed in a large measure upon the Bill as it came down. They were not exactly disclosed, because I may say that the Law Clerk and the Deputy Minister, to some extent, misunderstood the Premier's instructions. After that Bill came down I mentioned some objections I had to it, and Sir John Thompson spoke to the Clerk of the House and said he would like further to see me with regard to the matter. Sir John Thompson and I considered every clause of the Bill, and I know what his views were upon that measure as certainly as I know what my own are. Sir John Thompson proposed to accept in good faith the local law in regard to the elections. He proposed certain amendments to that. For instance, he proposed that the name of certain officials which were struck off in some provinces, should be restored. He objected to the principle of one man one vote, and he proposed that where a man was a property holder in more than one constituency that man should be at liberty to have his name put on the list in any constituency in which he had property. These were the two chief exceptions Sir John Thompson proposed to make to the local list as it actually stood. Now with regard to the revision, I remember exactly what his views were upon that. He said that wherever there were county judges he saw no objection to accepting the revision made by the local legislature, because it could be taken advantage of, and arrangements made that it should be also the revision for the Dominion. But in the provinces, where sheriffs and other officials were made the revising officers, he objected to that and insisted upon a judicial officer being made the officer for revision. If that measure had been submitted by the Government, I apprehend there would have been very little objection to it from this side of the House. At all events it would have been accepted as a compromise on the subject for the time being. Sir, I do not agree with the views expressed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). If he undertook to carry out his proposition, he would find that it would be scarcely less expensive than the present system, and it would be far more inconvenient than the acceptance of the qualification as fixed by the local legislature. When we accept the qualification of the local legislatures, we do not give up our jurisdiction over those lists. That list becomes a list for the election of members for the House of Commons by an Act of this Parliament, accepting and adopting that as our law, and so it is under our control in that respect as much as if it were a list actually prepared under a statute passed by ourselves. But, Sir, I do not agree with the legal view expressed by the Minister of Public Works. In the case of Valin and Langlois, the question was raised as to the legality of the constitution of the election court, and Lord Selborne in delivering the judgment of the Privy Council said: That the election court, as created under the Dominion law is not a provincial court. It was a distinct tribunal, and the judges of it are designated by the offices which they hold. And if you can designate a judge who is a member of a provincial court, and by so designating him make him a member of a Dominion court without any formal acceptance of office on his part, surely you can do the same thing with regard to a municipal officer. You can say: that the municipal council in a certain township or village shall undertake certain duties. You could designate that persons who hold certain municipal offices shall be officers for the discharge of certain named duties by the Dominion. There is no doubt that could be done. Accepting that as an unquestioned legal proposition, you would nevertheless have a much more expensive arrangement than you have by the acceptance of the local list prepared by the municipal authorities under the provisions of the local statute. It seems to me that if you wish to add any parties that you think are improperly disqualified by the local law, you could supplement your list by doing that.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would they not have to be reprinted?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not if you adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale).

Mr. COCHRANE. I am asking your opinion?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not saying that his opinion would be impracticable. I think it would be practicable, and you could have these names printed as a part of the local lists if you so wished. In the province of Nova Scotia certain voters are excluded from voting in the provincial elections by the form of oath, and not because their names are not on the list. The names of those excluded are printed on the list just as they were when that list was the list for Dominion as well as for local purposes. All you need do is to prepare a proper oath to administer to the voters, and those persons could vote the same as any others.

Mr. COCHRANE. To carry out Sir John Thompson's idea that a man who had property in different constituencies should be on the Dominion list, for each place in which he had property, would you not have to reprint that list?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not necessarily.

Mr. MONTAGUE. On a supplementary list?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, you could have a supplementary list, or you could provide that you would pay a certain pro-

portion of the expense in every province or every municipality, and you would have no difficulty. But as it is, you are constantly voting upon a list that does not represent the electorate of the country. Why, Sir, if an election had been held in my own constituency prior to the last revision of the list, there would have been on the list over 2,000 voters who were not entitled to vote at all; and men would have been brought from every part of this Dominion, and from every state of the union, to vote, some of whom had no longer any interest in this country. It does seem to me monstrous that 25 per cent of those on our lists are men not entitled, legally, to be there, and 25 per cent of those entitled to have their names on the lists are excluded. An election is held for the purpose of having an honest and fair expression of public opinion as public opinion is at the moment the election is held. It is a reflection upon this House that it continues to have a franchise law of this kind on the statute-book.

Mr. McNEILL. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Bothwell as to the very great inconvenience, and worse than inconvenience, the very great injustice, which obtains by reason of the fact that our Dominion list is not revised as often as it ought to be. I am quite sure that for that reason, as he says, many men are disfranchised who ought to have the franchise. But I wish to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that if we were to take the local list, we would find a great many disfranchised who ought to have the franchise. In my own constituency, after the last revision of the Dominion list, there were nearly a thousand voters more on that list than on the local list, although the local list ought really to have shown a larger number than the Dominion list.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How many of those are the same persons who vote over and over again, which takes place under the Dominion list, but cannot under the local?

Mr. McNEILL. There was a much greater number of voters.

Mr. LAURIER. The franchise of Ontario is more liberal than ours.

Mr. McNEILL. The franchise of Ontario is more radical—I prefer the term; and, therefore, there ought to be a greater number on the local list than on the Dominion list. But because the local list is not nearly as carefully prepared as the Dominion, that difference to which I have referred existed. Now, I entirely agree with two principles which have been laid down. One is that we cannot relinquish our right to regulate our own franchise, that this Parliament should be an independent Parliament, and not a Parliament dependent on the whim of the local legislatures. That is a principle which I think should never be abandoned, and a principle which the people of this country are prepared to support. I also agree with the statement that our list costs vastly too much, and the problem we have to solve is: How best we can reduce that cost. The proposal made by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and the suggestion thrown out by the hon. Secretary of State, seem to me in the right direction, and I think that if some approach could be made to the local governments, we might arrive at a conclusion that would be most beneficial. If we could divide the cost between the municipalities and the Dominion, we would effect a great saving, both to the Dominion and the municipalities, because it must be borne in mind that at present the municipalities bear all the expense of the local list. It is a very serious matter which I think we should not rush into without careful consideration; but my feeling at the moment is that in this suggestion we have the means of arriving at a very great improvement. I am satisfied that the people of this country will insist on this Parliament being an independent Parliament; I am satisfied, also, that they will insist on some reduction in the expenditure; and I think we ought to have a yearly revision of the list. And these three things could be accomplished by the means proposed.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend's arguments are all right, but his conclusions are all wrong. His conclusions do not at all follow his premises. So far as my knowledge goes, no one ever proposed that this Parliament should give up the power of regulating its own franchise. We on this side of the House have always been in favour of adopting the provincial franchises; but no one intended that, by so doing, we should give up the power of regulating our own franchise. When we propose that the law should be that the electors of the House of Commons shall be those electors who have the right to vote for members of the provincial legislatures, we keep the power of regulating our franchise; and if experience showed that the system did not work satisfactorily, we could repeal the law. So that it is not a fair argument to say that by adopting the principle we have been contending for on this side of the House during the last nine years, we would be relinquishing the control of our own franchise. I would put this question to my hon. friend: For seventeen years of this confederation there was only one class of electors voting for members of this House, and for members of the local legislatures; does my hon. friend say that during those seventeen years this Parliament had relinquished the power of regulating its own franchise? Were we not as much masters of it then as we are at the present time?

Mr. McNEILL. We had not relinquished, but we had not taken up that power; and it was understood at the time of confedera-

tion that we should take it up. Up to that time we had allowed the local legislatures to usurp the power, and they very improperly used it.

Mr. LAURIER. We decided to exercise our power in that way. We first decided in one way, then we decided in another way. But we say that if we are not satisfied with the provincial franchises as they exist, if we think they are not radical enough, or that they are too radical, as my hon. friend suggests, it would be within our power to adopt another franchise. But my hon. friend must admit that between the provincial franchises and the Dominion franchise at present there is very little difference. In my own province, the difference is very slight; in the province of Ontario it is greater. I would call my hon. friend's attention to another example. In the United States, where the people are as jealous of their liberties as we are, there is only one class of electors. The constitutions expressly provides that the electors for Congress shall be the electors who have a right to vote for members of the local legislatures; and that seems to be the most consistent principle. There are not two constituencies, one to be represented in the local legislature, and one in the Dominion Parliament. It is the same people who are represented in the one legislature and in the other, and who have the same rights and the same privileges and interests; but the division of the power is not in the electors but in the representative body. The legislatures are representatives of one class of interests and the Dominion Parliament is the representative of another class, so that the local legislatures and the Dominion Parliament, who are representatives of different interests, are only, after all, representatives of the same people. I ask my hon. friend what is the body who ought to have the regulation of the franchise? Is it not the local bodies who deal with local affairs and concerns? Does my hon. friend pretend, for instance, that the franchise should be uniform in every province? Does he not, on the contrary, believe that it should be regulated largely according to the manners and customs and education of the people? He cannot pretend that the same constituency prevails in every province, and therefore he must admit that what may be an adequate franchise in his province, may not be in another. I am quite satisfied with the franchise which rules in Ontario, but so far that franchise has not been acceptable to Quebec. All these reasons suggest that the best principle is the one we have been contending for on this side of the House. As to the question of expense, there is no comparison. The Minister of Public Works said a moment ago that everybody was satisfied with the present law, and that the electorate had shown their satisfaction time and again, Why, the Government and members of this House are not satisfied, because year after year, rather than have the law put in force, they bring in a Bill to prevent its being put in force. Can anything be more anomalous than to have a law on the statutes, and then, year after year, pass an Act to have it dispensed with? I believe, therefore, that the only principle which ought to prevail is that involved in the motion of the hon. member for York.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Mulock):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béchard,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bowers,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Carroll,
Casey,
Choquette,
Christie,
Edgar,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Guay,
Innes,
Landerkin,
Laurier,
Lowell,
Macdonald (Huron),
McIsaac,
McMullen,
Martin,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mulock,
Perry,
Proulx,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland, and
Yeo.—39.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Baker,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Blanchard,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Bryson,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chesley,
Cochrane,
Costigan,
Daly,
Davis,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grandbois,
Grant (Sir James),
Haggart,
Haslam,
Henderson,
Lachapelle,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdowall,
McCarthy,
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKeen,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Mills (Annapolis),
Montague,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Prior,
Putnam,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Lisgar),
Simard,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Carlwell),
White (Shelburne),

Hutchins, Wilmot,
Joncas, Wood (Brockville), and
Kaulbach, Wood (Westm'd).—82.
Kenny,

Amendment negatived, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MONTAGUE moved that the following clause be added :—

That the list of voters prepared under the said Act and amendment in the years 1894 and 1895, as finally revised and certified, and as amended or corrected on appeal, if there has been any such amendment or correction, shall be valid and shall avail for the purposes of the said Act and amendments, notwithstanding that the revising officer has not complied with the provisions of section 23 of the said Act, as amended, or that any prescribed form has been departed from, or that anything has not been done within the time or in the manner prescribed.

He said : I have already explained this amendment. By section 23 of the Franchise Act it is declared that where, in a polling subdivision, the number of voters registered exceeds 300, the revising barrister shall make another subdivision. There are some subdivisions where the revising barrister did not take this precaution, and it would be better to remove all doubts of the legality of such lists.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It has happened often that the revising officer has added names after the expiry of the time for adding them, and has done so on his own authority. If this clause is passed, it will prevent proceedings being taken to punish such a violation of the law. I know that in 1891, in a certain electoral district, hundreds of names, which had been struck off the list at the various preliminary revisions, and were supposed to be off the list altogether, were found all restored in the printed list, without authority. The revising officer alleged that they had been restored here in Ottawa. He said that he had left those names off and sent the list, properly revised, to the printing office, or the Secretary of State's office, and they came back with the old names restored. It was then too late for him to make a further revision, and he certified to the lists in that improper form. I do not know how many cases there may be of that sort. I do not know whether that has been done in the recent revisions or not, but I do not care to assist in putting upon the statutes a clause which would protect a revising officer who has committed a fraud of that kind.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There was no intention whatever on the part of the Government to legalize anything incorrect or illegal in the lists, with the exception of these little errors made inadvertently under section 23. These imperfections are not at all serious, but it was thought that out of abundant caution the lists containing them had better be legalized.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does it not go beyond that ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. When I spoke a moment ago, I said that the Government did not regard it as a vital point at all, and if there is any objection to the new section, I am prepared to drop it.

Mr. CASEY. There can be no objection to legalizing lists where there is an undue number in particular polling districts. That was the pretension of the hon. Minister when he introduced the amendment. But this amendment goes further. It provides : "Or that anything has not been done within the time or within the manner prescribed." That will not only cover the irregularity in that one particular, but in all other particulars. If he will strike out the closing words, the clause will not be objectionable.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Very well. We will agree to that. We will cover the whole purpose if we allow the clause to pass down to the fourth line, striking out the following words :—

As amended, or that any prescribed form has been departed from, or that anything has not been done within the time or in the manner prescribed.

Mr. McCARTHY. It might be well to let that stand until after recess. It seems to me that there may be a question as to whether it is in order. This Bill is to suspend the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. It is called "An Act respecting the voters' lists of 1895."

Mr. McCARTHY. It may be that this is something that ought to have originated as an instruction to the committee. It would be well to let it stand until after recess.

Mr. FOSTER. It can be discussed when the Bill comes up for a third reading.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know that there ought to be any objection, but the Bill ought not to go through until we have had time to consider it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This can stand in the meantime until the third reading.

Mr. CASEY. I would ask that it be printed in amended form before the third reading is moved.

Bill, as amended, reported.

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

After Recess.

THE LOBSTER FISHERY.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 91) to amend the law

respecting the lobster fishery.—(Mr. Costigan.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has had communication with the lobster packers about this Bill ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. Was a copy of this sent to the principal lobster packers of the lower provinces ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. FRASER. Is it not the usual course to get the opinions of those engaged in the trade in a case of this kind ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. Why was it not done on this occasion ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is the usual course, and a very wise course. That was the course followed when the Bill was introduced, establishing the system of branding, the granting of licenses, and so on. But, as I stated before, we have the unanimous expression of opinion from the canners, and others interested in favour of the law which is now being amended. The changes made by this Bill are very slight. The first change is as to the labels, which I explained when I introduced the Bill. Under the present law, it is obligatory to brand on each case the name of the packer, and the place and date. The change we make is to use a label declaring that the lobsters are Canadian lobsters, and were packed in the proper season. The other important change is, instead of a fixed license fee of $10, we make a proportionate fee according to the quantity packed. As to that, I had the expression of opinion from gentlemen representing large districts where packing has been done, and I had the officers who visited the factories come here and discuss these changes, and I have heard no opposition to the proposal at all.

Mr. FRASER. I think that the change with regard to the fee is a step in the right direction. As to the other change, if I understand correctly, there is to be one of these labels on every case.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Each case containing forty-eight one-pound tins.

Mr. FRASER. There is nothing labelled on the can ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. FRASER. These stamps will be prepared by the Government ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. And given to the officials ? What officials will have them ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The officials who look after these canning factories.

Mr. FRASER. The packers receive these labels for nothing, I suppose ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. Will there be any fee for the inspection ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; the license covers everything.

Mr. YEO. Is it intended that the license fee shall be reduced during the present season ? This was spoken of when the Bill was up before. I hope that if the Minister must have a license fee, he will see his way clear to let the reduction take effect during the present year. With respect to the labels, I pointed out on a previous occasion, the difficulty in putting them on where the lobsters are packed. In some cases, dealers buying lobsters from a distance would like to inspect the fish and know if they are properly packed. If the label is put on there will be some difficulty about that. I would like to ask what time this year does the close season begin in Prince Edward Island ? I understand that he had extended the time by 20 days on the south side of the island, and I think the extension has been made also on the north side.

Mr. COSTIGAN. With regard to the first point, when the Bill was under discussion before, the same question was asked, whether I would reduce the fee this year. I think I gave a good reason why it would be almost impossible to do that. The license has been paid for at $10, and the license has been granted long ago. There would be no difficulty in refunding to any packer any difference between the $10 that he has paid and the smaller amount he would be obliged to pay if he packs less cases than would come to $10. But I am afraid the hon. gentleman could not assure me that I would not have a great deal of trouble in getting at the difference between the $10 and whatever the license would come to above $10. So that it would be simply giving away a certain amount of revenue that the Government would be entitled to, and I would not be able to collect the surplus. Under the present Act the license has been issued. Every one who applied for the license this year, knew what the law was, and knew that he had to pay $10. He applied and got his license, and has paid his $10. Every hon. gentleman will see that it would be almost impossible to go back and deal with that now; it would create a great deal of dissatisfaction. If some men were entitled to a refund, those who would be obliged under the law, if I made it retroactive, to pay an additional fee, would complain. I think the House would not wish to make the Bill retroactive. I can only provide that when we grant these licenses again, they shall be at this rate. With regard to the labels, the Bill provides

that the labels are to be put on the boxes before shipment, and even if they are not shipped and are to be stored, after the close season they must be put on all the boxes that are kept in stock. The labels will be furnished free. With regard to the other point it may be desirable that the packers, in selling to purchasers, should have the privilege of opening and inspecting the cases in order to know if they are really up to the mark. That is provided for in the Bill. We will come to that in a clause later on, that I want to change. The packers will be at liberty to open their cases, after they are stamped and to inspect them and see if there is any faulty package, and if there is, they can take it out and fill in the box to their satisfaction. All I want to provide for is that in this repacking, for the laudable purpose of seeing that the goods are shipped in good condition, if they find a lot of empty cans, resulting in leaving half a dozen or fifty empty boxes, these empty boxes shall not remain with this stamp. The stamp is really a certificate, and the moment they empty the boxes, that stamp must be removed, because the stamp is a certificate that the boxes contain Canadian fish in good condition. After the box is emptied, I do not want it to continue to bear that certificate, as afterwards it might be filled with rocks or anything else. There will be every opportunity for an examination of the packages before they are shipped. With regard to the close season, I may state that representations are being made in favour of an extension, not only from Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, but also from New Brunswick, and my own intention was to resist, as far as possible, an extension, until I became thoroughly convinced that there was really a cause for making it. Reports and telegrams I have received, and representations that have come in from members of Parliament on both sides of politics, and from respectable citizens in the provinces I have named, gentlemen who I believe are influenced by good motives in making these representations, have shown such a condition of things there, owing to stormy weather and other exceptional causes, that I have asked the Council to extend the time ten days beyond the present limit in those sections. That ten days will be in addition to the regular time fixed for the open season that is, ten days taken off the close season, or ten days added on to the open season.

Mr. FRASER. Do I understand that if a man, for example, has put up that which next year would only require him to pay $10, he would get a refund? Suppose a man has paid $10, and has only put up enough lobsters to entitle the Government next year to get $2 from him, would he make a refund this year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No refund at any time.

Mr. FRASER. I thought the difficulty the Minister was referring to was that of collecting the amount after they had discovered the difference.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The licenses have been granted at $10, and there will be no refund, nor do I ask anything additional. It works both ways. Some of them would be entitled to pay a great deal more.

Mr. FRASER. Coming back to these labels, how many officers would there be who can do this labelling in each county?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That depends entirely upon the number of canneries. We have to have some of our fishery officials to inspect the canneries.

Mr. FRASER. In a large county like the one I represent, where there is so great a distance between different points, there may be some difficulty, if the officers who are to make the inspection are too remote from these places. If there is only one for every two or three counties, there may be some difficulty in having the inspection made at times to suit the canners.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It does not involve inspection. I am speaking now of the point the hon. gentleman has raised with regard to the convenience or otherwise of supplying the labels that will be necessary to carry out this section of the law. Now, that officer knows the distance, he knows how many canneries there are, and will know from their reports about what they will put up. He will be supplied with sufficient labels to meet the requirements of the canneries in his district. It will be his duty to hand them to the canneries, so that they will have them in time. The officer will be charged with so many labels; he will show that there are on hand so many, that so many boxes have been labelled and shipped and that the cans in stock have been labelled. The officer will know exactly what has been done with the labels.

Mr. FRASER. Then there will be no further inspection, except putting the labels on?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There will be no inspection of the cases. All we want to know is that the lobsters have been caught in the legal season, and then it follows that they are good lobsters.

Mr. FRASER. How will the officer discover that?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Fishing ceases after a certain number of weeks, by law.

Mr. FRASER. Then there will be no personal inspection of the cans?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. YEO. I understood the Minister intended to give an extension of twenty days as regards fishing on a portion on the south side of Prince Edward Island. I should

like to know when the close season for the present year begins ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The close season differs on account of temperature, season, movements of ice and for other reasons. On the island the season begins later than it does generally in the province of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. In the two latter provinces it generally commences on 1st July, while on the island it does not commence until 15th July, there being some waters at a few points where a later date has been fixed. That is the season based on experience. The extension of ten days applies to all points. In New Brunswick the season now begins on 1st July, and then ten days must be added to that time ; on the island the close season now begins on 15th July, and it will not begin until the 25th. So the hon. gentleman has to add ten days to the time allowed the fishermen at the different places, and he will then get the beginning of the close season.

Mr. BOWERS. Were the parties notified by telegram in different parts of the provinces that the time had been extended ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. BOWERS. If not, some parties might have taken up their traps.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot say that each individual has been notified by telegram, but every officer was wired last Saturday to inform the fishermen that the time had been extended ten days.

Mr. BOWERS. I was in the Minister's office, I think, on Friday, and I was told that the time had not been extended, and that no telegrams had been sent to officers. On my own responsibility and at my own expense, I telegraphed that the Minister had refused to extend the time. I cannot understand it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman got at the office too early. I think it was afternoon or evening before the decision was arrived at and telegrams were sent Friday.

Mr. YEO. I am not by any means finding fault with regard to the time having been extended. I was afraid from the explanation given by the hon. gentleman that the extension expected on the south shore of the island had not been granted. I understood that the hon. gentleman was going to give twenty days extension on the south side, from West Point to St. Peters, and ten days on the north side.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I was disposed to grant twenty days on a certain portion of the south side, on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Fisheries. Representations were then received urging a further extension of time, in most cases three and four weeks being asked, three weeks at least all round the coast, and I found that if twenty days were granted in one locality it would be impossible to give less than that time in other cases in which perhaps as strong a case would be made out. I therefore concluded that I would recommend twenty days extension in no place so that no precedent could be established. I substituted ten days instead of twenty days.

Mr. YEO. I am sorry the Minister has rescinded his intention, because there are exceptional reasons why a longer time should be given the fishermen on that part of the coast.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They have now fifteen days longer than the fishermen in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia.

Mr. YEO. When does the close season begin ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It begins on 25th July in the island.

Mr. YEO. The catch of lobsters has been much poorer this year than in any previous year. In the early part of the season the fishermen did nothing at all, and just now the lobsters are beginning to get good and the catch is large. I wish the Minister could have seen his way clear to give the time expected, which I understand he promised to give, namely, an extension until 6th August, or the beginning of August at all events. I think the Minister has received reports from different parts of the fishing ground, and his information must be that the catch of the fish this year is unusually poor. That would be a very good reason why the hon. gentleman should reduce the fee, as he proposes to do next year.

Mr. BOWERS. I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that there have been many petitions forwarded from Digby, Annapolis and other counties in favour of changing the lobster law so as not to allow the fishermen to catch lobsters under ten and a half inches. Last week I received several letters from different parts of the county, to which I call the Minister's attention. Here is one of the letters :

Freeport, N.S., 19th June, 1895.

Hon. E. C. Bowers, Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—Yours of 6th June to hand, and, as regards the small lobsters it is a certain fact we cannot catch the small ones and have them grow to large ones. Ten years ago, when I commenced dealing in lobsters, fishermen would only have a small portion of their catch small, not more than one-quarter ; to-day we find it the reverse—not more than one-quarter of the catch large ones ; very often not that many. It seems a great pity to save them under 10½ inches, as well as such a loss to the fishermen. I have never met one who did not agree with me, that unless the taking of small lobsters is prohibited, we will in a few more years have no lobsters to catch, and this valuable part of our fishery will be destroyed ; in fact, the catch has fallen off in the past ten years fully one-

half. I am glad to see you are interested in this important matter, and trust the Government will take steps to protect the same, and wish I was better able to express my opinion on this matter.

Yours truly,
M. G. CROCKER.

I have also received the following communications :—

Westport, N.S., 20th June, 1895

Dear Sir,—Replying to your favour of 6th, asking my opinion on the effect of taking lobsters 9 inches in length, I have to say, that I believe that the capture of lobsters of a length as low as 9 inches is inimical to the lobster industry, and I base my opinion on the fact that in six years, in this vicinity, the number of men engaged in this fishery has quadrupled, while the total catch has decreased to less than half the amount of six years ago, as evidenced by the number of crates of lobsters shipped. I have been in the business, both buying and shipping. I have ss. "Westport's" freight sheets to work from, and I know how many lobsters go from our ground to Yarmouth.

That the decrease of large lobsters (10½ inches) is due to the capture of 9-inch lobsters may be a case of 'non sequitur," but I think that the capture of 9-inch fish is largely responsible for the rapid diminution in number of 10½-inch fish. I wish to impress upon you that this is merely my opinion. It may be that the natural increase of the lobster is not equal to the means and men employed in their capture.

If this opinion will have any effect to conserve the best interests of the fishermen, I am pleased to be able to render this assistance.

Yours truly,
R. W. FORD.

Digby, N.S., 15th June, 1895.

E. C. Bowers.

Dear Sir,—Your favour at hand. In reply, we will say, in regard to the lobster fisheries, the best thing that could be done, is to to do away with all small lobsters, from 9 inches up to 10½, and catch nothing under 10½ inches, as the lobsters are fast being exterminated, and by preserving the small lobsters it will protect our fisheries.

We remain,
SYDA & COUSINS.

Tiverton, N.S., 21st June, 1895.

E. C. Bowers, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Yours at hand. In reply will say my opinion is, that no lobsters should be saved under 10½ inches size for United States market. That would be all the protection we would want They are not as plentiful as years ago, just because the small fish are allowed to be saved which is wrong.

Yours truly,
HANTFORD OUTHOUSE.

Westport, 20th May, 1895.

E. C. Bowers.

Dear Sir,—I wish you would place the lobster question before the Government. I suppose there will be no change in the law this season. Well, it makes but little difference, as I consider that there will be none to catch soon. This is the fourth season I have been fishing for lobsters. In 1892, with 100 traps, I caught 3,000 lobsters. In 1893 I got 2,200 ; in 1894, 1,600, and this year I will not get over 800. Why will the Government not enact a law making it obligatory upon us to not catch lobsters under 10½ inches, before the fishery is entirely destroyed. All the fishermen want it.

Yours very truly,
WALTER COGGINS.

Digby, 12th June, 1895.

Mr. E. C. Bowers, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Would call your attention to the lobster fishery. The size limit we have always been trying to press on the Government is 10½ inches, and unless this is done very shortly, the lobster business will be completely destroyed, and will be a thing of the past. There are nearly as many caught between 9 and 10½ inches as there are above, and there is very little money in them. Hope the Government will not refuse to save this fishery.

Yours very truly,
D. & O. SPROUL.

Sandy Cove, 15th June, 1895.

E. C. Bowers, Esq., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In regard to lobsters ; others as well as myself would like a change—say, to stop catching all lobsters under 10½ inches, as the largest quantity caught and sold are under 10½ inches. They only sell for from 1 to 2 cents each. If left to grow a few years, they would sell at from 10 to 20 cents apiece. Try and bring the subject to the Government's notice.

Yours very truly,
SAMUEL GIDNY.

The Minister will see that there is a general complaint all over the county against the taking of lobsters between nine inches and ten and a half inches. Last year I brought the matter to the attention of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and he told me that if I would get petitions from the county he would see what he could do. I sent petition forms all over the county, and some eight or ten petitions were sent in asking that the size should be changed from nine inches to ten and a half inches. The Minister, I suppose, forgot all about the promise. At any rate, he did not do anything in the matter of changing the size. I would call the attention of the Minister to this letter :

Westport, N.S., 20th April, 1895.

Hon. C. H. Tupper.

My dear Sir,—I pray you may not think I am taking too much liberties with you, but I cannot help refrain from mentioning to you what comes under my notice. On the 17th, my friend, R. W. Ford, who is interested with me in the lobster business, received a letter from E. C. Bowers, inclosing a form of petition, which I will inclose to you—Bowers asking us to have this placed before our lobster fishermen, and receive as many signatures as possible.

Mr. Ford supposed the reason Bowers sent to us was because we carry this business quite extensive. Mr. Ford yesterday prepared a petition quite suitable and calculated to place it before the fishermen, but, to his utter astonishment, on going into the post office this noon, he saw a petition on the counter with quite a number of names, old man Ruggles first on the list. Farmers, cobblers, carpenters and every boy in town have been asked to sign this paper. Now, is this the intention, or is it for the fishermen ? Bowers is an oily chap, and anxious to make the people

believe he has lots of influence with the Government, but I have yet to learn this fact.

Yours most respectfully,
(Signed) (Capt.) J. D. PAYSON.

Now, I wish to tell the Minister that the desire for this change from nine to ten and a half inches is a universal desire—one felt not simply by a portion of the fishermen or by one here and there, but felt by every person in the county. I am told that it is also desired in the counties of Annapolis, Yarmouth and Shelburne. I would also call the attention of the Minister to some reports contained in his last annual report, which show that in Quebec, in New Brunswick, in Prince Edward Island and in Nova Scotia, almost everywhere, the catch was poor. In nine cases out of ten, the average catch was less in 1894 than in 1893, and less in 1893 than 1892. So it is clear that the catch of lobsters is gradually decreasing, and I would like to ask the Minister to introduce a provision in this Bill, or to have an Order in Council passed before the 1st of January, 1896, providing that no lobsters shall be caught or sold under ten and a half inches in length in the western part of Nova Scotia. These small lobsters are caught in the winter time, and are shipped to the New York markets. A barrel of lobsters contains from 150 to 175, and I have seen as many as thirty to forty barrels shipped at once to the New York and Boston markets. There would be about 5,000 lobsters, which would sell for 1 to 1½ cents at the same season when large lobsters would bring 25 cents to 30 cents a piece in the Boston market. The Minister will see the great necessity there is of enacting a law giving the fishermen what they want, and to save the lobster fisheries from extermination. If the season is extended to the 15th of July, and the smaller lobsters are prevented from being taken, a great financial benefit will accrue to the fishermen and this fishery will be preserved. I hope the Minister will not simply pass this over, but will do something in the matter.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has, I am sure, given this subject a good deal of attention, and I have no fault to find with the position he takes. He wishes, however, to go further than I could go or than I think I could get the House to go in the line of protection to the lobster. To act upon his suggestion would be next to passing a prohibitory law.

Mr. BOWERS. I was only speaking of the western part of Nova Scotia, of the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That shows how difficult it would be to make an amendment to this Bill to suit one particular section. If I could carry a measure such as the hon. gentleman proposes for the lobster fisheries in all the provinces, it would do more to protect the lobster fisheries than anything else that could be suggested. But it would be prohibitory in many sections of the country to prohibit the taking of lobsters under ten and a half inches in length.

Mr. BOWERS. A law could be enacted for the Bay of Fundy without interfering with the parts of the Dominion that do not want it. If the people want the law for the Bay of Fundy, including the southern shore of New Brunswick and the counties of Annapolis, Digby and perhaps Yarmouth in Nova Scotia, I do not see why it should not be given to them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is a reasonable proposition, and if I had the necessary information, I would be happy to insert a clause applying the provision to the localities it suited, just as I would be willing to do with regard to the close season. If next year I have anything to do with this department, I will certainly be willing to introduce a law, based upon the best information we can gather, fixing the close season for different districts according to the differences of climate, temperature and so forth. But at present I have not the necessary information.

Mr. McISAAC. Do I understand that the extension of ten days applies to all over the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, it is uniform.

Mr. McISAAC. Is it more than ten days in any part of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia ?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. McISAAC. I have a letter here from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, dated the 29th of June, which states that the close season will commence on 11th July and 26th July in the areas specified, which commenced on 1st July and 15th July, respectively. This goes to show that the determination was to make it ten days in some parts of Prince Edward Island, and fifteen days in some other parts. If this is the case, I want to know why it is that some parts of Prince Edward Island have been given five days more than some portions of Nova Scotia, for instance, Antigonish County. There are portions of that county where the lobster packers are just as much entitled to the longest extension as those of the northern portion of Prince Edward Island, because there is very little difference between the conditions of the two districts.

Mr. PERRY. My impression, as I stated when the House was last in committee on this Bill, was that it was altogether useless, and I have come to the conclusion more earnestly since. Why pass a Bill of this kind when we find that by an Order in Coun-

cil the statutes of Canada may be superseded? It is a well known fact that the Government arrogate to themselves the power not only to make new laws, but to manipulate them by Order in Council, so that we do not know what they are. I understand that the Minister has stated that there were two close seasons for Prince Edward Island. I deny that. There never were two close seasons for Prince Edward Island, and if he looks at his own report, he will find that that was not the case. It is true, last year, not by Order in Council, but by inaction of the fishery officers on certain portions of the island, fishermen, who were probably friends of the Government, were allowed to fish in the close season. Some of them were fined, and unfortunately they were four Grits who were fined. The Tories were allowed to go scot free. The same thing may happen this year. When the hon. Minister tells us that there are two close seasons in Prince Edward Island, he states what is not correct.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not say there were two close seasons in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. PERRY. The departmental letter of the 29th June says that on the northern shore of Prince Edward Island the close season is from the 16th July, and that on the south side, it is from the 26th July. That shows that the hon. Minister is under the impression that there are two close seasons upon the island. I deny that, and would like to have it explained. We saw in one of the Government papers that the Government were going to extend the time twenty days. Now we see by the letter that it is only ten days, and it operates in this way, that on one side the close season extends to the 26th July, and on the other side it only extends to the 15th July.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Will the hon. gentleman read the letter showing that it is extended to the 26th August?

Mr. PERRY. The letter reads: The close season will therefore commence on the 11th July and on the 26th July. This season is in the west, where the close season respectively specified in the regulations commences 1st July, and 15th July, respectively.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Read me where it is extended to 26th August.

Mr. PERRY. If I said August I made a mistake. It should be 26th July, but the discrepancy is here, 11th July and 26th July. Is it possible that there is a close season on one side of the island and a different close season on the other. Now I see the Bill provides for a fee of $10 for each license, but on and after the 1st January, 1896, it shall be $2 per 100 cases. If it be right in 1896 to change the license, why not change it now? Could not the Minister of Marine, by the power vested in him by Order in Council, alter that part of the Act and make it more lenient and acceptable to the packers for the year 1895 as well as for the year 1896? He might as well charge the farmers a license fee for packing oats or barley or flour or beef or pork or anything else. Why, you might as well provide that a Minister of the Crown should pay a fee, not of $10 but of $500, before assuming the responsibility of office. Let us have fair-play all round. I contend that that $10 has to come out of the man who brings the lobsters from the bottom of the sea to the surface of the water. He will have to pay $10 or $2 per hundred cases when the rest of the community go scot free. Why not tax the man who manufactures self-binders, wagons, mowers and everything else? Why not charge him $10, $15 or $20 in the shape of a license before he can have the right to manufacture these articles? The lobster packing is a very risky industry, in which men of capital have to risk their money and fishermen their time and hard work, and yet they are to be handicapped by the $10 license or $2 per hundred cases. I look upon the act as useless, as not worth the paper it is written on, because the Minister has the power to alter the Act just as he thinks fit. He has done it already. He has now altered the close seasons, and why should he not alter any other part of the Act? As to the close season, I made a mistake in the month, but the departmental letter said the 11th and 26th July. If this is applicable to Prince Edward Island, the Minister must be under the impression that we had two close seasons on the island.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Let the hon. gentleman read the letter and say whether it applies specially to Prince Edward Island or generally?

Mr. PERRY. The letter is like a good many more of the doings of the Government, it is ambiguous. You can take three or four meanings out of it. I always understood it as applicable to Prince Edward Island and no other place, and I drew my conclusions from that. Now, I would ask the hon. Minister to explain himself squarely so that parties interested in the fisheries may know what they are doing and not be liable to be pounced upon by hungry wolves and sharks, who may wish to make a few dollars out of these poor people.

Mr. YEO. When does the close season begin in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. COSTIGAN. On the 25th July, north, south, east and west.

Mr. YEO. I am sorry the hon. Minister has not seen his way clear to giving further extension on the south side of the island.

Bill, as amended, reported.

Mr. BOWERS. Before this Bill is passed, I would ask the hon. Minister if this section 8 in the new Bill is the same as in the old. It reads:

8. On the request of any person authorized or employed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to hatch lobsters, and under a penalty not exceeding five dollars and costs for each refusal, the manager or owner of every lobster factory or canning establishment shall, as far as possible, and with due care, take from and keep, in such manner as is from time to time prescribed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, all eggs attached to lobsters brought to such factory or canning establishment, and deliver such eggs to a person authorized by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to receive them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Bill has been changed.

Mr. BOWERS. It is very strange that this Bill is to be put through without our having copies of it before us.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The very reason I have delayed is in order to have an opportunity to prepare these amendments and have them printed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was the new Bill distributed ?

Mr. CAMERON. Yes ; long ago.

Mr. BOWERS. What I want to call the hon. Minister's attention to is this 8th section. This provides that these eggs are to be kept and delivered to a person authorized to receive them. In our part of the province of Nova Scotia there is no person authorized to receive these eggs, and therefore I consider this part of the Act bad and indefensible. If this section goes into force the industry will be destroyed altogether in the western part of Nova Scotia. They catch these lobsters, and if there is no one to receive the eggs, they will take them off and destroy them and sell the female lobster.

Mr. FRASER. I was going to say that this section was passed in committee without reading. In fact none of the sections on page 2 were read, and we had no opportunity of discussing them. I want to enforce what the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) has said so far as these eggs are concerned.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the sections were not read they cannot be reported as passed.

Mr. FRASER. None of the sections on page 2 were read.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The clause read by the hon. gentleman is part of the amended Bill. It was introduced at the suggestion of the commissioner of fisheries after consultation with the packers. I consider it as much a part of the Bill and as useful as any other section.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I think——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must remember that we are not now in Committee of the Whole, and that he cannot speak more than once.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then we must challenge the attention of the House that one of the most important Bills of the session, one in which the constituents of some hon. members are deeply interested, and one which has been watched very closely by these gentlemen, has passed in committee, according to the uncontradicted statement of some hon. members, without some of the sections being read, and they were called passed before they were announced by the chairman. That is a very serious state of matters. If it is an inadvertence, I presume the Minister will have the House go back into committee again. If not he will have to challenge the opinion of the House as to going back. It is monstrous if a Bill can be smuggled through the committee. Hon. members who have been waiting patiently for this Bill that they might have an opportunity of calling attention to what they consider defects find the Bill suddenly reported without several important sections being read. I trust the hon. Minister will not insist upon this. It will not facilitate the business of the House. If he does not move to refer the Bill back to committee, we must.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman says that several members of the House have been watching for this Bill. None of them more anxious about it than myself. I have delayed in order to give these alterations time to be put before those interested and afterwards printed. If the hon. gentleman states that he had not an opportunity to discuss these clauses, that he was taken by surprise—though, if so, it was quite unintentional—I have no objection to going back into committee. I do not want to take a snap verdict or to claim any undue advantage, nor do I wish to refuse any hon. member the opportunity of speaking upon any section of the Bill. I am not objecting going back into committee.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

On motion for third reading :

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved that the order for third reading be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to committee for further consideration.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 7,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask the hon. gentleman not to inflict such a high penalty as $400. I think the amount is utterly disproportionate to the offence of "refusing, or otherwise obstructing any such officer in the discharge of his duty." What might be considered an obstruction, might be a very slight offence, indeed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I merely keep the old section.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think $400 is altogether too high. I did not know there was such a clause in the old Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have no objection to making it $200.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was going to suggest to the hon. gentleman that $100 would be an enormous penalty for any possible offence of that kind. I can hardly conceive any offence that would justify a fine over $100.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Make it $100.

On section 8.

Mr. BOWERS. The Bill says here that the manager or owner of every lobster factory or canning establishment shall take and keep all eggs attached to lobsters brought to such factory, and deliver them up to a person authorized by the Minister to receive them. That means that in the county of Digby, or the county of Yarmouth, or Shelburne, or anywhere else, even where there is no hatchery, he shall, so far as possible, take from and keep, in such manner as is prescribed by the Minister, all eggs attached to lobsters, &c. Now, what will be the good of doing this where there are no hatcheries? If they are allowed in this manner to take eggs from the lobsters and no proper place or hatchery is provided, the eggs will die. They will then boil these female lobsters and can them. This should be changed to apply only where there are hatcheries.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman will compare this clause with section 9 of the old Act, he will find it is word for word of the old Act.

Mr. FRASER. That is not an answer to the objection. Because this section may have been in existence for fifty years, is no reason why it should be retained if it is objectionable. There is no need for it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have stated that the commissioner of fisheries has urged very strongly the re-enactment of that clause, and I take his advice.

Mr. FRASER. I think there is only one lobster hatchery in Nova Scotia, which, I understand, is at Bedford, in the county of Halifax. Now, what would be the use, for example, of a lobster factory down at Cape North, pretending to fulfil that section? It is imposing upon every man that catches lobsters, a duty, under a penalty, of keeping all the eggs in such a manner as is prescribed by the Minister. Then every man that packs lobsters in the province of Nova Scotia, must in such a manner as the Minister will prescribe, keep all the eggs and deliver them over to a person authorized, who will never come, because there is no need of all the eggs. The Minister will see that this is so broad it will never be fulfilled. Is every man that puts up lobsters in Nova Scotia to keep all the eggs until a person will make a demand for them, with the authority of the Minister? In the first place, the eggs will not be required; and, in the next place, the owner of the factory will never be asked, and why impose the duty?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand the object of the commissioner is to put himself in a position to obtain a plentiful supply of lobster ova. There can be no objection to that. It is, perhaps, owing to a misconception of the meaning of this section that the discussion has arisen. I understand it is not compulsory for everybody to keep the ova of lobsters, and that it is only compulsory in those cases where a request is specially made. For instance, in Prince Edward Island, where there is no hatchery, probably no request will be made, and it is only when a request is made by a person authorized to hatch lobsters, that lobster factories or canneries are required to keep the ova.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In order that they may be utilized, instead of being destroyed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With that limitation, that it does not apply generally to all cannery establishments and lobster factories, but only to those on whom a special request is made to keep the ova, the clause does not seem to be objectionable.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is the object.

Mr. BOWERS. I suggest the words "where hatcheries exist," be inserted.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think the suggestion proposed is necessary, because we have only one hatchery for the three provinces.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend desires to confine the application of the section to localities where a lobster hatchery exists. But the clause will only be made applicable to those localities, because I cannot conceive of any person employed by them to hatch lobsters in Nova Scotia requiring the canneries of Prince Edward Island to keep ova. If any application were made, public opinion would secure its repeal.

Amendments concurred in, and Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Canadian Pacific Railway—	
Construction	$ 2,000
To pay for work under award	84,220

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the circumstances under which this work is going forward? I suppose the item refers to the award under the Onderdonk contract.

Mr. FOSTER. The item of $2,000 is to pay the salary and expenses of the engineer supervising the work done under the award; also to pay legal expenses and land damages. The amount of the award, as the hon. gentleman will recollect, was $579,255 The amount earned and surveyed, and paid up to first April, 1895, is $495,034, leaving a balance of $84,220.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is doing the work?

Mr. FOSTER. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under the superintendence of our own engineer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this complete the whole award?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of what does it chiefly consist?

Mr. FOSTER. Of filling in, constructing culverts, putting in concrete, and so on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total amount paid for costs by the Canadian Government on the award?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The whole costs of both sides amounted to about $200,000.

North-west Mounted Police..... $500,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see there is a reduction of $155,000 here. I would be glad to have a somewhat detailed account from the Minister as to how these reductions are to be made, and what the general policy of the Government is to be with respect to the mounted police?

Mr. FOSTER. I will give my hon. friend as much information as I can; not being myself familiar with the routine, but having these explanations put in my hand. Taking a look back at the accounts for a number of years, the committee will find there has been a gradual reduction in the cost of maintenance, and this from several causes. In 1877-78, the cost was $862,965; in 1888-89, eleven years afterwards, the cost was $829,-701; a reduction in that period of about $33,000. In 1889-90, there was a reduction upon the previous year of $76,607; in 1890-91, a reduction on the previous year of $13,-093; in 1891-92, a reduction on the preceding year of $38,067; in 1892-93, a reduction from the preceding year of $86,453; and in 1893-94, a reduction of $4,216 on the previous year. So that in the year 1893-94 the maintenance of the force cost $611,263, being a reduction of about $251,000 in the six years. That shows a gradual reduction in the maintenance of the force brought about by several causes, amongst them: the gradual, although not very large, reduction of the force, and by very careful management, and by the reduced cost of food supplies particularly, which are obtained in the North-west now, and the price of which has been constantly decreasing as compared with the price of imported goods. The following statement will show the reduction in the number of officers and men. In 1889, the total was 1,041; in 1891, 1,018; in 1892, 933; in 1893, 920; in 1894, 962, and at present 853 which number in the course of a year will be brought down to about 700. It is intended to keep the force at that number for the present at least. The Government does not intend to reduce the force below what is necessary for the security of the people of the North-west, and in speaking of the security of the North-west, account has to be taken of the gradual opening up of settlements, which implies, of course, an extension of the police service. A small squad has to be sent for the protection of new settlers. I think that probably gives a general idea of what has been done and what it is proposed to do in the near future.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do the North-west police perform service in British Columbia or in Manitoba, outside of the North-west Territories?

Mr. FOSTER. There was a small force sent to British Columbia a few years ago when trouble broke out, but there are none there now and none in Manitoba.

Mr. MULOCK. Whilst any wise movement in the direction of saving money ought to meet with the approval of the House, and would no doubt meet with the approval of the country, yet it is quite possible to be at times unwisely economical. I am not sufficiently familiar with the needs of the North-west to say whether a reduction of the force to the present number of 853 is too great or too small, or whether the proposed reduction to 700 men will meet the requirements of the country. I would venture to suggest, however, that the Government could not do a greater injury to the prosperity of the North-west than to so reduce and weaken the force so as to create doubts in the minds of settlers as to the security of life and property there. Not only is that sense of security necessary for the retention of the present inhabitants of the North-west, but also for the encouragement of immigration into that country, and at the present time there is a very considerable degree of uneasiness, I am told, in the minds of the settlers at the reduction, and threatened further reduction in that force. I trust, therefore, that the Government know fully what they are doing, and that they are not taking a leap in the dark because of some mere abstract principle of economy. I trust that in reducing the number of the force they are acting upon the

advice of responsible persons in the North-west. Has that reduction been made on the advice of responsible agents of the Government throughout the North-west ?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly. I think my hon. friend need not fear, and neither need the people have any fear, that there is any disposition to reduce the force below the actual necessities of the case. This force has been under the management, as deputy head, of Mr. Fred. White, who is a most competent and careful man, and it is upon his advice and direction, informed as he is by his officers in the North-west, and having an excellent idea himself of the needs and wants of the country—it is on that basis that the reductions have been taking place and are now taking place. My hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) may rest perfectly sure, that the advice which is tendered will be conservative, and that we shall not go beyond what is prudent in the reduction. My hon. friend must also remember that the police force is now far more efficient in proportion to its number than it was formerly. There are two reasons for that. One is, the greater facility for transportation afforded by main lines and branches of railways running through the country. The other reason is, that in the possession of arms the men are becoming more efficient. They are now being provided with a couple of Maxim machine guns which are very effective if they have to be used in active work, and which though they may not be used will be of very great deterrent value. Everything is being managed with a view to the security of the people of the North-west. During the last year the police have been removed entirely from Manitoba, and the maintenance of law and order has been left to the people of that province. That, of course, leaves more men for service in the North-west Territories.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you know how many have been removed from Manitoba ?

Mr. FOSTER. The number in that province has been gradually reduced from year to year, and last year the last of them, about twenty men, were removed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What weapons are the North-west mounted police armed with ?

Mr. FOSTER. We have secured two hundred Lee-Metford carbines for them, and they have Winchesters and two Maxim machine guns. The artillery force consists of two 7-pounder guns, four 9-pounder guns and 2 mortars. Then they have the Enfield revolver for close quarters.

Mr. MULOCK. I have received communications from persons in the North-west, more particularly in the Alberta district, the tenor of which are not in the line of the proposed reduction. Of course, the settlers may be unduly anxious, perhaps nervous. However that may be, I want as one member of the House to take my full share of responsibility for endorsing any expenditure that is necessary for the proper preservation of life and property and the affording of every reasonable confidence in the security of the people there. The Minister and the Government, of course, knowing more particularly the requirements, will be primarily responsible, and I do not think they should seek protection for any unwise ecomony by suggesting that it is the result of demands from this side of the House. I am not of course speaking for this side of the House ; I am only speaking my own views ; but to that extent I again press upon the Government not to make a mistake and retard settlement, as they would do, did it turn out that this force has been so weakened as perhaps to invite trouble, with all its attendant consequences.

Mr. McMULLEN. Any person who looks over the items of cost of this force, as set out in the Auditor General's Report, must come to the conclusion that the men connected with it are paid very excessive salaries. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), I have had communications from the North-west, in which there has not been a single word to show that there is a necessity for the existence of this large corps in that country at all. I believe the time has come when it should be very rapidly reduced. I do not challenge the statement the hon. member for North York has made, I have no doubt he has such communications ; but I know the people of the North-west are exceedingly anxious to have all the money possible spent among them. If the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) were here, he would laud very eloquently the expenditure of money on the North-west mounted police, and would tell us that they were an absolute necessity, so that the expenditure of money might be continued. I do not believe anything of the kind. I have received no less than seven letters from different sections of the North-west, and those who have written to me say that the corps is largely made up of English dudes who are paid large salaries for travelling around the country.

Mr. MULOCK. From what districts have you received the letters ?

Mr. McMULLEN. Regina, Fort McLeod and other districts. We have any number of officials on the reserves to see that the Indians are taken care of and kept on their reserves ; then we have a great many engaged in learning agriculture ; and I cannot see, unless it is for the purpose of preventing smuggling across the boundary, that there is any necessity for the enormous expenditure that is made in connection with this corps. We provide them with everything

—what they eat and wear, and with medicine and medical attendance if they are sick. We have a commissioner who receives $2,600, an assistant commissioner who receives $1,600, 11 superintendents who receive $1,400 apiece, 33 officers who receive $1,000 a year each, and some 17 or 18 assistant surgeons all of whom receive very large allowances. So that if the Government were disposed to save money in connection with this corps, it could be well done. The hon. Finance Minister stated a moment ago that the expenditure on this corps last year was $611,283.21, but he does not take into consideration the salaries at Ottawa chargeable to the mounted police, amounting to $9,742.50, or the charge for compensation for injuries, amounting to $1,953.51. The net amount is given by the Auditor General as $622,000, while the Minister says it is $611,000. He deducted these amounts in order, if possible, to show that there is a considerable reduction made each year. The reductions have not been anything like what they should have been. The last time Sir John Macdonald was in this House, discussing this very question, he stated that it was the intention of the Government to reduce the force from 100 to 200 every year, as he found they could safely dispense with the services of these men. I believe we can well dispense with the services of a very large number I do not believe there is any necessity for the existence of the expensive and well-equipped corps we have now. In some sections, such as those referred to by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) they should have a few of those police around for the purpose of protection, but I insist that in the south-western portion of the North-west there is not that necessity. The people there do not think there is. I have friends and relatives living there for the last twelve years, and they declare that the North-west mounted police, while an efficient, is an enormously expensive corps, and largely made up of the class of people I have stated—young Englishmen, brought out and paid large salaries, and well provided for, and some Canadians who cannot very well be mastered at home, and are sent out there for the purpose of being drilled into good behaviour. It is not right that the country should be saddled with an enormous expenditure to keep up this corps, which could, in a great measure, be dispensed with.

Mr. DALY. I am sorry there is a difference of opinion between hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you sure there is none on your side ?

Mr. DALY. I do not think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No difference of opinion on any subject ?

Mr. DALY. Possibly, but not as to the keeping up of this corps. The hon. member for North Wellington says he has communications from the south-western portions of the North-west Territories, which lead him to believe there is no necessity for the Mounted Police there. I may tell the hon. gentleman that if there is one place in the whole of the Territories where it is absolutely necessary to have the mounted police, it is in the south-western portion.

Mr. McMULLEN. Close to the border ?

Mr. DALY. Yes ; in treaty 7, amongst the Blackfeet, Bloods and the Piegans, the most unruly and difficult Indians we have to deal with. If the mounted police were not there, the friends of the hon. gentleman, of whom he speaks, would not stay there twenty-four hours. Instead of the force being reduced, in my opinion, it should be left where it is ; but, at all events, we have the assurance of the Finance Minister that the force is not to be reduced below 700. The hon. gentleman does not do justice to the men who make up the force, when he says they are English dudes and young Canadians sent there to get them out of the way. I wish to say, on behalf of the mounted police, privates, non-commissioned and commissioned officers, that there is no more efficient force in the whole Dominion. The men are a credit to this country, and to the officers who command them, and the services they have rendered Canada speak volumes for the force. I do not think that any person at all conversant with its work will say that it does not do its work most efficiently and economically. In fact, it is a by-word amongst the people that the force is managed with unsparing economy, and the hon. gentleman has been entirely misinformed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In what way does the hon. gentleman wish us to understand he uses the word " by-word " ?

Mr. DALY. I say that the rigid economy exercised in every direction in the management of the force is a by-word among the people out there. The force is recognized by those competent to give an opinion as the most efficiently-managed force in the British possessions. Military men who have had to do with similar organizations have always said, on inspection of the mounted police, that it is one of the finest bodies of men to be found in any of our British possessions, not excepting the Australian or Cape Colony police. I would be derelict in my duty, as a representative of the North-west, did I not rise in my place to say a word on behalf of the hard-working and efficient young men and officers of this force.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to take the same line as the hon. member for West Assiniboia. There is not a member from the North-

west, from the Minister down, who is not prepared to get up and demand that every single item of expenditure in the North-west should be increased rather than decreased. It appears that there are some members, not excepting one of the Ministers, who would be quite prepared to say that money spent in digging one hole and filling up another is a proper expenditure, so long as it be spent out in that country. We are quite willing to spend money in the North-west where it is absolutely necessary, and where the country will receive some return. But we have no right to spend money uselessly, even for the purpose of keeping up the North-west mounted police. Any person who will look at the expenditure in connection with that force, as set out in the report before us, must come to the conclusion that there is a good deal of extravagance. Let me read some of the items: R. J. Devlin, paid for 204 coats at $17.44, and fourteen at $13.95½, total $3,753.09. What kind of coats were these?

Mr. DALY. Fur coats to ride across the prairies when the thermometer is thirty to thirty-five below. The hon. gentleman would be a good deal narrower than he is now if he had to ride across the prairie without one of these overcoats.

Mr. McMULLEN. I fancy that furs are to be got in the North-west very cheap, and it is strange that you should have to come to Ottawa to buy them and send them back to the North-west again.

Mr. DALY. You can go to London and buy fur coats cheaper than you can buy them out here.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is where all the surplus of the world goes. Notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. Minister, I still adhere to the statement I have made. For instance, take Regina, and look at the expensive buildings there for the police, and the very large corps that are kept there? Will any one tell me that it is necessary to have so many men kept for the preservation of the peace in that part of the country? I say it is not, and the people of Regina say it is not. I know that the mayor of Regina will not say that it is necessary that the force should be kept in Regina as strong as it is. I hold that while it is necessary along the border to have the force in order to prevent smuggling, it is not necessary to have them in many other places.

Canadian Pacific Railway—	
Construction	$ 2,000
To pay for work under award	84,220

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice, on page 11 of the reports of the Auditor General, overruling the treasury board, that when a matter in connection, I presume, with payments due the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was before the board, he declined to pass a certain cheque on the ground that there were cross accounts still existing between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway to a very large amount. In what condition are these accounts? Why have they not been settled? And what effort has been made to secure a settlement? If you turn to page 11 of the Treasury Board, over-rulings, you will find this report:

10th March, 1894.—The Board had before them the matter of the refusal of the Auditor General to issue his certificate for cheques in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for $57,481.71 and $35,149.52, under authority of the Orders in Council of the 2nd and 8th January respectively, and on considering the report of the Auditor General and the Deputy Minister of Finance thereon, the Board order that the cheques mentioned in said report be issued. It appears that the claims which the Auditor General indicates as possible cross-claims, are matters of disputed liability and not such as could be properly insisted on as offsets, and it appears also that the Department of Railways and Canals has adopted measures to adjust the liability. As regards the interest included in the proposed payments, it appears that the question of liability for interest has been already considered, and does not stand on the same footing as a claim for interest on the fuel account referred to by the Auditor General.

Now, it is evident that the Auditor General declined to issue these cheques under the circumstances, he contending that there was cross-account. We want to know what steps have been taken to get that account settled with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. The items the hon. gentleman speaks about, I suppose, is the disputed account between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government in reference to the rolling stock, and also the account in dispute for stores taken over when the North Shore Railway was taken over. It is a question between the two corporations, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific by which of them the amount is due.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the amount in dispute?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not a note of it. The accounts are in course of settlement between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific. The moment the question is settled between them, it will be settled with the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to this $84,220——

Mr. HAGGART. You will remember that the award of the arbitrators was for $579,255.20. The amount certified and paid up to the 1st April was $495,034.64, leaving a balance of $84,220.56. That is the amount asked to be voted.

Intercolonial Railway—	
Increased accommodation at Halifax	$125,000
Branch from Intercolonial Railway between Windsor Junction and Bedford to Dartmouth	100,000
Original construction	2,000

Indiantown Branch	$ 2,000
Increased accommodation at Moncton	1,000
do do Sidney	20,000
Rolling stock	10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister will please explain these in detail. He had better go over them one by one. But, in particular, we want to know how much more is to be expended on the increased accommodation of Halifax, and what it consists of.

Mr. HAGGART. As to the total amount, speaking from memory, I think it is about a million and a half of dollars.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does this $125,000 complete the proposed increased accommodation ?

Mr. HAGGART. No ; the total amount to be expended is $281,385. That is the estimated cost of the remaining portion of the work.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are these items charged to capital account ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. Minister say what the capital account of the Intercolonial stands at ?

Mr. HAGGART. That is published in the report. I think it is about 54 million dollars. The only work so far commenced is the construction of the crib-work facing. The total expenditure on the extension work into Halifax from the commencement of the work in 1872 to 1st April, 1895—that is in answer to the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—is $1,512,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That includes this increased accommodation ?

Mr. HAGGART. No ; the expenditure on works undertaken will increase the total to about $1,800,000.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That means the old Lockman Street extension ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No ; it was brought down from the Richmond depot long ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister does not intend to conclude the work this summer ?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How much will you spend this summer ?

Mr. HAGGART. I expect to spend $17,000 on a brick shed, $15,000 on grading, $30,000 on cribbing, and $3,000 on track.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where is the shed to be—on the wharf expropriated from Roach ?

Mr. HAGGART. It is on Water Street, between the depot and the wharf.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the anticipated cost of the branch between Windsor Junction and Bedford to Dartmouth ?

Mr. HAGGART. The total cost will be $198,000, of which $7,770 has been expended.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the length of that one piece.

Mr. HAGGART. I think it is eleven and one-half miles.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought the hon. gentleman had not made up his mind to construct that branch ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was last session. They were discussing it then.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the contract been let by tender ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes ; it is under contract.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the contractor ?

Mr. HAGGART. Part of it is let to Daniel McGregor & Sons and part to Thomas Cook.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were tenders asked for by advertisement ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, and these were the lowest tenders.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What has become of the bridge there ?

Mr. HAGGART. We intend to build a branch instead of a bridge, take the branch from Dartmouth over to the main line, about 11½ miles, and do away with the bridge.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I would like to know if better accommodation is going to be given at Cape St. Ignace station.

Mr. HAGGART. The officers of the road think there is sufficient accommodation there at present.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I received a letter a few weeks ago from Mr. Pottinger stating on the contrary that they intended to give better accommodation.

Mr. HAGGART. Then I have to say to the hon. gentleman that Mr. Pottinger reports one thing to him and another thing to me. He reports to me that at present there is a station there, and a siding of sufficient length.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. It is not the shortness of the siding that we complain of, but its location as it crosses the public road, and sometimes when cars are on it, they keep the people waiting for from fifteen minutes to half an hour. The siding is also a source of danger to the people who have to cross. If the department would only put it a little west of the station, it would not cost very much. Mr. Yeo, the roadmaster, admitted it was a very dangerous siding, and Mr. Pottinger wrote to me that they were going

to begin work after the 1st July, or something to that effect, as soon as the Estimates were voted. Now, it seems they have changed their mind.

Mr. HAGGART. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is that Mr. Pottinger says it is not at all necessary to move the siding. If we moved the siding, I suppose we would have to move the station.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Not at all. You could move the siding 500 feet further west without moving the station, and unless this is done, I think the Government will be called upon before long to pay more than the cost of removing the siding, as damages for an accident. The station is about an acre from the road. The cars always stop upon the road, they pass several times a day, and they wait there some times for half an hour. It is a very dangerous place, and the attention of the department has been frequently called to it during the last ten years. Mr. Yeo himself has visited the place, and admits that it is dangerous. I must protest against the refusal of the department to make that change. It will not cost more than a few hundred dollars, and I do not see why the department should do what is required. If they do not do so, I am sure that some day the Government will be called upon to pay for accidents much more than it would cost to remove that siding.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman put a notice on the paper, and I sent down and made inquiries in reference to it, and Mr. Pottinger's answer to me was that there is no necessity of changing the siding.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I must protest against the action of the Government in refusing to move the siding now. I repeat that I had a letter from Mr. Pottinger not long ago saying that it would be done after the 1st July, or something to that effect. Mr. Yeo himself came there, and I met him along with the Mayor and many citizens, and pointed out to him the danger of the situation.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman makes an extraordinary statement when he says that Mr. Pottinger promisied him that he was going to remove the siding after the 1st July. After the hon. gentleman's statement in reference to the subject, I shall feel it my duty to inquire of Mr. Pottinger why he sent such a statement to the hon. gentleman, and gave me information to quite the contrary effect.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I am not sure that he stated exactly the siding. But Mr. Yeo wrote to me to meet him at the place, and I went there and the Mayor and several citizens met him. Mr. Yeo said that he had made a report to the effect that the siding must be removed, although he did not fix the time. I then wrote to Mr. Pottinger, and he replied to me saying that the work would be done after the 1st July, or something like that, that he could not do anything until the Estimates were voted. Consequently I was surprised at the answer the hon. gentleman gave to my notice of motion. I will telegraph at home for Mr. Pottinger's letter, and I will lay it before the Minister.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to get the letter from the hon. gentleman, because it seems extraordinary that Mr. Pottinger should write to him that he was going to do the work, when he writes to me that there is no necessity for it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. It is something to that effect. But from the wording of the letter I understood the work was decided upon, and I sent the letter to one Mr. Gamache, or to the mayor of the parish to show him that the work was going to be done.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this the last branch of the Intercolonial Railway that is going to be undertaken ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the only one under construction.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there any further additions that we may expect in the way of branches ?

Mr. HAGGART. None that I know of.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sorry that the Minister has used all the branches and the main line together, so that they are now worked in such a way that we cannot get information in regard to the cost of working those branches. I notice we have spent $3,800,000 in Cape Breton for building a branch line. I suppose these people were entitled to it, as well as others. But the Minister was not able to give any information that that line was paying running expenses. I suppose the construction of this branch will be still another sucker added to the number that are already constructed to draw upon the resources of the main line. I have no objection to the people of the maritime provinces seeking railway accommodation, but I think the interest of the whole Dominion should be considered in these matters, and that the people in the west who have built their own roads by municipal and provincial resources, should not be called upon to contribute largely to the construction of roads where there is not a dollar paid by either province or municipality. But I am glad to have the Minister's announcement that the construction of branches is drawing to a close. The hon. gentleman has stated that the construction of this branch would dispense with the construction of the bridge, what amount was spent on the construction of the bridge and why did it collapse ?

Mr. HAGGART. Two years ago I made a comparison between the estimate cost of the

branch and of rebuilding the bridge. I found the branch line could be built as cheaply as the new bridge, and as the people preferred the branch we built it. The estimated cost of the bridge was $220,000, and for that sum a branch could be built.

Mr. MULOCK. I find the report of the Intercolonial Railway only occupies two or three pages, and the Minister has scarcely done himself or his subject justice. I am satisfied he will not find the returns of any railway, of even a much less magnitude than the Intercolonial Railway, containing so little information as is embodied in this annual statement of a road constructed at a cost of $54,000,000.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will wait until the total Estimates are passed, I will give him as full an account as he desires in regard to this particular road.

Mr. MULOCK. I will receive with welcome this elaborate statement promised. At the same time I cannot allow this shortcoming to pass regarding the annual statement, for while it is not possible to improve the present statement it may be improved in the future. Take the annual report of the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway and there will be found set forth with a good deal of detail the various extensions of the railway, the works under contemplation and a description of the progress of the work and estimated cost of carrying them to completion, and altogether the shareholders are placed in possession of information with respect to the position of the enterprise. I need not add anything to a mere statement to what the report on the Intercolonial Railway contains to show that in these respects it is wholly valueless, and the same remark applies very considerably to other reports throughout this volume. Here is a road 1,142 miles in length, involving an annual expenditure of nearly $3,000,000, and this committee is asked to vote for extensions $260,000, while there is not one line in the annual statement as to this contemplated expenditure. We are told by the Minister that $125,000 is required to increase the accommodation at Halifax, this being only part of a contemplated expenditure there amounting to $260,000. I ask the Minister in all fairness whether he does not think it is due to the committee to set forth this information in his report. It renders it very difficult and almost impossible for members to satisfactorily discharge their duties without this information. I cannot find either in the report of the Minister or the report of the Auditor General any intelligent statement of the receipts and disbursements of the Intercolonial Railway. There is a statement of the receipts from passengers and freight. There are, however, other sources of revenues besides tolls; yet no information is to be found in either of those annual statements showing other sources of revenue or the amounts received. I ask the hon. gentleman where are entered receipts from the sale of second-hand rails, and rolling stock, and supplies? Under what account will these receipts be found?

Mr. HAGGART. They go into the earnings of the road.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose there are frequently transactions of that kind, and that not a year passes without old rails and rolling stock being sold?

Mr. HAGGART. These will be found in the store account. There is a regular store account kept.

Mr. MULOCK. These particulars are not found in the report.

Mr. HAGGART. The total amount in store is there set out—the total amount purchased on store account.

Mr. MULOCK. I suggest that there should be greater details given. When large quantities of rails or rolling stock are sold there should be a distinct item showing that source of revenue. At present it is quite impossible to intelligently analyse the financial operations of the road. Some millions are thrown at us, and we are told that the accounts balance and that great skill and business ability have been displayed in the management of the road. I dare say there is, and I am not wishing to detract from any credit to which the hon. gentleman is entitled in regard to the road. But I would feel more satisfied if I came to the conclusion on evidence rather than on mere faith. To-day it is impossible for any one on the evidence laid before the House and the country to form an opinion as to the successful or non-successful operation of the road. Is there anything in the accounts to show what amount has been written off for depreciation in rolling stock and plant during the past year?

Mr. HAGGART. The instructions given are that the road must be in as good order at the end of the year as it was at its commencement. The rolling stock and the material on the road and the road bed, as shown by the reports of the mechanical superintendent and of the officer in charge of the road bed, are in better order than they ever were. Any new material brought in is charged to the railway out of the store account. All old material sold goes to the credit of the road for working expenses.

Mr. MULOCK. That is no doubt as it happens. But I am complaining that there is no such information on the face of the records. When the hon. gentleman is again compiling his report I suggest that he submits a statement showing the total amount of money expended for renewals and maintenance, for buildings, the amount expended on the repairs for bridges, upon renewals of rails and on renovating rolling stock.

Then we will know how much you have paid out on the earnings, instead of, as the result of some sort of induction to ascertain it, as now the Minister says we may. I am only pointing out in a few instances the shortcomings of the report, and by no means pretending to say what a railway report should contain. I know from the Minister's own expressions that he acknowledges these defects in the report. The Minister has promised us an elaborate report later on, and I trust that in future he will make it a part of his annual report.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I have already had occasion to draw the attention of the Minister to the complaint of the cattle dealers at Lévis that there is no accommodation afforded for their cattle. When the cattle come by train, and if the boat is not there to take them over to Quebec, the owners are obliged to leave the cattle on the streets, or else pay a charge of so many cents per head per day to a man named Turgeon who has a vacant lot of land there. I called the attention of the Minister to this last year, and some years ago I pointed out the place to Mr. McDonald, the local superintendent, and to Mr. Schreiber. Does the Minister intend to do anything in the matter?

Mr. HAGGART. The Deputy Minister says he has had no complaint in reference to the matter.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I drew his attention to it last year.

Mr. SCRIVER. That may have been, but he forgets it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I myself have complained of the matter in the House.

Mr. HAGGART. Our experience in expropriating property in that section of the country has been very unfortunate. It is a very expensive matter to get accommodation there.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. That may be unfortunate, but it is not the fault of the public. These people are charged high rates for bringing their cattle from Rimouski to Lévis, and they are entitled to have accommodation. I again call the attention of the Government to the matter, and I hope that they will remedy the evil.

Mr. HAGGART. With reference to the statement of the member for York (Mr. Mulock) if he turns to page 67, and following pages of the report, he will find that the details of expenditure are given as fully as can be expected. Could he suggest anything more that he thinks ought to be put in that report?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The great trouble has always been in respect to the stores account. I never could make head or tail of it, but there seems to be, on the face of it, a material discrepancy between the General Manager's report, and the Chief Accountant's report. The chief accountant in the stores account (page 71) credits the account with the issue for the year, $1,167,000; also, with the sales of material, fuel, to other railways, $12,983, and also sales of old material, $48,535. But the general manager, in his report, only gives the one item, $48,535. I suppose that can be explained, but my object is to know what kind of an audit is made by the Auditor General, with reference to that stores account. I see that in June, 1894, he called the attention of the department to a letter of the Minister of Finance requiring him to make an audit of this stores account, and he asks that a list of all the property be prepared, and a statement of the purchases and issues for the period indicated, and that certain details be given to him. There is no reply to that letter published in the report. If the Auditor General does make an audit, is it a purely accountant's audit in the department here, or does any officer from his department make what I should call a substantial audit?

Mr. HAGGART. One of the officers of the department goes down to the stores, and I suppose takes stock and makes a substantial audit. I suppose the $12,000 is a charge for old rails to some particular railways which, perhaps, has been paid by a reduction from the subsidy. These old materials ought to be a credit, I think, instead of a debit. The amount of the stores at the beginning of the year is, say $1,700,000, and at the end of the year, $1,200,000. That would be found to be correct by the Auditor General. Then there is a charge against the Intercolonial Railway for $500,000. That goes in the shape of cash to the revenues of the country. The only audit required then would be that of the Auditor General to see that the sheet was correct, and that the receipts in it correspond with the vouchers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that they charge the stores account with the balance from the previous account, and with the purchases made during the year.

Mr. HAGGART. The stores account would not be charged to the Intercolonial Railway. They deal with it as if it were a separate body.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There are two or three things I want to call attention to. The statement of the general manager on page 65 shows the value of the stores purchased to be $980,000, and the value used to be $1,167,000, and the value of the old material sold to be $48,000. When I turn to the stores account, I find that in addition to that $48,000, there is the sale of material, fuel, &c., to other railways to the amount of $12,983, which does not appear to be referred to at all by the general manager; and there is no explanation which would enable any person reading these accounts to

understand what that means. Then, in order to find out whether there is any check kept by anybody upon the stores account, I wanted to find whether there goes down a man from the Auditor General's office to check the stores on hand, and, if so, where is his report? The hon. gentleman knows enough about railway accounts to know if there is any department in which great leakage can occur and that leakage can very easily be hidden, it is the stores account. I want to know whether the stores on hand are actually checked. I do not mean a paper check, but a check by a man of the stores themselves.

Mr. HAGGART. We ourselves have a check on all the stores every year. In reference to the $12,983, I suppose that will be for material charged to the different railways connected with the Intercolonial Railway. I speak for the Auditor General, but I understand that he has a couple of people down at Moncton making an audit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does he make a report to the hon. gentleman?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is very curious, if the Auditor General makes an audit, that he does not make a report either to the hon. gentleman or to the House. I have been asking about this stores account every year, and I have never yet been able to obtain a clear understanding of it.

Mr. FRASER. Is not stock taken of the stores each year?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. Is the return of that stock-taking made to the hon. Minister?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, it goes to the office at Moncton, and the totals come here.

Mr. FRASER. Is that done by an officer of the department?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, we have an audit department at Moncton. We have a chief accountant and treasurer there, who sign the stores report, and this is checked over and revised by the Auditor General's officers who are sent down.

Mr. FRASER. That is only the figures. What I want to get at is who is the official who goes in to the store-house and finds out the quantity on hand at the beginning of the year, and who knows the quantity got during the year, and checks what has gone out, and who finds at the end of the year that the balance is there.

Mr. HAGGART. There is an officer, who is generally changed every year. There is a thorough departmental audit every year.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister was correct in saying that there were certain items which I asked for later on in the book; at the same time, the accounts are, I think, extremely meagre. With regard to the store account, I find, as an illustration, that last year you acquired $981,000 worth of stores. What is the system adopted in purchasing that enormous quantity each year? To what extent do you buy by tender, by advertisement, and by private sale?

Mr. HAGGART. All stores are bought by tender and advertisement.

Mr. MULOCK. Who opens the tenders and awards the contracts?

Mr. HAGGART. The tenders are opened at Moncton. The tenderers all tender by quality, and if there is a dispute as to the quality, it is tested by the professors of the school of technology at McGill, to whom samples of oil, turpentine, &c., are furnished.

Mr. MULOCK. Who issues the authority to purchase?

Mr. HAGGART. The general manager. I never issue an authority.

Mr. MULOCK. Who is present when the tenders are opened?

Mr. HAGGART. The storekeeper and general manager. When the tenders are opened, he has authority to award only to the lowest. If there is any dispute as to quality, or if he prefers a party who is higher, on account of his sample being better than the others, he refers that matter to the department here and they deal with it altogether.

Mr. MULOCK. The amount purchased per annum is so large that the Minister cannot make any mistake in seeing there are proper checks in connection with the purchases. The same remark applies to the sales. I will ask how the hon. gentleman gets the best price for what he is selling?

Mr. HAGGART. The rolling stock is sold by tender.

Mr. MULOCK. I can state a case where they were not.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not aware of having authorized the sale of any article unless by tender. We send circulars out asking for tenders.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman says that in all cases the rolling stock is sold after tenders were advertiesd for in the press.

Mr. HAGGART. Tenders for eleven or twelve locomotives were asked for last year, but the prices were so low that I refused to accept them, and I instructed the superintendent down there, if he got higher prices to sell them, and he sold three.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Minister calls for tenders in a public way through the public press and afterwards exercised his judg-

ment, I do not know what else he can do. What record is there of the opening of the tenders, both for purchase and sale ?

Mr. HAGGART. They send an abstract of the tenders up here signed by the two of them.

Mr. MULOCK. This is a tremendous power to put in the hands of two employees.

Mr. HAGGART. Any person who has tendered will soon let us hear about it if another tender was accepted a quarter of a cent higher than his.

Mr. MULOCK. Tenders are capable of being opened at different hours and so on. What I desire to know is whether the Minister can say that his supposed rules are lived up to, and that tenders are in all cases advertised for.

Mr. HAGGART. Not always advertised. Circulars are sent out sometimes.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the weak point in the system. In what cases do you invite tenders privately and in what publicly ?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that circulars are sent out to nearly every one in the trade, and that there is an immense number of tenders received.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman mean that circulars are sent out, and that advertising is not the rule ?

Mr. HAGGART. The general rule is to advertise, but in some cases circulars are sent out. Sometimes it would cost a great deal more for the advertising than for the article required. My instructions are to send circulars to every one in the trade, and we accept the lowest offer, no matter whose it is.

Mr. MULOCK. I have had experience in investigating public accounts, and where the circular system was adopted—for instance in the Militia Department—I can say, without fear of contradiction, that tenders were not invited from the trade generally but from the few favourites who were in the ring. I hope that system will not continue, under the new regime at any rate. If that old system of inviting tenders privately is enforced in connection with the Intercolonial, it cannot be stopped too soon, and I would ask the hon. gentleman, when making his statement, to say what proportion of supplies has been got during the last fiscal year as the result of competition after public advertisement and what proportion is the result of tenders invited by circulars sent out privately ?

Mr. HAGGART. It would be pretty difficult to separate the two, but we will look into it to-morrow.

Mr. MULOCK. When will the hon. gentleman make his statement ?

Mr. HAGGART. I was going to make it to-night. The revenue account of the Intercolonial comes in afterwards, and I will make it then, but the tenders are asked every six months, and the hon. gentlemen from the maritime provinces can state that every man engaged in the trade, who is able to furnish the article, has his tender received. They know when the tenders are to be received, and they all tender, and no fault can be found with the department under that head.

Mr. FRASER. Those who tender and are successful know the prices, but those who tender and are not successful do not. I have heard a good deal of complaint that favourites did get the tenders.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will apply at the department, he will get the details and the prices of all articles furnished by tenders.

Mr. FRASER. Those who tendered cannot very well do that.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, every one knows the price.

Mr. FRASER. Why, it takes a very long time to get an answer. I am merely saying what I hear, and I do not know that there is anything wrong.

Mr. FLINT. I notice that a large amount has been spent by the Intercolonial on printing and advertising. Those who criticise the expenses of the Government for printing and lithographing are not in the habit of taking into account the fact that this expenditure on the Intercolonial is in addition to the printing and advertising referred to in the first part of the Auditor General's Report. The advertising last year amounted to $9,249, and the printing and lithographing to $37,984. This amount is distributed very much in the same channels as the other sum for similar purposes. It is distributed among the Government organs in different parts of the country, and is no doubt a very strong inducement to them to stand up for the Government through all emergencies. I notice that the Halifax "Mail" received $570 for advertising last year, and the Halifax "Herald," which is really the same paper, received $5,141 for lithographing. The total sum which went to the "Journal's" office from the Intercolonial alone was $6,111, a very respectable sum. The Yarmouth "Times," a little local sheet, published in the county of Yarmouth, received for lithographing on account of the Intercolonial, $1,017, a very large sum for a small paper. It is a very curious circumstance that the Intercolonial Railway managed in Moncton has to go all the way to Yarmouth to hunt up a Tory paper to run up a large bill like that in the course of a year. This has been going on for a good many years. Of course, if these journalists and others have put in

tenders, they have a right to what they get. The Moncton "Times" received $297.88 for advertising, and, for printing, $14,175, a total put into their hands of $14,473—a very respectable douceur, which no doubt has its effect on the minds of the stockholders of that paper. The Quebec "Chronicle" received $2,000, and the St. John "Sun" the very respectable sum of $10,292. The total amount of these bills for printing and lithographing is $47,234. Add this to the $269,625 that is spent by the other departments for printing and it will be seen how large a sum of money is put in the way of a very very few individuals. I would like to ask the Minister how these orders are given ?

Mr. HAGGART. According to the mileage. I think the Intercolonial has less printing than any other railway. The hon. gentleman asks if this is done by tender. No ; the printing and advertising is regulated by an Order in Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the famous A, B, C order in which a description is given of various classes of Government organs.

Mr. HAGGART. There is so much for New Brunswick, so much for Quebec, and so much for Nova Scotia.

Mr. FLINT. I see that the poor unfortunate Queen's printer out of the large sum of money spent for printing and lithographing receives only $4,507. Why, when we have an extensive Printing Bureau at Ottawa, considered to be one of the best on the continent, why cannot we do that work as well there as by giving it to little printing offices throughout the country ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How are you going to keep the St. John "Sun," the "Herald" and the "Times" if you do that ?

Mr. FLINT. The advertising accounts ought to be upon a business basis. The Government in relation to advertising ought to choose its mediums for advertising just as a private individual would do in his own business, choosing the papers that have the largest circulation or having a circulation in the special locality it is desired to reach. But the Government gives this advertising to the journals all of one stripe. It is time a larger share of the printing was given to the Printing Bureau. Let the Dominion at large have the profit and take the temptation from our journalistic brethren.

Mr. HAGGART. The Queen's Printer has supervision over the prices of advertising and printing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would remind the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) that in the Printing Bureau we have no facilities for lithographic work.

Mr. McMULLEN. But you have for printing. The Minister of Railways has made a statement I should like to see him try to verify. He says that the printing and advertising on the Intercolonial is less than on other railways. Does he mean to say that it is less per mile, or does he compare the Intercolonial account with that of the Grand Trunk which has 4,000 miles of track or the Canadian Pacific Railway which has 5,000 as against 1,100 for the Intercolonial ?

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman had been listening he would have heard. I put it as clearly as I could. What I said—and I venture the opinion ; I do not know whether it is correct or not—that for the length of line and the business done, the Intercolonial expense for printing is as little as that of any other Canadian road.

Mr. McMULLEN. Take the printing per mile either of the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific and you will find that it is very much less than the Intercolonial. I went over the calculation last year. The hon. Minister is willing to venture the assertion, but he has not tried to verify it. If he had tried to verify he probably would not make it.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says he has verified his statement, so of course it must be correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman says he is not prepared to substantiate his statement. I say I went over the calculation, and I am prepared to challenge the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. HAGGART. I have not gone over the calculation.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before we leave this item, if there is nothing further to be discussed on the votes we have already considered, I would like to ask as to this $20,000 for increased accommodation at Sydney. What does that include ? There was a claim put in by Mr. Emery for accommodation at Sydney. Has that been settled, and if so, how ?

Mr. HAGGART. It went to the Exchequer Court, but I have forgotten what the judgment was. It was some years ago, I think.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the intention with regard to this $20,000 ?

Mr. HAGGART. That vote has been in every year for the last three or four years as the hon. gentleman must know, because he pays attention to the details of the Estimates. It is for the purpose of furnishing accommodation between the railway station and the wharf when the agreement is consummated between the department and the town. There is a difference between us and we have not come to an arrangement.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the town own the wharf ?

Mr. HAGGART. We purchased the wharf, as the hon. gentleman may remember, and intended to build a line to it. The town of Sydney was to furnish the right of way. They changed their mind, and wanted the station and the wharf for the terminus, at another place. We said to them: You pay us for the wharf, select the site of the station where you want it, with the terminus where you want it, furnish the right of way, and we will give you the road.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I would like to know of the Minister what is the result of the investigation that was held at Riviere du Loup about a large amount of goods which were stolen last year from the shed and cars?

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, we took action against the parties accused, and one of them was punished. We could not convict the others.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I think the only one arrested was the one who pleaded guilty.

Mr. HAGGART. We tried to get evidence, but we did not get evidence sufficient to convict.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I gave the officials the names of some persons as witnesses, and I am told they were never summoned to court. I would like to know why they were not brought into court?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must not expect me to know why it was that those witnesses were not brought into court.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I wished to know if an investigation was held there.

Mr. HAGGART. An investigation was made for the purpose of proving these parties guilty, but there was not sufficient evidence to convict them. We only succeeded in convicting one of them.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Was complaint made before a justice of the peace? In what way was the investigation held?

Mr. HAGGART. It was by our own officers. The inquiry was made by Mr. McDonald, our inspector down there, and Mr. Skeffington, who was the head of the detective police.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Can the Minister give me the cost of the loop line which was built from Riviere du Loup station to the wharf some years ago?

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot tell at present. I will furnish the hon. gentleman with the figures.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Is that branch used now?

Mr. HAGGART. Very seldom.

Mr. CHOQUETTTE. I would like to know how many cars have passed on that branch these last two years?

Mr. HAGGART. It will be very difficult to get that. Cars may pass or be shunted over the line, and no account kept of them.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I mean from the station to the wharf. I do not think there can be more than one or two.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think it is used at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. In regard to North Sydney, I understand the road is finished to that point. I think it is at that point that Mr. Emery's claim is set up for terminal accommodation. The Minister said that the case was in the Exchequer Court. I would like to know what amount was awarded to that gentleman.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the amount claimed was $80,000. They eventually came down to $18,000, and I think the amount awarded was in the neighbourhood of $7,000 or $8,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know what the Minister's regulations are with regard to passes over the Intercolonial Railway. I know he grants them to members of Parliament, and I presume to senators. I want to know if there are any other passes granted, to whom they are granted, and the number of them.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot tell. All the passes, I think, are granted under some form or Order in Council. I think the Lieutenant-Governors and some others are entitled to them. I seldom grant a pass myself, unless to a member of Parliament going from here down there; I do not believe, on the average, once a month. My intention is to give passes to every member and senator, the same as on other roads. I think members of Parliament, individually, ought to be entirely independent of the Minister, and I grant them all passes alike.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not charging the Minister with granting free passes himself. I only wanted to know the basis on which passes are granted, and the individuals to whom they are granted.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the manager of the Intercolonial Railway is governed by some rule in the granting of annual passes. They are given to managers of other railways, to Lieutenant-Governors, to members of the provincial governments down there, to the Admiral, to the General commanding the forces, to the bishops down there, and to the heads of the Methodist and Baptist conferences, and of the Presbyterian assembly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Passes are granted to those classes of people, and nobody is complaining of that; but what we want

to know is what passes are granted outside of these by the general manager.

Mr. HAGGART. There are only trip passes granted by the general manager; I do not know who they are.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there no rule for his guidance? Is it in his discretion?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The managers must have some discretion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to know what the limit is, because there is a great deal of complaint about it, that it is absurd to an intolerable extent.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know to whom he issues them, but, as a general rule, they are issued to employees of the railway, and other railways, and to some of the newspaper men. I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAMERON. I desire to relieve the mind of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) of the idea that the Cape Breton branch is a sucker on the Intercolonial Railway and a burden on the treasury of the Dominion. If separate accounts be kept on the Intercolonial Railway, making Moncton a dividing line——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why Moncton?

Mr. CAMERON. Because that portion of the Intercolonial Railway east of Moncton pays well, and the loss is altogether on that part of the road between Moncton and Quebec. The branches from St. John to Moncton, Halifax, Pictou and Cape Breton pay well, and I have no hesitation in telling my hon. friend that there is no part of the Intercolonial Railway, with the exception probably of that portion between Truro and Pictou, which pays as well as the branch in Cape Breton. I defy any one in this House or out of it, to prove anything to the contrary. If the hon. gentleman will go down to Cape Breton during the summer season, say, for instance, in July, and see the enormous amount of traffic and travel on that road, he will be easily convinced that no part of the road pays as well as the Cape Breton section, and that it is a pity a large number of branches should not be built to accommodate the tourists who visit that island during the summer season, in which case that branch would pay better than now.

Soulanges Canal—Construction..... $600,000

Mr. HAGGART. I desire to make a statement with regard to the changes proposed in the construction of the Soulanges Canal. In treating of the works of construction on the Soulanges Canal before this House on former occasions, I have explained that the canal is, for construction purposes, divided into thirteen sections, Archibald Stewart being the contractor for sections 1 and 2, O'Leary Bros. for section 3; George Goodwin for sections 4, 5, 6 and 7; Charles Raynor for section 8; Randolph McDonald for sections 9 and 13; Rogers & Taylor for section 10; Poupore, Fraser & Co. for section 11; and George Goodwin for section 12. With the exception of section No. 12, fair progress has been made with the work, there having been executed on sections 1 and 2, 35 per cent; on section 3, 62 per cent; on sections 4, 5, 6 and 7, 33 per cent; on section 8, 54 per cent; on section 9, 52 per cent; on section 10, 64 per cent; on section 11, 62 per cent; on section 12, 5½ per cent; on section 13, 41 per cent. The masonry consists chiefly of lock-work, none of which has yet been executed, though a large quantity of stone has been quarried and cut for the locks on sections 1 and 2. The late chief engineer, John Page, orginally planned this canal with six lift-locks, five of which had a lift of fourteen feet each, and the other had a lift of twelve to fourteen feet. These were the maximum lifts that Mr. Page was disposed to allow. Upon looking into this matter shortly after taking charge of the department, it became apparent to me that the physical features of the ground were well adapted to a reduction of the number of locks, and that it would be eminently to the advantage of navigation to increase the height of the lifts, by reducing the number of locks, and at the same time make a saving in the cost of the operation of the canal. Chief Engineer Trudeau who succeeded Mr. Page in office, was indisposed at first to make any alteration in Mr. Page's design, but after carefully considering my proposition, he agreed to reducing the number of lift locks to five, four of which are at the Cascades or lower entrance to the canal. As Chief Engineer Trudeau did not see his way to making the lifts greater than 17ft. 6in. for these four locks, the five lock plan was adopted, and the contract was let, but to do Superintending Engineer Monro justice, it must be said that he has always supported my view that there should be three locks only at this point, each with a lift of 23ft. 4in.; and Chief Engineer Schreiber is of our opinion, but after the work was commenced, I have felt the way was not freely open for such a change, and have hesitated to make it, though believing it to be in the public interest, but finding the contractor was not disposed to be unreasonable in the matter and that he was willing to carry out the work on the three-lock plan at his contract prices of $2.80 per cubic yard for concrete backing and foundation, and $14 per cubic yard for the face stone masonry. I called in Messrs. Walter Shanley and T. C. Keefer as consulting engineers in the matter, they have gone fully into the plans and estimates prepared by Mr. Monro, and have carefully considered the cost of construction and maintenance of the work, also giving attention to the question of the cost of the operation and the increased facilities it will give to the quick despatch of vessels passing through the canal. These

gentleman have reported strongly favouring the three-lock system from every point of view. I will now read what they say, and leave the House to judge of the wisdom of adopting this proposed change from a four-lock system to a three-lock system, and I feel satisfied the advantages of the three-lock system will be apparent to hon. gentlemen :

We have the honour to report that, in accordance with the request of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, as conveyed by your letter of the 6th instant, we have made a careful examination of Mr. Munro's estimates, specifications and plans for his four-lock system and for his three-lock system, at the lower entrance of the Soulanges Canal (section 1), with special reference (1) to the practicability of substituting three locks for four locks ; (2) to the cost of construction as affected by the proposed change ; (3) to the effect upon the annual cost of maintenance to be produced by such change ; and (4) to the question of the time required for passing vessels through this section of the canal under the two systems.

1. The practicability of overcoming the 70 feet of lift with three locks as well as with four, is indisputable in view of the fact that greater lifts with larger locks have long been in use elsewhere ; in the Liverpool docks, for instance, the lifts at certain periods of the tide approach to 30 feet. We may remark, too, that in the Nicaragua Canal, now under construction, it is designed to have a lock of more that 40 feet lift.

2. Upon the question of cost of the section with three lifts instead of four, we find that the three-lock plan would increase the quantities of the less expensive work, excavation, while the reduction in the number of locks from four to three would diminish the quantities of the more costly items, masonry, concrete, foundations, lock gates and machinery ; the ultimate difference being in favour of the three-lock system by a substantial amount, whether No. 1 plan of lock construction or No. 2 plan of lock construction, as described in the contract specification, be adopted.

3. The annual cost of maintenance will be reduced under the three-lock system by the wages of one crew of lockmen, and by the wear and tear of gates and machinery lessened in like proportion, as three is to four.

4. The effect of the proposed change upon the time required for navigating the section is in favour of the lesser number of locks. The time lost in locking is largely in slowing down to enter and in getting under way in leaving ; and in the handling of the gates and valves ; all of which will be reduced one-fourth by the doing away with one lock, while the total number of minutes required for filling or emptying the three higher-lift locks will be no more than for the four locks of lower lift, because of the greater head in the former and the less number of valves to be manipulated.

Locks upon canals, likes grades and curves upon railways, are necessary evils, and, therefore, should always be as few in number as the circumstances will permit. The governing consideration on section 1, Soulanges Canal, is the length of reach obtainable between locks. With four locks this length is the minimum admissable for the present length of lock, and, if adhered to, would prohibit the future lengthening of the lock. The length of the full-width portion of the reach as now planned is 410 feet, which is increased a little over fifty per cent by the narrowing approaches to the lock. This would necessitate careful, and therefore tardy, navigation in the case of two vessels, the united lengths of which might exceed 500 feet, meeting in the reach. By the throwing out of one lock, and so substituting two reaches for three, the length of the full-width portion will be increased to 810 feet, giving ample space for the largest vessels to meet and pass without warping.

In the four-lock system one of the reaches (owing to local conditions of the ground) is without the usual, and very necessary side-basin, or equalizing reservoir, for maintaining the full depth in the reach while it is being drawn upon for filling the lock below. The absence of such reservoir might be seriously felt in this case because of the shortness, and therefore limited water surface of the reach. The three-lock plan, with only two reaches, each with ample side reservoirs, effectually removes this objection.

We have referred incidentally to the consideration that the short reaches of the four-lock system would not admit of the future lengthening of the locks, which would only be done to provide for longer vessels, requiring of course, longer reaches than those now planned for shorter vessels. The lengthening of the lock in such cases would have the effect of shortening a reach none too long for the size of vessel for which the present plan of lock is designed.

If in the future it should be desired to lengthen the locks of our canal system, as is now being done on the Erie Canal, it will afford an opportunity for the introduction elsewhere of breast-walls under the upper gates of each lock, a plan which has been wisely adopted in the Soulanges Canal. This system of construction would effectually prevent disasters, such as have not infrequently occurred on the Welland Canal, from the bursting open of the upper gates by an ascending vessel, and which could not have taken place had the gates been protected by a breast-wall.

Mr. Monro's estimate for the four-lock system is.....	$440,000
And for the three-lock system.....	320,000
	$120,000

It may, and will, no doubt, be said, if this is such a great improvement why was it not so planned at the outset. I have already explained the cause. The late John Page was opposed to greater lifts than fourteen feet, if they could be avoided. Mr. Trudeau, his successor in office, was of a timid nature, and consequently was not disposed to very largely increase the lifts, urged though he was by my arguments in favour of fewer and larger lifts, when the physical character of the country would admit of it. Mr. Monro, who was more advanced in his views, and had kept a watch on what had been accomplished in other places in that respect supported the greater lifts, and Chief Engineer Schreiber, as I have before stated, after discussing the matter with me and Mr. Monro, gave the three-lock system his hearty support, after having had the report of Messrs. Shanley and Keefer read, the arguments they have advanced in its favour must, I am convinced, commend the change to the strong support of hon. gentlemen. The fifth lock is upon section No. 4. Up to

this time little preparations for constructing this lock have been made, but the contractor informs me that so soon as he has the great bulk of his prism work completed he intends to vigorously prosecute it. Upon sections 8, 10 and 11 large cast pipes of 10 feet in diameter, bedded in concrete, are being inserted to pass rivers under the canal. They are far advanced towards completion, and it is believed they will do good service. The ice last winter damaged one of these culverts, which was under construction, but measures have been taken to repair it and make it a good substantial piece of work. Upon section 13, a substantial steel bridge has been built to carry the Canada Atlantic Railway over the canal. The steel superstructure rests upon strong, well built massive masonry piers and abutments. The crib entrance piers at either end of the canal are well advanced. When this whole work is completed it will be a good straight piece of navigation with fine approaches at both the upper and lower entrances. The cost, based on the contracts under way, is estimated at $4,750,000, and there has been expended up to the 31st of May 1895, $1,643,800, leaving work to be done to the value of $3,106,800.

Cornwall Canal—Enlargement..... $350,000

Mr. HAGGART. The total estimated cost of the enlargement is $4,101,400. The expenditure up to 31st March, 1895, has been $3,560,400, leaving a balance to complete of $635,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it on the Cornwall Canal that an accident was recently reported to have occurred ?

Mr. HAGGART. The steamer "Ocean" carried away three of the gates.

Rapide Plat Canal $200,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman had better give a statement of what the present position of the work is on each of those items, how much remains to be done, and any other particulars.

Mr. HAGGART. Section 1, is under contract to Poupore & Fraser, $420,000 ; section 2, Weddell Dredging Co., $33,000 ; section 3, Poupore & Fraser, $143,000 ; then there are pier gates, J. R. Millar, $3,200. On section 1, there is a lock to be built the foundation of which has been a troublesome one to deal with. The greater portion of the work is dredging. The amount of expenditure, 1894-95 up to the 31st of March, was $172,450. Total estimated cost of building, $1,600,000.

Mr. DENISON. When the Soulanges Canal item was before the committee I was in the Chair, and with the permission of the House I wish to be allowed to say a word in connection with the question of the depth of the locks proposed on the Soulanges Canal. Since I first brought this matter up in the House a few years ago, the movement in favour of deeper water on the St. Lawrence Canals has gained a great deal in public interest. If the idea now spoken of in the United States is carried out, of putting a canal twenty or twenty-one feet around the Niagara River, the only point between Port Arthur and Montreal that would not have a depth of twenty feet would be the locks on the St. Lawrence canals. It seems to me that when the Minister is making these proposed changes in the depths of the Soulanges Canal, he ought to again consider the question of preparing the lock sills for a depth of twenty feet, so that if the idea should be carried out eventually, it can be done cheaper than if it were necessary to build the lock all over again.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Denison) must remember that would be necessary to have the locks the same width and breadth on the proposed canal, and to increase it, I am frightened, would be a good deal more than the cost of the new locks. However, the whole of the locks are nearly completed, except the one that Poupore & Fraser have to do with. The locks on the Lachine Canal, the Cornwall and Galops Canals are finished.

Mr. DENISON. It seems to me that ought be done. If we are going to build canals now of the same dimensions as we built them twenty-five years ago, it appears to me that it would be a mistake. As I understand it the same width would be sufficient, and there would not be much expense in lengthening the lock to correspond with those on the upper stretches.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the inspector on the Rapide Plat Canal ?

Mr. HAGGART. A man named Hickey is chief inspector.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was he once a member of this House ?

Mr. HAGGART. No ; it is a cousin of his, I think.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is his salary ?

Mr. HAGGART. Three dollars a day.

Galops Canal $140,000

Mr. HAGGART. This is to build the work at the upper entrance under contract with Messrs. Murray & Cleveland. The amount expended for the year 1894-95 was $80,700. Mr. Robertson is the superintending engineer, I think, and there is no clerk of works, and no inspector.

Mr. McMULLEN. How is it you have no inspector on this canal while you have an inspector on the Rapide Plat Canal ?

Mr. HAGGART. The other is more difficult work. Murray & Cleveland's work is

now approaching completion, and it is very simple work.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hickey is not an engineer.

Mr. HAGGART. No, he is chief inspector.

Trent Canal $400,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of that?

Mr. HAGGART. The total cost would be in the neighbourhood of $6,000,000, but the new design will reduce it to four and a half millions.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the changes in the new design as compared with the old?

Mr. HAGGART. It is by adopting the natural water-stretches and using hydraulic lifts and concrete blocks.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the depth of water?

Mr. HAGGART. Five feet on the mitre sill.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And it cost $6,000,000?

Mr. HAGGART. No, it will cost $4,500,000 when it is finished. That may be distributed over a number of years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Judging from past experience that is a correct observation. It is, I think, sixteen years since that was made to do duty at election time.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suppose this canal will be entitled to the name of the larger Tay Canal when it is finished? I wish to enter my protest against expending money on works of this kind in place of the development of railways and the deepening of our water courses, to the Atlantic Ocean, to twenty feet. The idea of expending such a large amount of money to connect certain water-stretches with a five-foot canal and locks, is absurd, because it is a tedious and expensive way of moving freight. In my humble opinion it is an exceedingly foolish expenditure, the whole thing from start to finish; and lest the Minister might on some future occasion say, as he said with regard to the Tay Canal, that no exception was taken to it, I want to raise my protest now against this foolish and insane expenditure, to which I am bitterly opposed.

Mr. HUGHES. I understand that hon. gentlemen opposite have on other occasions entered their protests against expenditures which to-day they endorse; and five years from to-day, when my hon. friend who has just entered his protest will see the great benefit which this canal will be to the Dominion of Canada, I trust that he will then apologize for the statement he has made here this evening. We have an instance in the Erie Canal of the benefit which a waterway much narrower and shallower than this is to the nation to the south of us. The Trent Canal is not, by any means, a wonderful undertaking; but it will shorten the distance from the west to the east by some 250 miles, which will be of great advantage for the transporting of grain. Large vessels can easily go to the town of Midland to unload, and from that point, barges holding from 10,000 to 15,000 bushels of grain can readily go by the Trent Canal to Montreal, which will mean a saving of three or four days. I am pleased to see that the hon. gentleman has simply entered his protest without giving any reasons therefor, and I fully believe that in his heart of hearts he endorses the undertaking. I am only sorry that he could not take a trip over the part already constructed, the connecting link, and see the plan which is being carried out. It is estimated that the saving in freight rates alone to the district tributary to this canal would more than pay the interest on all expenditure every year, ten times over. To get our grain to Port Hope, we have to pay more than the people in the western states have to pay to get their grain to Liverpool. The rates from Lindsay to the city of Toronto are 11 or 12 cents, whereas, from Chicago to Buffalo they have been made at 1¼ cents for corn, and 1⅛ cents for oats, and from Buffalo to New York at 1⅞ cents for wheat and 1⅝ for corn. From Chicago to Kingston the rate is quoted at 2¼ cents for corn, and from Kingston to Montreal at 2½ cents for wheat, and 2¼ cents for corn. We pay twice that to get our grain from Lindsay to Port Hope. It will be a great gain to the farmers of that district when the canal is constructed, and there will be many other incidental advantages from it which it is not necessary at present to discuss.

Mr. McMULLEN. I hope the predictions of the hon. member will be fulfilled, for, after the enormous cost of this work, I should desire to see some return from it. The hon. gentleman knows that the Erie Canal was constructed before railways were thought of. I question very much if the state of New York would build a mile of that canal to-day.

Mr. HUGHES. They are talking of enlarging it.

Mr. McMULLEN. They had to take some steps to prevent it becoming absolutely useless. But in the present embarrassed condition of the finances of this country, I think this is an unnecessary undertaking. I had an opportunity of viewing a part of this waterway some years ago, and I was pleased with the manner in which some of the work had been constructed; it appeared to be very substantial; that was the lock at Fenelon Falls. The intention in constructing that lock, I think, was that it should carry Hector

Cameron into Parliament, but it did not. The people got the lock, but Cameron did not get the seat.

Grenville Canal $40,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a new vote apparently ; what is it for ?

Mr. HAGGART. It appears that when the enlargement of that canal was carried on, the work was stopped before its completion, leaving the channel very narrow and shallow, and from the falling away of the banks, it is gradually becoming narrower, until it is now only about 20 feet wide. This amount is required to be applied towards the work at the points which most urgently need attention. The amount expended up to the 31st of March, 1895, on capital account was $4,035,533.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 12 o'clock, midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 3rd July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 138) to amend the Companies' Act (from the Senate).—(Mr. Foster.)

PRISON-MADE BINDER TWINE.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. Macdonald, Huron) asked, How many car loads of binder twine have been shipped from the Kingston factory (prison) to the Continental Cordage Company, Brantford, or to John Connor, Brantford, from February 15th, 1895, to June 20th ? At what price was same invoiced ? Is David Lambert, of Brantford, employed by the Government in connection with the prison binder twine plant, Kingston ? If so, how much is he paid, and what duties does he perform ? Is John Connor, of St. John, N.B., employed by the Government in same connection ? What is his salary and duties ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Two car loads have been shipped. The price in the invoice was the regular price charged to other purchasers. David Lambert is not employed in connection with the binder twine plant. John Connor is employed, not in connection with the binder twine plant, but as selling agent. He is not paid by salary, but by a commission on sales. His duty is to sell twine.

WRECK OF THE STEAMER "SAN PEDRO."

Mr. PRIOR asked, 1. Have the Government given instructions to their agents in British Columbia to remove the wreck of the steamer "San Pedro" from Brotchie's Ledge ? 2. If the present owners of said wreck object to waive their claims to ownership to the same, or to remove the same, have the Government power under existing laws to compel the owners to remove the wreck, or to remove it themselves ? 3. If the Government are not possessed of such powers, will they introduce legislation at once giving them the necessary authority ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Under existing powers instructions have been given in order that the wreck may be removed. If it is not removed by the owner, the Government will remove it.

THE DUTY ON PIPING.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, 1. Whether the Department of Customs has decided to exact the highest rate of duty on piping used by farmers for wells ? 2. Whether oil refiners are allowed to import pipes for use in oil wells at the lower rate of duty ? 3. If so, on what principle are pipes for use by oil refiners admitted at a lower rate than those required for the use of farmers ?

Mr. WALLACE. The Department of Customs has not decided to exact the highest rate of duty on piping. when imported to be used by farmers for piping wells. Duty will be collected in accordance with the provisions of tariff item No. 259, at the rate of 20 per cent ad valorem. 2. The rate of duty is the same for either purpose. 3. They are not.

MAIL SERVICE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, 1. What was the amount paid for carrying the mails from Ashcroft to Cariboo, B.C., in 1887 and 1888 ? 2. What are the terms of the contract under which the mails are carried from Ashcroft to Cariboo, and from Ashcroft to Lillooet ? 3. Is the contract for carrying the mails between Savona's Ferry and Cache Creek still in existence ? If not, when did it expire, and when did the subsidy cease ? 4. Who were the stockholders in the British Columbia Express Company in the years 1888 and 1891, and was the contract for car-

rying the mails made between these persons and the Government ? 5. When does the contract for carrying the mails between Ashcroft and Cariboo, Ashcroft and Lillooet, and Clinton and Lillooet expire ? 6. Who are the persons holding the contract for carrying the mails from Revelstoke to Nakusp, New Denver and Three Forks, from Revelstoke to Nelson, from Golden to Windermere and Fort Steele ? What are the terms of these different contracts, and the amount of the subsidies paid under each, and when do they expire ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. $24,000 for each year. 2. $24,000 per annum ; the service to be tri-weekly between Ashcroft Station and Clinton, weekly between Clinton and Barkerville, weekly between Clinton and Lillooet, and during the summer months, weekly between Ashcroft Station and Lillooet. 3. The mail service between Cache Creek and Savona's Ferry terminated on the 1st of March, 1895, and the payment therefor at the same time. 4. The contract for the mail service performed by the British Columbia Express Company was made with the company, but it is not known at the department who were the stockholders of the company at any time. 5. 30th June, 1896. 6. Nakusp and Revelstoke, contractor, Capt. Troup ; service as required ; rate of payment, 5 cents per mile ; expires at the Postmaster General's pleasure. New Denver and Three Forks : there is no such service. Both these offices are served by the Nakusp and Slocan Railway, which runs from Nakusp to Three Forks. Nelson and Revelstoke : There is no single service between these places. During the season of navigation mails are carried by steamer from Nelson to Robson, thence by the Kootenay Railway to Nelson. Golden to Windermere and Fort Steele—this is part of the route between Golden and St. Eugène Mission. The contractor is F. P. Armstrong ; frequency, weekly in summer, fortnightly in winter ; rate of payment, $3,000 per annum. The contract terminates 30th June, 1897.

WORKS AT GRAND ETANG, C.B.

Mr. FRASER asked, 1. Has the contractor fulfilled the terms of his contract in erecting the works at Grand Etang, C.B. ? 2. Who was inspector of said works ? How long was he employed, and what was he paid ? 3. Do the Government propose to excavate the channel to a depth of a foot below low water, so that a dredge can be used ? 4. Had the Government at the time they gave the contract for said works any guarantee that the municipal or any other authorities would build a new road or bridge ? 5. If the municipal or local authorities do not divert the public road nor build a new bridge, will the Government allow the works already done to go to decay ? If not, what will the Government do ?

Mr. OUIMET. The contractor has fulfilled the terms of his contract in erecting the works at Grand Etang, C.B., with the exception of the excavation in the channel. Mr. Joseph Boucet who was the inspector of the work, was employed from the 5th of March, 1894, to the 3rd May, 1895, and was paid $698.75, being at the rate of $2.50 per day when actually engaged on the work. The Government proposes to excavate the channel to a depth of one foot below low water so that a dredge may be used to do the remainder of the work. This cannot be done, however, until the road crossing the entrance of Grand Etang has been diverted and a new bridge built, and inasmuch as roads in Nova Scotia are vested in the provincial government, negotiations have been opened with the provincial government through the Secretary of State with a view of coming to an understanding in connection with the diversion of the road and the building of the new bridge.

THE WORLD'S FAIR, CHICAGO.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. Campbell) asked, 1. How many persons were sent to Chicago by the Dominion Government in connection with the World's Fair ? 2. The names and addresses of such persons ? 3. The sums paid to each of these persons for salaries, expenses, &c. ? 4. The total amount paid for all purposes in connection with said exhibition up to date ? 5. Are there any claims still unpaid, and if so, to what amount ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is no reason why that information should not be had, but it is a class of information which is usually asked for by means of a motion for a return, and I would suggest that that course be pursued.

Mr. MARTIN. A motion was passed for such a return last session, but the information has never been brought down, though I have asked for it repeatedly.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF MANITOBA.

Mr. MARTIN asked, Whether an appointment has been made to fill the vacancy in the office of Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba ? If not, how soon does the Government intend to fill the vacancy ? Has any promise been made to the present incumbent that he will be reappointed ? Is it intended that Hon. J. C. Patterson should take the position, and if so, when ?

Mr. FOSTER. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that no appointment has been made to fill the vacancy in the office of Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. The Government proposes to fill the vacancy shortly. No promise has been made to the present incumbent that he will be reappointed. The name of the person who takes that high and

responsible position will be announced when the appointment is made.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. Minister has omitted to answer the last part of my question.

Mr. FOSTER. It is all answered.

C. E. HICKEY, WILLIAMSBURG CANAL.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, 1. Whether Mr. Charles E. Hickey has been appointed to any position on the Williamsburg Canal ? (a.) If so, was it the position of superintendent ? (b.) What is his salary ? 2. Is it a fact that the salary of his predecessor, in the same office, was $1,400 a year, while that of Mr. Charles E. Hickey is $1,800 ? 3. If his salary is $1,800 per annum, what are the reasons which induced the Government to give him (Mr. Charles E. Hickey) a higher salary than that usually paid the superintendents of the canals ?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say : 1. Yes, Mr. Charles E. Hickey has been appointed to a position on the Williamsburg Canal. (a.) Yes, he was appointed superintendent. (b.) His salary is $1,800 a year. 2. Yes, the salary of Mr. Hickey's predecessor in office was $1,400.

Mr. McCARTHY asked, 1. Whether Mr. G. N. Hickey has been appointed to a position on the Rapide Plat Canal ? (a.) If so, when was he appointed ? (b.) What was the position he was appointed to ? (c.) What was his salary ? (d.) Is he still in the same employment? 2. Was Mr. G. N. Hickey appointed overseer or inspector in connection with any work on the Rapide Plat Canal ? (a.) If so, in what capacity? (b.) What were his qualifications for the position ? 3. Is any other person discharging the duty of inspector in connection with the work ? (a.) If so, who ? 4. Is J. Gillespie acting as inspector of the stone work on the new lock, Rapide Plat Canal ? (a.) If so, at what salary or wages ?

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. member, I beg to say :—1. Yes ; Mr. G. N. Hickey has been appointed to a position on the Rapide Plat Canal. (a.) He was appointed on 4th June, 1894. (b.) He was appointed to the position of overseer. (c.) $100 per month. (d.) Yes, he is still in the same employment. 2. Yes. (a.) Overseer. (b.) Considerable experience in connection with canal and other works. 3. Yes, there is another inspector in connection with the work. (a.) His name is John Gillespie. 4. Yes. (a.) At $3 per diem.

BORING THE STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. PERRY asked, Has the work of borings across the Straits of Northumberland been commenced for the present season ? If so, how many borings have been done to date ?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. HAGGART. I have to state that the preparation for the work of boring has been made, and all is in readiness to put down first boring when weather permits.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. YEO (for Mr. Rider) asked, What is the total amount now required to be expended to complete public works chargeable to income now in progress in—1st. Province of Ontario ; 2nd. Province of Quebec ; 3rd. Province of New Brunswick ; 4th. Province of Nova Scotia ; 5th. Province of Prince Edward Island ; 6th. Province of Manitoba ; 7th. Province of British Columbia ; 8th. The Territories ?

Mr. OUIMET. That answer cannot be given now. I am told that it would take at least ten days to prepare this statement, and I think the hon. gentleman might give notice of motion. The work will go on, all the same, at once.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Dropped.

DR. CHENIER'S MONUMENT—CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. BRODEUR asked, Have customs duties been paid on the statues of Maisonneuve and Sir John A. Macdonald erected in the city of Montreal ? If not, has the Government taken security from any persons for the payment of these duties ? Who are the persons and what is the nature of the security ? Has the committee charged with erecting a monument in honour of Dr. Chenier, or any one on behalf of the committee, requested the Controller of Customs to allow the monument of Chenier to pass the customs on the same conditions and on the like formalities as the monuments of Maisonneuve and Macdonald ? If so, has permission be given to make the customs entry as above stated ? If not, why has such permission not been granted ?

Mr. WALLACE. Customs duties have not been paid on the statues of Maisonneuve and of Sir John A. Macdonald erected in the city of Montreal. The statues were excepted from duty by Orders in Council. The committee charged with erecting a monument in honour of Dr. Chenier have asked that the statue be admitted free, and I have likewise submitted the question to Council for decision. No Order in Council has yet come to hand. Answered by reply to third question.

TELESPHORE GENDREAU, HARBOUR MASTER OF MONTMAGNY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant the inquiry asked for in relation to Téle-

sphore Gendreau, harbour master of Montmagny; and if not, why not?

Mr. COSTIGAN. As the Government has been informed that Mr. Gendreau has instituted proceedings against Mr. Lislois for damages for falsely and maliciously making charges against him, it is proposed to allow reasonable time for such proceedings before ordering a special inquiry.

MR. LOISELLE, EX-POSTMASTER AT STE. ANGELE DE MONNOIR.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would like to know from the Postmaster General why he has not laid on the Table all the papers concerning the dismissal of Mr. Loiselle. I was glad to hear him say yesterday that he had decided at last to bring down some of the papers, but I see that he has only brought down the inspector's report. He must know perfectly well that many other documents were asked for, especially the correspondence and vouchers and judgments, and the record of the case Loiselle vs. Guillette. These papers were ordered last year and also in 1892. The Postmaster General stated some time ago, in an answer to the question put by me, that the reason these papers were not brought down was they were lost in 1892. I contradicted at the time the declaration of the hon. Minister, and in support of that contradiction I will read to the House a letter of the Postmaster General, written in 1893, in which he declares that these papers are in his own hands:

Ottawa, 21st February, 1893.

My dear Mr. Brodeur,—I have received your letter concerning the case of Loiselle, of Ste. Angèle de Monnoir. This record, which could not be found last year, has been recovered; and I have no objection, if you desire, to have the papers deposited on the Table of the House with the exception of the inspector's report.

I am sorry that the Postmaster General claims now that these papers are lost and that they have been lost since 1892, when he states in his own letter in 1893 that the papers are in his hands. It will be seen that the declaration I made in the House is perfectly correct; I am sure that the Postmaster General will see to it that all the papers in this matter are filed. I do not know why the greater part of the record should be left out of the return.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has read a letter which, to my mind, proves nothing at all. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the controversy between us was about certain papers which had been transmitted, as I stated at the time to the Department of Secretary of State, long before I was Postmaster General, and which have never been recovered. I never stated that the evidence which was adduced in the case of Loiselle against Gervais was not to be found. When this matter was brought up at the time when Sir John Thompson was leader of the House, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) when asking for the papers, never referred to the record of the court as I understood him. In fact, this omission on his part was referred to by Sir John Thompson, who said it would be important before the Government decided whether the report should be brought down or not to know exactly what was the evidence adduced in the case of Loiselle and Gervais, and if the hon. gentleman had the papers and it would be convenient for him, it would be better that the Government should see these papers. I never understood that the hon. gentleman wanted me to produce the evidence. There has never been any controversy about that; I have never had any objection to producing that record. I understood that the hon. gentleman had that record himself, and I never understood that it would be of the slightest importance to him to have it brought down. As to the papers which have been lost, I have repeated so often the facts that I do not want to take up time further than to say again that they have been lost.

Mr. BRODEUR. No; the papers are not lost.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman will be kind enough to keep quiet until I have told him exactly how I understand the case. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman, and I think it not at all fair that he should interrupt when I am making an explanation to the House. I say the papers were lost from the department and have never been recovered. I never saw them, and I do not know what papers they are. I know that a certain part of the docket of the department was transferred to the Department of the Secretary of State of that time and has never been recovered. The controversy, as I understood it, was as to the report of the inspector, which I refused to bring down because I considered it was against the efficiency of the service to do so. And I still hold to my opinion. But, obeying the order of the House, I have brought down that report and it is now on the Table. If the hon. gentleman wants to have the evidence——

Mr. BRODEUR. I want the proceedings, the vouchers, the letters and all the other papers.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Though the hon. gentleman may want it ever so much, he cannot have that part of the report which has been lost. If he is not satisfied with those papers which can be brought down, I am afraid I cannot satisfy him.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PERRY. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when the

papers ordered by the House relating to the returns made to the department by the wharfinger for Tignish Harbour, P.E.I., for 1894, containing the list of vessels anchored and cleared into and out of said harbour, with amount of wharfage paid by each vessel, will be brought down. It is now about a month since the order of the House was passed, and I would like to know if it is the intention of the Minister to bring them down. He must know that this is an important matter, and it will be too late to bring the papers down on the last day of the session.

Mr. OUIMET. I will give the hon. gentleman an answer to-morrow.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works as to the paper regarding the site for the Portage la Prairie post office ?

Mr. OUIMET. I thought I had communicated a letter from my deputy.

Mr. MARTIN. That promised the return to-day.

Mr. OUIMET. No ; it promised it after to-morrow ?

Mr. MARTIN. No ; to-day, and to-morrow at the latest.

Mr. OUIMET. The letter, which I have before me, is not in accordance with the hon. gentleman's recollection.

MAIL SERVICE—LAKE ETCHEMIN AND ST. ROSE OF WATFORD.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to inquire from the hon. the Postmaster General whether he is prepared to state to the House when the papers I moved for on the 3rd of June last, will be laid upon the Table of the House, and whether they will be brought down during this session ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) What was the nature of the papers moved for, as I did not quite catch the words of the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. VAILLANCOURT. (Translation.) I moved for a copy of the contract entered into between the Postmaster General and Mr. Joseph Lamontagne, on the 1st July, 1894, for the mail service between Lake Etchemin and St. Rose of Watford ; also copy of all papers, correspondence, tenders and returns of inspectors relating to the cancelling of said contract, as also copy of the new contract subsequently passed by the Government, with the tenders which preceded the same. It is now over a month since the Order of the House was issued, and I think it is about time the papers should be laid before the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) I may tell the hon. gentleman that all the papers moved for, with the exception of the returns of the inspectors, will soon be brought down. I gave instructions to send over the papers to the Secretary of State, and they will be laid on the Table within a few days.

Mr. BRODEUR. And my papers—will they also be brought down ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think so.

MANITOBA SCHOOLS.

Mr. McCARTHY. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to ask the hon. leader of the House whether he can give us any information as to the remedial Bill. We know now that the answer has come, and the session is advancing; and I think the House would like to know whether the Government have determined to bring in a remedial Bill—whether we are to expect one this session.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend is very insistent. Only yesterday I told him that we had just received the documents from Manitoba. This morning for the first time they have been laid before the members of the Council. We cannot do legislation up quite so fast as that.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 91) to amend the law respecting the lobster fishery.—(Mr. Costigan.)

FOREIGN INSURANCE COMPANIES.

Mr. FOSTER moved concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 92) further to amend the Insurance Act.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the nature of the amendments made by the Senate ?

Mr. FOSTER. The amendments are unimportant. They provide that a foreign company, when it asks for license to do business, need not be granted the license, even if it performs all the conditions that are necessary, if it has a name which is the same name as a company now doing business in Canada. It is to prevent confusion of names.

Mr. EDGAR. In the judgment of the department ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

FEMALE OFFENDERS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 128) to amend the Act respecting certain female offenders in the province of Nova Scotia.

He said: This is a Bill promoted by Senator Power, in the Senate, to make more clear and distinct the powers of the court in dealing with these female offenders. In 1891 this Parliament adopted an Act respecting the reformatory established by the legislature of Nova Scotia, and provided that the persons contemplated by that local Act should be sent to the reformatory. In chapter 51, the judge, or stipendiary magistrate, were given authority to deal with these persons so brought up, and send them to the reformatory. The Bill now before the House proposes to amend that first section, and, as it appears to me, it is simply to define clearly the powers of the judge or magistrate in reference to the term during which these persons so brought up may be sent to the reformatory.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has explained in very general terms the object or the purview of this Bill. I am not going to object to its being read the second time, but I am not thoroughly satisfied that we are acting with the best discretion in the matter. As I understand the Bill, it is amending a measure we introduced some years ago, providing that certain female offenders might be sent, in the option of the police magistrate, to a reformatory, instead of to prison, and providing that he should have the power to send them there for the time during which he was authorized to send them to prison, if they were sent there. Now this Bill, as I understand it, contemplates extending the power of the magistrates, and whereas an offender might be sent to prison for three months for an offence for which she was convicted, under this Bill, it would be possible for a magistrate to send her to the reformatory for one, two, three, four, or five years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; four, if she is under twenty-one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But the hon. gentleman will see that if she was sixteen past, she could be sent to the reformatory until she was twenty-one.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And so if she were just past sixteen she would go to the reformatory for five years, whereas the offence might be of the character of mere vagrancy, punishable by law with three or four months' imprisonment, possibly three or four weeks, if she went to prison. Now, I wish to call attention of the committee to that. It may be in the hands of a very judicious man. I have no doubt those powers may be exercised in such a way as to benefit the class who are sought to be included in the Bill, unfortunate women, and others of that kind. But I cannot help calling the attention of the committee to the fact that we are investing an extraordinary power in the magistrate, and giving him a discretion which is not given to any other magistrate I know of. The hon. gentleman, I assume, is thoroughly well satisfied with the gentleman who holds the position now. I have no reason to doubt that he would exercise his discretion fairly well; though my experience in life has led me not to place the greatest confidence in judges and magistrates, or people of that kind. I have learned that they are human, and moved and swayed by human passions, just as much as those who are not on the bench, and all the glamour which is thrown around judges who sit upon the bench, has long since disappeared in my eyes, in matters of this kind. At the same time, I will not oppose the passage of the Bill if the hon. gentleman says that he considers it is one that, in his judgment, the House ought to approve of. I merely express my own fear that we are somewhat departing from the conservative course which hitherto we have followed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would say in addition to what I have already observed, that on general principles, I agree with the hon. gentleman, but I am acting here on the supposition, which I think is well founded, that we are proceeding largely with a local matter, where the local legislature has invoked our powers in order to enable them to carry out the object of the establishment of that reformatory, and the purposes for which it was established. The Bill is confined to the city of Halifax. The measure has the approval of the local legislature. In 1891 we gave the local judiciary these large powers, and gave them a jurisdiction, believing that they had well considered the operation of the measure in the locality to which it is confined. I may also observe that in 1891 we seem to have intended practically what this amendment now seeks, that is, we left to the local magistrate a very great discretion, without limiting the term at all. We said then that a person coming within that section might be sent to the common jail for a term of two months, or for any longer time. This Bill is to make that provision more distinct, and I think it would be safe, under those circumstances, to act in the line that the local legislature seems to have carefully considered.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A party in that case could not sue out a habeus corpus, though the period might be for five years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think not. I think we are going on dangerous lines if it was a general provision, but with that limitation, I felt safe in taking charge of the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is dangerous in the sphere, and so far as the sphere extends.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is limited to the city of Halifax.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has any provision been made to ensure that there shall not be any abuse of this discretion, for example in cases of commitment for vagrancy. I can understand that a woman, 16 or 17 years of age, might be arrested on the charge of vagrancy and sent to the reformatory for four years. I dare say the discipline would do her good, but at the same time this would be a very serious interference with the liberty of the subject.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think we have met that objection. This institution is open at all times to the inspector of penitentiaries, and so long as any aid is received from the city of Halifax, it is also open to the inspection of the municipal authorities.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Even that does not meet the point I raised. I suggest whether it would not be well in case a magistrate exercised his discretion and committed an offender to the reformatory for a longer term than that for which he could have sent the offender to prison, that he should make a return to Parliament, giving the name of the person, the punishment, the term of the imprisonment and the offence for which imprisoned.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman's object might be secured by having the inspector mention each in his annual report. I will see that instructions are given to that end.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would there be any difficulty in requiring that the judge shall in all cases report to the Minister of Justice within a few days after giving sentence the fact that such sentence had been given, and the Minister present a return of such sentences within ten days of the opening of Parliament?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a proposition which might be considered.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am having in my mind a possible abuse of the power.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman's object could be attained in the way I have suggested. I should not like to come into unnecessary collision with an institution which is largely local, while at the same time this Parliament is within its right in seeing that no injustice is committed by virtue of this Act or anything we may do. I still incline to favour the provision we have now, whereby we can get all the information we require, and that information can be presented to the House at any time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I. I do not understand how the Minister of Justice could come into collision with the institution by having the facts reported.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It must be remembered that we have very wide powers now. We can appoint any officer to visit the institution and obtain such information as we may require, and the House can also take such course as it pleases. I should favour the exercise of our present power rather than undertake to place the institution under more immediate control.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The judge might report the cases to the Minister of Justice, and the Minister might report to Parliament all those cases where the judge sentenced offenders to terms of imprisonment beyond those to which he could have committed to the common jail.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will undertake to communicate with the local authorities, so that we may arrange a plan suitable to all concerned.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

GENERAL REVENUE FUND OF NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Bill (No. 134) to legalize payments heretofore made to the general revenue fund of the North-west Territories, of certain fines, penalties and forfeiture (Mr. Daly) was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman state the object of this Bill?

Mr. DALY. I have stated it twice already, and I presume the hon. gentleman was not in his seat at the time. In 1887 an Order in Council was passed at the instance of the North-west legislature providing that fines imposed for the infraction of the North-west Liquor Act should be paid over to the general revenue fund of the Territories. Thereupon an Order in Council was passed, and at that time there was $4,984 in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor, but that included fines other than fines which were imposed for infractions of the liquor law of the North-west Territories. The Auditor General has taken exception to these moneys being paid over without proper authority, and we are now seeking legislation to confirm the action taken by the Government. The objections taken by the Auditor General were: First, that the sum included moneys collected for infractions of other laws than the license law; and, second, that the Order in Council was not retroactive.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the Dominion Government be entitled to these fines except for this legislation?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. If the money is the property of the Dominion, then why give it to the Territories ?

Mr. DALY. Because the moneys were collected in the Territories by the officers of the Territories, and for the infraction of laws in the Territories. They were entitled under the general law to these fines.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this a pure gift to the Territories ?

Mr. DALY No; as the hon. gentleman knows, the North-west Territories Government is still in leading strings. Although we vote money here which is expended by the local government, yet the accounts are audited by the Auditor General. Under ordinary circumstances, if these moneys had been collected by the provinces, they would belong to the provinces, and, being collected in the Territories, ipso facto, they belong to the North-west Territories treasury.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman propose to continue this, or is it merely to apply to the past ?

Mr. DALY. It is to be continued, of course. When I said that Canada would be entitled to these moneys, I meant Canada in right of the North-west Territories.

Mr. McCARTHY. If it is intended to legislate not merely for the past but for the future, the language of the Bill will have to be changed.

Mr. DALY. We do not require any legislation for the future, because the Order in Council provides for the payment to the North-west Territories Government of all fines, subsequent to the Order in Council of 1887.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, instead of using the word "ratified" in the Bill, it would be better to use the word "legalized."

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INCORPORATION OF BOARDS OF TRADE.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 137) to amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade (from the Senate).

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the change proposed by this Bill ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to allow certain districts to form boards of trade, which, under the old definition, cannot do so. It is done in the interests of two applications which have been made, one from the town of Mattawa, which, under the old definition, could not, of itself, form a board of trade, and which, by adding two townships to it can do so. The object of the Bill is to extend the definition sufficiently to allow all towns in that way to form boards of trade, and so have the advantages which come from gathering themselves together for commercial purposes.

Mr. McMULLEN. It does not interfere with any existing boards of trade ?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. EDGAR. One would think that the new districts taken in were more suitable for agricultural societies than for boards of trade.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must recollect that the districts lying around a town have sometimes very large cheese and butter interests, and it is with reference to these that boards of trade are formed.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Bill (No. 127) further to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. McCARTHY. I would like to know what change this makes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. None. We have been voting the salaries in the Estimates, and they should be contained in a Bill. That is the whole object of the clause.

On section 2,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no new appointment here.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this the rule that applies to the other provinces ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. This is simply to carry out the principle that ought to have obtained in these cases as in all others, but was omitted, that is, to include in the general laws the provision for these salaries as well as to vote them in the Estimates.

Mr. McMULLEN. How does the hon. gentleman arrange for the expenses of the judges in attending court in Manitoba ? A lump sum is allowed in Ontario.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A per diem allowance for the sittings and mileage. A regular return is sent in and audited.

On section 3.

Mr. McMULLEN. This matter, I think, was under discussion in the House before. This Bill proposes to increase the salary of this judge, which, I think, this House should resent.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When the resolution was under consideration it was suggested that I should obtain information which was not then at my command, in order to give the House some idea of the amount of business conducted in the Admiralty Court of British Columbia, because, as hon. gentlemen pointed out in that debate, it did appear as if this court had very little to do, and that the salary which was fixed for this office in Nova Scotia was ample for the judge in British Columbia. At that time it appeared that only one case had been dealt with in the Admiralty Court of British Columbia in the last year. I have a return from British Columbia, however, showing that the work of that court now, and possibly for years to come, is and will be relatively greater than the work of similar courts in the eastern provinces, and hon. gentlemen will see at once what gives rise to that. Under the international arrangement between Great Britain and the United States all the cases of seizures come into the Admiralty Court, and, consequently, ever since that award was adopted, that court has been very busily engaged indeed. I will give hon. gentlemen some idea of the amount of work by referring to this return briefly. There were four cases tried in the Admiralty Court in 1891, as stated by the hon. leader of the Opposition. But this is what has happened since, and what I think I will be able to show the House will continue to occur.

Mr. LAURIER. I followed the statement of Sir John Thompson.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Things have happened since then which have changed the whole complexion of the case. I have in my hands a return from the registrar of the court, showing that while only four cases were dealt with in 1891, in 1892 there were seventeen; in 1893, sixteen; and in 1894, fifteen. This year, although yet very early for bringing these cases to court, as most of them are sealing cases, there have only been five entered; but the collector at Victoria is of the opinion that there will still be a large number, because sixty-four vessels have cleared from Victoria this year, of which forty-two are engaged in the Behring Sea, right within the area of the award. When the late judge was appointed, he received $600 for comparatively little work. I need not refer in this connection to the other very important statements made by representatives of British Columbia as to the growing commerce of the province, its increased shipping, as compared with the provinces to which I particularly refer. I refer to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick particularly, because there $1,000 has been fixed; and, looking back to the debate, I do not hesitate to say that if these figures had been before the Minister of Justice in 1891, he would have been bound to ask the House to appropriate $1,000 for each of these courts, because, on the basis of work done, the discrimination is absolutely unjust, in my opinion, to British Columbia. I have here a list of all the various cases, the ordinary admiralty cases, some involving very large amounts—one in 1892 for $7,000; another, $3,500; another $8,000; another, $20,000; salvage cases, and so on—all a class of cases which are intricate, and give a great deal of work. Therefore, I think the case is very strong, indeed. I shall not trouble the House with reading the return I have here of the arrival and departure of vessels and their tonnage, and so on, at British Columbia ports, as compared with Halifax, Montreal, St. John and Toronto; but I may say the comparison is very largely in favour of this court. Before sitting down I may remind the House that we have already voted $1,000 in the supplementary Estimates to Chief Justice Davie, and in the last Estimates. That will go for what it is worth. The House, having passed those votes, with the facts as they stand, should make the provision the same as in the courts to which I have referred, remembering always that there is not an increase, but a decrease, in fact, in the salary heretofore paid the chief justice of British Columbia, as compared with that which, under this readjustment of salary, will be paid.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the fact that the vote happened to be passed in the Committee of Supply has anything to do with the decision we may come to in this matter, when brought formally before us. It frequently happens that these votes are passed in Supply, and no questions asked, especially when it is apparent that it is a statutory increase.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I stated when the supplementary vote was moved exactly how the difference was made up.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) However, it was evident, in the discussion on the resolution, that the committee did not think that there was sufficient ground to justify the increase in the salary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the absence of the facts I have mentioned.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Very well, the only question now is whether the fact that the certain number of cases to which the hon. gentleman referred justifies the increase in

the salary. It is pretty dangerous ground to take that because there has been a very slight increase, the salary must be increased. Unless the increase is of so great a character as to absorb a very large portion of the judge's time, I do not think we should propose any increase in the pay. As a matter of fact, we know that these admiralty cases are constantly changing. I remember, some few years ago, we had a large number in Prince Edward Island, because they were then trying to enforce the provisions of the Washington treaty. People were breaking its provisions, and were constantly brought into court.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is a permanent treaty in this case, remember.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I dare say there have been in the Vice-Admiralty Court in British Columbia more cases than for many years, but that was anticipated. It was well understood that there must be, in process of time, a fair amount of business in a place like British Columbia. The hon. gentleman says there is discrimination. There is no discrimination. The chief justice of Prince Edward Island has $600 allowed him as the vice-judge in admiralty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why, in Quebec, the judge gets $2,000 a year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, but the hon. gentleman will remember that the late Sir John Thompson said, when moving the vote in the House, that he moved it to the individual who held the office because he had received it from the Imperial Government, but that when he died or resigned, or a change was made, his successor could not hope to get that amount paid to him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But not to reduce it to $600.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He did not say the amount he would reduce it to, but gave the House distinctly to understand that the House was not in any way committing itself to a $2,000 salary; and, speaking for himself, he said he thought it was far beyond what the position would, under ordinary circumstances, justify the House in voting. But, under the peculiar circumstances, as a kind of pension, as it were, to the person holding the office at the time, because the old office was abolished, we were to continue on the salary. The chief justice of British Columbia, by the Admiralty Act of 1891, was placed in the same position, and at the same pay as the chief justice of Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman will admit that, from time to time, there are many cases in the Admiralty Court in Prince Edward Island; and if we were to take the position that because there have been a half a dozen, or a dozen cases at Charlottetown in any one year over another, we should increase the salary, we would be doing an injustice to the country. When the hon. gentleman cited the number of cases instituted in the court, did he wish us to understand that that number of cases had been adjudicated upon or merely instituted?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Adjudicated. I have the complete return. Some of them may have been settled out of court, but these were the actions instituted, and I think nearly all of them adjudicated upon.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Every day in the week, in maritime ports, actions are instituted, sometimes a little hastily, and withdrawn, and sometimes they are settled before going to trial.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Here is the list: In 1895, the Queen vs. the ship "Shelby"; that case is still pending. Maclure & Bingham vs. the ship "Velox"; action for $1,200, judgment for the plaintiff. Canadian Pacific Navigation Company vs. ship "Eva"; that was settled out of court. McCarthy against the ship "Cruiser"; that was tried in 1894. Hayter against Ward & Co., trial in 1894, and judgment. Mack & Beattie against schooner "Pinchard": settled out of court. Ward & Co. vs. "Norma"' settled. McGuire vs. ship "Pendeckton"; tried and judgment given. Canadian Pacific Navigation Company vs. the "Lawrency"; settled between the parties. Canadian Pacific Navigation Company vs. the ship "Eumenides"; judgment after trial. Jacobson against the wrecked "Archer"—trial and judgment—1894. Canadian Pacific Navigation Company vs. "Archer"—trial and judgment—1894. Canadian Pacific Navigation Company vs. the ship "Wrestler"—action of 1894—settled out of court. Ship "Henrietta"—trial—judgment for the plaintiff—1894. Thorson et al, ship "Henrietta"—trial and decree—1894. Pickney against ship "Henrietta"—trial and decree—1894. Wilson vs. the ship "Eva"—settlement out of court—1894. It will be observed, Sir, that I did not state the case as strongly as it might be stated. These were not Behring Sea cases, they have nothing to do with the award. With the 64 ships there and the close manner they are watched, it is evident that the business of the court is of a difficult and intricate character.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will pardon me for saying that he has stated the case stronger than it really is. I understood that these cases were adjudicated upon and judgment given by the judge. But now it appears that not one-half of them have been tried and adjudicated upon. I would merely wish to repeat my protest. I think it is improper ground that Parliament is proceeding upon to raise the salary

of a judge because there is for one or two years an abnormal business in court. That will soon rectify itself. We settled this amount with British Columbia—to the——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was only one case then.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—on the basis of the salaries paid in other provinces. If you disturb that relation you will find yourself in this position:—The admiralty judge in Prince Edward Island, who receives $600 will say: My salary was fixed at the same as that of the chief justice of British Columbia, and I do as much business as the chief justice of British Columbia——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He could not say that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You may have these one or two years to cite showing an increase of business——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not one or two, but three or four.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Take for two or three years before in Prince Edward Island and you will find that the business was twice as much as in British Columbia. So it is always changing; but I suppose that on the average it will be about the same. To do justice, if you determine to raise any of these salaries at all you will have to raise the salaries of the others. We settled these salaries, on a very fair basis, in 1891, and that basis ought not to be disturbed.

Mr. McCARTHY. I take the view of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. I do not think that because the business appears to have increased since 1891, even to the extent represented by the Minister, that justifies an increase of the salary; while the mischief anticipated by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is pretty certain to flow from it. Any time there is an increase of business in any particular place the Minister will be pestered with applications for increase in salary, if he yields in this case. Now, it must not be forgotten that this salary is attached to an office filled by a gentleman who fills another office as well, and from that office he derives a very good salary. What is the salary of a chief justice?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am glad the hon. gentleman asked me that before going on with his line of argument. The predecessor of the present chief justice received $5,820 a year. Under the Act of union it was provided that British Columbia being a much smaller and less important province than it is now and having nothing like the business it has now, that after retirement or death of the chief justice of that day, the salary should be $5,000 instead of $5,820. So, when Mr. Davie was appointed chief justice, he received $5,000 a year. By recognizing the work in the admiralty of which he is judge, and giving him $600 for it, we can prevent him suffering the whole reduction or disparity between the salary paid his predecessor and himself—$820—and still have a saving to the country of $420, which he will receive less than his predecessor and not a large salary by any means.

Mr. McCARTHY. Of course, we are not paying the judges upon the same scale as the judges paid by the British Government. This salary of $5,820, I suppose, was that paid to the chief justice of British Columbia by the Imperial authorities. When it is considered that the judges in the courts in the province from which I come, except the chief justice, receive only $5,000 a year and the enormous work they have to do in comparison with anything that is to be done in British Columbia, it appears to me that this increase in salary is wholly unnecessary and wholly unjustifiable. The local judge in Toronto district only gets $600 per annum. It may be said that the local judge has only to do with the admiralty jurisdiction of the lakes. But nobody can tell that that business may not increase very largely, and on that ground if this salary is to be increased, Judge Macdougall might ask for an increase also. I do trust the Government will not press this, unless there is an attempt to raise the salaries all round, which I would not object to. But I do think it would be invidious to give the chief justice of British Columbia a higher salary than is given to the chief justice of Manitoba who is paid $5,000. All their time is devoted to the public. Of course they cannot do more than the time permits. Under these circumstances I think the chief justice of British Columbia will be well paid at $5,600.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the hon. gentleman would do well to adopt the suggestion which is made. It is to be remembered that, even if the chief justice has some extra work to do in the maritime court, in the time he devotes to that he is relieved from other duties. His whole time is the country's, and if he fills two offices and the duties of one of those offices increases, he is to that extent relieved from the discharge of the duties of the other. Now, is the Minister about to lay down the principle that the judiciary are to be paid on the quantum meruit basis? He cites the work of this year to sustain his resolution, and, if I caught his figures correctly, there have been only five cases entered in the maritime court of British Columbia this year, and one of these has been settled; so there are only four cases likely to require the attention of the judge. If the increase goes on at this rate you will have eight cases in the maritime court for this year. And for this he is to receive not only the $600 about which there is no question but a bonus of $400 a year for all time to come. The proposition is indefensible on any ground that can be suggested.

Mr. McCARTHY. This never can be decreased during the life of this man.

Mr. MULOCK. It is for all time, as I say. There are judges drawing salaries as maritime court judges having practically nothing to do. The judge in the maritime court of Toronto receives $600 a year. And how many cases does he have in a year? If we are going to pay on the principle of the number of cases, you will have to proceed to scale down as well. I do not find any suggestion by the Minister to reduce the salaries where the work has fallen off, but I only find suggestions in the direction of an increase. Now, as I have pointed out before, I hope the sense of the House will be taken on this Bill when the committee rises. This is an initial step towards encouraging invitations for an increase of salary on the part of the judges from one end of this country to the other, not merely judges of the superior courts, but of the county courts as well. It is an unjustifiable step, it involves thousands of dollars, and I am satisfied that it is not proposed in the public interest. This incumbent was appointed with full knowledge of the law. There was a provision on the statute-book that as soon as the then chief justice died or vacated his office, the salary should again be put back to $5,000, and we now have an admission by the Minister that this scheme is not for the purpose of compensating him for his services a a maritime judge, but to some extent to make up for the reduction in the salary that took place when the former chief justice died. Now, the admission made by the Minister to-day is quite intelligible, and it brings us back to where the debate left off before, when I asked the Minister if there had been any understanding with the new incumbent that he should have this increase of salary. If there is something of that nature, I can understand the Minister pressing his Bill, but I cannot understand him pressing it in the public interest: and if he persists in pressing it, I trust there will be a division taken, and that the members will have an opportunity to place themselves on record on this most dangerous and unsound principle.

Mr. MARA. The argument of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would hold good if he could show that the Government have to pay more to the chief justice now than they did formerly, or if it could be shown that the province of British Columbia is singled out for the purpose of paying the chief justice of that province more than is paid to the corresponding judge in any other province of the Dominion. Instead of receiving a larger salary than the late chief justice got, the present chief justice will receive $420 less, and instead of British Columbia being singled out and the chief justice paid more than in any other province, we find that in Nova Scotia where the work is less, the salary is the same.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the work is less; that statement cannot be borne out. I do not mean to say that for a short time the work cannot be shown to be larger than in British Columbia, but taking an average of five years, I will undertake to say that the business in the admiralty court in Nova Scotia, is more than double or treble that of British Columbia.

Mr. MARA. Five years is not a fair average to take. The hon. gentleman must remember that British Columbia has advanced by leaps and bounds during the last three years, the shipping is very much larger, and if you take an average at all, you must take it for three years and not five, because the business there has increased, and will continue to increase. However, the point is this: is the chief justice of British Columbia receiving more than he is worth? Is he receiving more than any gentleman should receive holding that high and important position? If hon. gentlemen opposite take the stand that the hon. member for North York has taken, we will know where they are. I regret very much to see the hon. member for North Simcoe taking the position that the judges—because that is inferentially the position—are paid too large salaries.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I would like to see them paid larger salaries.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He says they are not paid enough, but he does not want to see this judge paid enough until the others are paid more.

Mr. McCARTHY. I want them to be kept even.

Mr. MARA. In other words, if the other judges are paid too little, he will not allow one judge to be paid what he considers he should be paid. I am glad to see hon. gentlemen opposite say that they will take an opportunity to divide the House on this question, as they will let the people of British Columbia see where they stand. The only thing that I regret is that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), judging from his remarks, will be found voting with hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The position taken by the hon. gentleman is a very extraordinary one. He says that unless you pay a judge in British Columbia more than you pay a judge anywhere else for the discharge of his duties, you are acting in a way unfriendly to British Columbia, and he threatens hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with the indignation of British Columbia if they do not submit to that sort of proceeding. Now, Sir, I claim here not merely to represent the constituency that sent me here, but I am acting here as a representative of Canada, not of the province of Ontario. I suppose this Parlia-

ment represents the Dominion and not the province; and the hon. gentleman stands up here and argues that if the judge in British Columbia is not paid a larger sum in proportion to his services than any other judge in the Dominion, you are dealing unfairly with British Columbia, and you will be visited with the indignation of the people of that province. Well, Sir, I have a better opinion of the people of British Columbia than the hon. gentleman has presented of them to this House. I believe that the people of British Columbia have the same interest as people in other portions of the Dominion, in conducting the affairs of this country honestly and economically. The hon. member has referred to the salary that was paid to a former judge, an Imperial appointee, whose salary was fixed by the Imperial Government. What did we do with regard to that salary? Why, we said it was too much. We said that as a matter of good faith with the party who was appointed to the office, he was entitled to receive the salary that was attached to the office at the time of his appointment, but we said at the same time, with the concurrence of the representatives of British Columbia, that that was too high a salary, and that when his successor came to be appointed as a Canadian appointee, the salary should be fixed with reference to the services which he performed and the importance of the office which he held. That was the principle adopted. Now, the Minister of Justice argued here to-day that because a judge received that Imperial salary, we are to be guided by it, we are to look back to a salary which this House pronounced too much in order to fix the salary of this chief justice with reference to the discharge of his duties as an admiralty judge. The hon. member presses that upon us wholly without regard to the amount of business done. The representation was, I think, when we discussed this matter last, that there had been one case tried in the court of admiralty in British Columbia in three years. Yet notwithstanding that representation, the hon. member presses this increase of salary, and presses it, not on the ground of the services which the judge had to discharge, but because his predecessor had received a larger salary as an Imperial appointee. Well, Sir, I would like to know upon what ground you are going to make the salary of the chief justice of British Columbia $6,000, and to leave the salary of the chief justice of Nova Scotia, with more than double the population, at $5,000? That is the position. Do you think the chief justice of Nova Scotia, or the chief justice of New Brunswick, would be satisfied with the salaries they are receiving, if you increased the salary of the chief justice of British Columbia to $6,000?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is what the chief justice of Nova Scotia receives.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The salary of $5,000, and he receives $600 more.

Mr. DALY. $1,000 more.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking now of the salary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The chief justice of Nova Scotia receives $5,000, and the chief justice of British Columbia will receive $5,000. But the chief justice of Nova Scotia receives $1,000 as judge in admiralty, and the grievance will then be the other way. Unless this Bill be adopted, there will be an invidious distinction between admiralty work on the Pacific and admiralty work on the Atlantic.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman knows that in the province of Nova Scotia, if you were to undertake to enforce your fishery regulations, and to protect your fisheries, you would have five times the business in the admiralty court of Nova Scotia that you have in British Columbia. What we require here is to pay a salary that will secure the services of competent men in the discharge of those duties, and we believe that salary is sufficient now. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, that none of his predecessors in office have undertaken unduly to press the question of the salaries of the judges upon the attention of this House. They have proposed to declare that the salaries in their estimation were not what they ought to be, and yet whenever a discussion took place in this House, and there was an evident indisposition to increase the salaries, that proposal has been withdrawn. What will the hon. gentleman do with his proposal at the present time? He presses this upon the attention of the House against the judgment of the House, and I think the hon. gentleman will find the result to be that a large proportion of the population of this country who now believe that the salaries are too high, will make a general demand for a reduction of salaries all over this Dominion. That will be the effect of the proposition of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DALY. In previous discussions that we have had upon a similar resolution, the hon. gentleman took exactly the same ground that he does now. I do not think it is at all fair to say that the member for Yale (Mr. Mara) desires that the chief justice of British Columbia should be paid a larger salary than the other chief justices. But what the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) wants, and what I want, and what I pressed on the attention of the committee was, that the chief justice of British Columbia should be paid exactly the same sum and be placed exactly on the same footing as the chief justice of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why not the chief justice of Manitoba?

Mr. DALY. Manitoba is not a maritime province, and the parallel does not apply. If the chief justice of Manitoba had to perform the duties discharged by the chief justice of British Columbia, I should press for the same increase in his case. We pay $1,000 additional to the chief justice of Nova Scotia for the performance of additional duties as a judge in admiralty, and make an invidious distinction by not paying the chief justice of British Columbia the same amount for the same work. Living is more expensive in British Columbia, and if, as the hon. member for Yale has said, it is necessary to take an average of three years in order to find the business done by the court, I undertake to say that in three years from now the business of the admiralty court of British Columbia will have increased fourfold. The whole business of the province is increasing, the maritime business particularly. There are steamship lines running to Japan and Australia, and the number of vessels will probably be increased within a few years, and the shipping business is increasing generally, and consequently the volume of business before the admiralty court will likewise increase. If the Bill is not agreed to, and the chief justice of British Columbia is not placed at the same salary as the chief justice of Nova Scotia for performing similar duties, we are making an invidious distinction in favour of Nova Scotia. The Minister of Justice has given an illustration of the increase of the work of the admiralty court in British Columbia.

Mr. MULOCK. Four cases this year.

Mr. DALY. It makes no difference if there are only two cases; the judge is there to discharge his duties whether there are only two or three cases. I would like to ask how many cases have been tried in the admiralty court of Nova Scotia this year, whether one, two or three cases. The hon. gentleman cannot say, nor can I. If there were five or ten cases the chief justice is receiving $1,000 additional salary on that account. All we say is that the chief justice of British Columbia, who is discharging the same duties as the chief justice of Nova Scotia, should have the same salary. No one is losing anything by it.

Mr. MULOCK. The country is losing $400 a year.

Mr. DALY. No. The previous chief justice of British Columbia received as chief justice $5,820 and $600 as admiralty judge, and all that is being done by this Bill is to place the salary of the chief justice of British Columbia on the same footing as that of the chief justice of Nova Scotia in this regard.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is very curious that these arguments did not strike the attention of the hon. gentleman four years ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The facts were not before us.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) After the matter has been threshed out, the then leader of the Government recorded his deliberate judgment that the amount then asked was all he could conscientiously ask for the admiralty work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The chief justice of British Columbia was then receiving over $6,000 a year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. Minister wants to level up and to place the judges of all the maritime provinces on the same footing. Why does he not apply that principle to the case of Prince Edward Island?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not under discussion before the committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has argued that because a certain sum is paid in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the same sum should be paid in British Columbia. But in Prince Edward Island the chief justice only received $4,000 as chief justice and $800 as judge of the admiralty court. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to place the salary of that chief justice and admiralty judge on a level with that of the chief justice and admiralty judge of British Columbia?

Mr. DALY. There is no proposition before the committee to equalize the salaries.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to know why there is not such a proposition. If the principle is a correct one, why should it not be applied to Prince Edward Island?

Mr. DALY. Because I was not aware of the facts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman not pledge himself to remedy the injury?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Put a notice on the paper.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When once the door is opened to remedy what is alleged to be an injustice, I consider that the whole question should be considered, and salaries of all the judges levelled up or levelled down. The hon. member for Yale challenges us to take a vote. I am prepared to consider the judges' salaries all round, and give my vote and judgment in each case as well as the hon. member, but I am not prepared to select one particular judge or a particular part of the Dominion and say that an increase should be granted there, while at the same time judges occupying similar positions and discharging similar functions in another part of the Dominion are left with

reduced salaries. How could I go back and justify myself to the people of the maritime provinces if I voted to increase the salary of the chief justice of British Columbia so as to make his salary $6,000 and leave the salary of the chief justice of Prince Edward Island at $4,800? On what principle is such action justified? Is the Government for the time being to select favourites and advance their salaries? Surely we have not got so low as to adopt that as the principle upon which we shall proceed with respect to our judges. Surely if we are going to do justice, we are going to do it all round and not make invidious distinctions. If the Minister of the Interior correctly stated the desire of the Government, that the judges of the maritime provinces should all be placed on the same footing, he is committing a gross injustice against Prince Edward Island by giving the chief justice of British Columbia $1,200 a year more than the chief justice of the island. We had better pause in this matter, instead of reversing the deliberate judgment arrived at under the leadership of Sir John Thompson four years ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We are not doing it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Sir John Thompson stated that he would continue the salary of a judge of admiralty of Quebec so long as that individual lived, and after his death the salary would be reduced. He stated further, that the salary of the chief justice of British Columbia was in his judgment an adequate compensation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In order to be fair add the fact that the chief justice at that time was receiving $4,800, exclusive of his salary as admiralty judge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And Sir John Thompson made the statement with deliberate judgment that the chief justice of British Columbia received a salary which, after his death, would not be continued. He made that deliberate statement with the facts before him, and yet Parliament is now asked to reverse that decision. When the hon. Minister of Justice sneered at his leader, he ought to remember that he is endeavouring to reverse the proposition of his former leader, which we are endeavouring to uphold.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The proposal at that time was to give $600 for the performance of the admiralty duties in British Columbia, and the hon. gentleman voted for it, and he now asks the committee to reverse the decision arrived at and advocated by his leader four years ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I must correct that statement. The leader of the House in 1891, in my opinion, did nothing of the kind. He was dealing with the salary of the chief justice of British Columbia as judge in admiralty. He found that the salary of the chief justice was $5,820 a year and that only one admiralty case in the year had come before him; and under those circumstances he proposed that the salary should be $600. That sum with the salary which the chief justice was enjoying, was $400 more than the proposition now before the committee involves. Now, there are 15, or 16, or 17 cases a year in that court, and there is a growing shipping in the province. I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen behind me should have considered it was very extraordinary action that this attack should be made in the case of British Columbia. Hon. gentlemen have referred to various Bills that have been brought down here in recent years. They had for their object an increase of salaries all round. Hon. gentlemen who have been loud to-day against keeping the salary of the chief justice of British Columbia at a decent figure, had not a word to say against the proposition to level up salaries. These hon. gentlemen had nothing to say even when Admiralty Court salaries were increased all around in 1891. They were increased in Nova Scotia and increased in Prince Edward Island, and there was not a word of protest from the hon. gentlemen.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I beg your pardon, there was a word.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But there was no vote; and there is to be determined opposition and a vote in the case of British Columbia.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There was a protest.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was a mild protest that did not reach a division, in the case of Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia, or the other provinces. Therefore, whether the opinion be right or wrong, there was good ground that the members from British Columbia should think it remarkable that there should be this angry and heated discussion over this proposition, involving as it does a saving to the country of $400 a year. Under these circumstances, I share with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mara) his suspicion that the bench of British Columbia was not receiving that fair treatment and consideration at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite that they have been always willing to accord to the bench of provinces in the east.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman placed certain facts before the House to-day, and I call his attention to the fact, that he was prepared to press for this increase in the absence of these facts, and on the same evidence he had in 1891.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not an increase.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) At first the Minister of Justice was not in possession of the facts he now submits to the House, but he did not want these facts, and he was prepared to support this proposition without them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was prepared to prevent a decrease if I could.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Justice was prepared to place the salary where he asked us to place it to-day before he had any knowledge of the increased business in British Columbia at all. Therefore, that does not affect his mind in the slightest, I repeat, and the hon. gentleman does not deny it, that while he is increasing this judge's salary, he has not a word to say about Prince Edward Island, which stands in the same position as British Columbia in this respect.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose we will never agree as to whether this is an increase or a decrease; but it is only fair for me to add, that when I brought down the proposition my object was not to obtain an increase in the pay of this judge, but, as I stated, to prevent what I believed to be an unwarrantable decrease by virtue of the operation of a statute passed some twenty years ago.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not desire to lie under the imputation that I am not quite willing to deal as fairly with the bench in British Columbia as I am with the bench in my own province, or anywhere else. The argument of the Minister of Justice is altogether outside the question. I am willing, I have always been willing, to vote for an increase in the judicial salaries. I think, Sir, and I have thought for many years past, that in comparison with the earnings of the profession, the salaries of judges are not such as to induce, perhaps, the best men of the profession to accept positions on the bench, and in that way a public evil is wrought. But, Sir, so long as the salaries remain as they are, on what pretense can the Minister of Justice justify an increase in the salary of the chief justice of British Columbia? That gentleman has been appointed only this year. He has accepted his appointment with a salary of $5,000 and $600 a year for the position as judge in admiralty. Having accepted under these circumstances, he cannot complain that the work has since grown so enormously, because there has been no time for it to grow. The other argument used by the Minister of Justice, that the late chief justice, an Imperial appointee, was getting $5,820 a year and the $600 in addition (which is more than the present chief justice is to get), seems to me also to be one that cannot be urged with any great force. Because, upon our statutes, there was the deliberate declaration of Parliament that the salary of the chief justice of British Columbia should be $5,000 a year, so soon as the late chief justice should cease to hold office. I do trust that this matter will not develop into a squabble between provinces. I resent very much the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Mara) behind me. I have no desire to do injustice to British Columbia, and I think that what my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said: That we represent here not provinces but the Dominion, ought to be remembered by that hon. gentleman. Whatever is right for one province ought to be right for another province, and when I remember that the chief justice of the province of Ontario, who has been on the bench for nearly forty years, is getting but $6,000 a year, all told, it does appear to me that if comparisons are to be made—which always are odious—it does appear to me ridiculous that this chief justice in British Columbia, appointed only yesterday, should get a salary of $6,000 a year.

Mr. MARA. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) that whatever is right in one province is right in another. I would like to ask him (Mr. McCarthy) what reason he can give that the salary of the judge in admiralty in British Columbia should be less than the salary of the judges in admiralty in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. I would ask him what reason he can advance to this House, why the combined salary of the chief justice and judge in admiralty in British Columbia, should be smaller than the salary which attaches to these offices in Nova Scotia?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What do you say about Prince Edward Island?

Mr. MARA. The cases are not analogous. The hon. gentleman himself argued a few moments ago that on account of the shipping done in British Columbia and Nova Scotia, you might draw a comparison between the two. But even then you will find that the shipping of British Columbia far exceeds that of Nova Scotia, and you will find also that the amount of business done in the admiralty court of British Columbia is greater than is done in Nova Scotia.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman got the figures by him? I ask merely as a matter of interest, because his statement surprises me, that the shipping owned in British Columbia is larger than the shipping owned in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MARA. I did not say anything about the owners. I said that the vessels entering and clearing British Columbia ports were greater than those entering and clearing in Nova Scotia ports. I wish to add that if you draw any comparison, Nova Scotia would be a fair comparison with British Columbia, and the advantage is on the side of British Columbia.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is rather singular that this judge, after having been installed in office only two or three months, should immediately press upon the Government for an increase of salary as a judge in admiralty. It appears that the judges in admiralty in various portions of the Dominion, as soon as they have eight or ten cases to try in a year, make that a ground for pressing for an increase of salary from $600 to $1,000, and they give as a reason that the Minister of Justice proposes to increase the salary of the judge in British Columbia, because he has disposed of ten or fifteen cases during the year. I do not think the hon. Minister is justified in pressing this increase on the House. My impression is that the people of this country think they are paying large enough salaries to the judges. I therefore move that the sum of $1,000 in the third clause be erased, and the sum of $600 inserted in lieu thereof.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think that amendment will have to be revised.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will withdraw it, then, and move that the clause be struck out.

Bill reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved second reading of Bill (No. 130) further to amend the Civil Service Act. He said: As I explained when introducing this Bill, the main provisions are contained in two clauses. As hon. gentlemen know, under the Act now in force, the inside service is divided into a number of divisions—deputy heads, chief clerks, first-class clerks, second-class clerks, third-class clerks, and employees below the third-class, known as sorters, messengers, &c. The two most important provisions in this Bill are contained in section 2 and section 7. Section 2 provides that for the future, the office of third-class clerks shall be abolished. That, of course, will not affect those at present occupying third-class clerkships. Section 7 gives the Government power, under certain conditions and with certain restrictions, to employ to do the work now done by third-class clerks, as is done in England, a class of occasional writers, who shall be paid the sums set forth in the subsequent provisions of the Bill. All the other provisions of the Bill are such as to make the general Civil Service Act conform to the conditions created by these two sections. I suppose the question of the constitution of the Civil Service is recognized by us all to be a very difficult one; and if the general question were to be discussed, we should find, probably, as many opinions as there are gentlemen in this Chamber to discuss it. But I think there is one point on which we can all agree; that is, that when the Civil Service was constituted, the permanency which was then given to the service was for the purpose of securing for the performance of the more important duties the very best class of men who could be secured. It was to be an encouragement for men of high qualifications to apply for and accept positions in the service; and the same idea, I fancy, ran through the minds of this Parliament when it constituted a superannuation system. There is no doubt that, as regards the higher offices in the service, the feature of permanency has worked very well indeed. There is no doubt that the great mass of the Civil Service are exceedingly well qualified, a great many of them having superior qualifications; and I am free to admit that, as a class, they do not deserve the attacks which are very often made upon them. At the same time, I think we must all admit that there is a large amount of work done by the service which is largely clerical—work which does not require any special qualifications. That work is now done chiefly by third-class clerks. The objection to the present system is this, that when a young man enters the Civil Service, he secures, in nine cases out of ten, his permanent appointment as a third-class clerk; he knows that during good conduct his position is permanent; and, therefore, he has not that incentive to lay broad foundations for a successful future which a man has who knows that his permanency in the service depends on the manner in which he qualifies himself for the future service by the earlier years of his work. But, take a young man who enters the service as a probationary clerk. You will find him doing his best to cultivate proficiency in as thorough a manner as possible in order that he may make himself so exceedingly useful to his superiors and the state and be recommended for a higher grade and a permanent place in the service. This Bill abolishes the third class clerkships. It abolishes the permanency of the lower grades of the service, and, at the same time, does what is recommended by almost every Civil Service commission which has had the subject under consideration and by those best qualified to judge, and who have given evidence both in England and Canada; it creates a probationary term of service, during which the qualifications of that civil servant who received a temporary engagement are examined, and upon that test his future appointment, as to permanency in the service, depends. The clause providing for the employment of occasional writers gives the Government power, under certain circumstances and restrictions and upon certain recommendations, to employ occasional writers for the purpose of doing the work which is now done by third class clerks who are permanent. I may say again, this Bill does not interfere in any way with the third class clerks who are at present in the ser-

vice, and I may say still further that it does not in any way widen the power of the Government to employ a large number of persons as temporary employees without the consent of the House, because, as hon. gentlemen will see by one of the provisions in the Bill, these temporary writers are only to be employed out of moneys specially voted by Parliament for that purpose.

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill is very objectionable in many ways. It provides for the abolition of third class clerks. The officers now employed as third class clerks are to be maintained, but no new appointments are to be made to that class which henceforth is to be abolished. These employees are to be replaced by temporary clerks to be appointed at the will of the Minister and the Governor in Council. The Bill proposed is calculated to lower the character of the Civil Service. At present the clerk who is appointed to the third class has a position in the department. He is not removable at the will of the Minister, but in the case of the new officer, he is altogether dependent on the will of the Minister. If he is not like putty in the hands of the head of the department he can be removed at will. He has no status whatever. It is of the greatest importance to the Civil Service that its members should have a civil status. The hon. gentleman says that now the Civil Service have no incentive to do better. It seems to me the reverse is the case. At present they have the incentive of promotion and increase of salary. If the civil servant does his duty, he will be reported for promotion or increase of salary; if he does not give satisfaction he will remain where he is. But under this Bill, all these qualifications, which at present give to the service the character of permanency, will be removed. It will be possible for the Minister to load the service with gentlemen who are called temporary clerks but who are really intended to be permanent according to the other provisions is used in contradistinction to the word "permanent."

Section 47 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor :—

47. When from a temporary pressure of work or from any other cause extra assistance is required in any branch of either the first or second division, the Governor in Council may, on the report of the deputy head of the department, concurred in by the head of the department, that such extra assistance is required, authorize the employment of such number of temporary clerks, writers, messengers, porters, packers, or sorters, as are required to carry on the work of the department.

This Bill contemplated that these temporary clerks are to be appointed only when there is a pressure of extra work, but all the subsequent provisions defeat that end. They are calculated not for temporary service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The word "temporary" is used in contradistinction to the word "permanent."

Mr. LAURIER. Certain officers are to be appointed permanently and others are to be appointed temporarily during pressure of work, but all the subsequent provisions which are to be applied to these temporary clerks are not of a temporary but a permanent nature. Read section 10 :

10. The remuneration for temporary assistance shall be as follows :—

(a.) In the case of a temporary clerk or writer, at the rate of four hundered dollars a year, and, in addition thereto, at the rate of twenty-five dollars a year for each optional subject, not exceeding two, in which he passed prior to such employment,—the optional subjects, for the purposes of this section, being book-keeping, shorthand and type-writing ; and

There is nothing temporary when you calculate to pay a clerk at the rate of so much a year. You may call him temporary, but I call him permanent, if you calculate his salary on a permanent and not on a temporary basis. The word "temporary" is there, but all the qualifications are for permanent clerks, called temporary, who can be removed just at the will of the Minister. If the temporary clerk is not sufficiently pliable in the hands of the Minister, he has no status and can be replaced. In my humble judgment this Bill is calculated to degrade the character of the Civil Service. It is very injudicious and most impolitic. The character of the service for efficiency ought to be maintained at the highest level, but this will be removed if you take away from it the permanency now enjoyed and put it in the hands of the Minister to employ more writers whom they can discharge and replace at their own sweet will. I beg to move that the Bill be not now read the second time but that it be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have carefully read over the report of the Civil Service commission appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1891, and I cannot see that this Bill at all legislates in the direction recommedned by that commission. I think, if the hon. gentleman will read it, he will see that the desire of the commission was to have established a system of first, second and third class clerks. They recommend also the advancement in the service be by competitive examination, and that engagements in the service be on the same basis. This Bill proposes to give the Government power as they or the deputy heads may think desirable, to increase the service by engaging any individuals they please. They can be taken in as temporary clerks, while the third-class clerks are done away with altogether. It is a singular thing that the Government should appoint a royal commission to investigate the service, and then, instead of adopting the recommendations of the commission, to propose legislation directly opposed to those recommendations. Until our Civil Service

is put upon the same basis as that in England, which is removed from the influence of the Government and from politics, men being engaged simply on the ground of their ability as shown in the competitive examination, and advanced for the same reasons, we shall never have any real improvement. We are paying three and a half million dollars a year for our Civil Service, a sum far in excess of what is really necessary, the extra cost being simply the loose and unbusiness-like methods that have been followed. In the report of the commission in 1891 it was declared that in some offices there were first class clerks and third class clerks working side by side, and doing the same work, the first class clerks giving no better service to the country than was given by the man beside him who received one-third of his salary. This itself shows that the service was and still continues to be in a deplorable condition, and that the expenditure was and is far more than necessary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This will reduce the cost.

Mr. McMULLEN. I question that very much.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I quite concur in the view of this measure expressed by my leader. The hon. Minister has spoken of the substitution of writers for third-class clerks. That means the substitution of temporary officers, the number of whom may be increased or diminished as the exigencies of the public service may require. And yet the hon. gentleman proposes to make this temporary employment in the service the stepping-stone to permanent position in the various branches of the Government. The hon. gentleman says that where a party is appointed to the position of third-class clerk, he becomes indifferent to his duty owing to the security of his position, and becomes a less efficient officer than if he were for every moment of his employment on trial and liable at any moment to be dismissed. Sir, I think I could trace any inefficiency in the public service to other causes than those the hon. gentleman has assigned. The public service of this country was at one time a non-political service. The party who entered it ceased to be an elector. He could no longer be of service to his party, because it was intended in his new position he should be of service to the state. The hon. gentleman and his friends have completely changed that condition of things. They extended the electoral franchise to those in the Dominion service. They made these parties active politicians, who were employed as agents of the Government in the discharge of political functions. Their public duties were often neglected and their promotion was made to depend, not upon their devotion to the public service, but to the efficiency with which they discharged the duties imposed upon them as political agents of the Ministers. This kind of proceeding has demoralized the public service. There are men in the service who ought to be in the first places in the various departments, but who are not in those places. They have not been promoted, no matter how devoted they may have been to the public service, no matter how efficient in the discharge of their duties. Well, Sir, what motive is there to efficiency when men are so treated? What motive has a man to make himself efficient when he knows that his political opinions of past years are not forgotten, and that it is present political sentiment and present political usefulness that will gain for him promotion. This influence, more than any other cause, has led to the degradation and inefficiency of our public service. The men in the service are divided into political and non-political officers. Those who are political are supposed to go out with the party to which they belong, while those who are non-political are permanent officers of the public service. But, Sir, how can you make a man a permanent officer in the public service if you make him an active politician? How can you make him depend upon his efficiency in the public service if by the neglect of his duties he is serving all the more devotedly those who are his masters? Then there is another thing that is turning the public service into a political organization, into a sort of central committee in the interests of the Administration. The method followed has had the effect of crowding the public service to repletion. Every department of the public service is overcrowded. This is proven by the statistics I gave a few days ago. If the hon. gentleman would direct his attention to the reorganization of his department and to dispensing with the services of those who are no longer required, while paying fairly those who are continued in the public service, and giving them to understand that their promotion is a matter wholly independent of their private political sentiments, if he will disqualify those in the various departments of government, in the interests of the service, from exercising the electoral franchise, so that, like the judges, they may devote themselves wholly to the public service—if he will do these things, the service will be substantially improved, and we shall have an efficient and inexpensive service, instead of the expensive and cumbrous service we have. I do not think the public service can be improved by a Bill such as that the hon. gentleman has submitted; improvement must begin with the conduct of the members of the Administration themselves.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there is a good deal of merit in the Bill proposed by the hon. Secretary of State, if the object of this Bill is to get efficient work done and pay a fair price for it. It does not seem to me there is anything objectionable in it,

because it provides for getting the work done equally as well as it is done to-day; but in addition to that it provides for making a great saving to the country. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite benches generally complain when there is anything like over-expenditure or extravagance. Now, this Bill makes for economy, and I think they, at least, should support it. Looking cursorily over the Estimates, I find there are 320 third-class clerks in the service to-day. If these 320 reach the maximum of the salary that they could get under the present law, it means a total amount of $320,000, which would have to be paid them annually. The maximum for that class is $1,000, and each of them will aim at reaching it, and as soon as they reach it they will be entitled to that salary. Many of them will exert pressure to be put into the next higher class, so that the man who reaches the next class, will still go on by statutory increase until he gets a larger salary. And yet the work is largely the same in both classes. The work is of a routine nature, and it might be done by any good writer or copyist. Now, then, why should we not save this money if we can? If we can get the work done quite as well by men who start at $400 a year and who can go no higher than $600. why should we commence at $500 a year, increasing the salary by $50 a year until they reach $1,000? If we take the 320 third-class clerks who are employed, it would mean a saving every year of over $128,000 in the inside service, and that surely is a consideration that should weigh with this House, if it does not in any way prevent the work from being done as well as it is done now, and I believe it will be done quite as well. As the Minister says, when these men are put on, they are there under the statutory law, they are permanent, there is no stimulus for them to improve, and no ambition to do their work in a more efficient manner, as they would do it were they likely to be promoted to some higher position, provided proficiency entitled them to such promotion. There they say to themselves: In order that we may get that promotion, all we have got to do is to bring political pressure to bear upon the Minister of our department and then we will go on and get the statutory increase of $50 a year until we reach the maximum of $2,200—which is the maximum for the highest class. It seems to me we can do away with one class entirely. I think we have too many classes; we have a third class, a second class, and a first class, and then we have chief clerkships. This provision seems to have been made for the purpose of making more positions, to which big salaries are attached. Now, if we could do away with both the third and second classes, and at the same time get the work efficiently done that is now done by the third and second-class clerks, I think it would be in the interests of the country that we should do it. It does not go as far as it might go, but it is in the right direction as far as it does go. I do not think it will in any way tend to diminish the efficiency of the service, and it would result in a great saving of money.

Amendment, six months hoist, negatived on division, and

House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MONTAGUE. The alteration made here enables us to employ a few temporary writers at the age of 15, whereas under the old Bill sorters, packers and messengers only could be employed at 15, and others at 18.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that if the alteration consists in lowering the age to 15, it is distinctly not an improvement but very much the reverse. There is no scarcity of suitable persons at any higher age, and this reduction to 15, which means employing children in a great many cases, will be distinctly injurious to the status of the service, and likely to produce bad work. I think this is a very fair sample of the carelessness with which the Bill has been drawn.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the opinion of the Deputy Ministers with whom I have conversed, and I have conversed with most of them, and also the opinion of the Auditor General, that you get no better messenger than young fellows 15, 16 and 17 years of age. They are quick on foot, they are obliging, and ready to do what they are bid, and they have less distractions than men who are older. For that class of work, persons of that age are especially fit. And so with packers and sorters. The object is to lower the minimum age down to 15 so that we may have the option of employing these young fellows at that age, with whom it would be a great object to earn a small amount of money, and who would make excellent clerks in their way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then let this provision of the Bill be confined to those classes, messengers, packers and sorters. As I understand the effect of this clause, it would allow the cramming of the department with temporary writers and other officials of that kind, at the age of 15. It is quite evident that option might be gravely abused.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the Minister ought to remember that the pressure is sufficiently great as it is, even with the age at 18, and with the maximum age three years lower, it would be enormously increased. Further than that, there is no adequate idea of responsibility in the case of children, and you are much more likely to have a messenger that will be dilatory, although he is physically possessed of greater

activity than one who has a stronger sense of responsibility, and with more mature years. It seems to me the disadvantages, even with regard to messengers, more than compensate any advantages that are likely to be derived of the nature the Minister mentioned. You do not employ messengers of that age in this House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may say that we do not regard that as a vital point, but certainly the Deputy Ministers and the Auditor General have reported that in many cases young men and girls of 15, 16 and 17, pay closer attention to their work than those of more mature age. However, if the committee think proper, the section can be amended so as to limit it to messengers, porters, and packers, of the full age of 15 years, and as regards other officers, the full age of 18 years. That will leave the law practically as it was so far as age is concerned.

On section 2,

Mr. MONTAGUE. The provisions mentioned in these sections—21, 22, 23—created a third-class clerkship, and provided the salary for the same. This repeals those provisions, and abolishes the third-class clerkship.

On section 6,

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is as to dispensing with examinations of persons employed in the service since 1872.

Mr. LAURIER. What does it propose to do ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It repeals that clause.

Mr. LAURIER. Then you take power to make appointments without examinations ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, we abolish the power which we already have.

Mr. FOSTER. The section in the old Act gave power to make appointments without the qualifying examination, in certain cases. This section is an amendment, setting out that qualifying examinations cannot be dispensed with.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But you dispense with it in the Estimates ?

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot limit the power of Parliament.

On section 7,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the change in this section ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It limits the present power.

Mr. McMULLEN. This section appears to qualify all persons now holding temporary positions so that they may retain their positions without examination.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Temporarily. You do not want all these officers changed, I suppose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

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

After Recess.

INTERNATIONAL RADIAL RAILWAY COMPANY—TWO CENTS PER MILE.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MASSON. The clauses of this Bill have all been passed, but after the various sections had been adopted, a motion was moved by the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) to the effect :

That the rates charged on the track or tracks of the said railway, known as the International Radial Railway Company, shall not exceed two cents per mile.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). When this Bill was in the committee the other night we agreed to hold one of the clauses over in order that the Minister of Railways might be present to hear the discussion and take part in it if he so wished. What I pointed out then, and what I wish to point out briefly to-night is, that this Bill is practically a measure to incorporate a street railway company, which desires to operate in a populous portion of the province of Ontario. Not only is it a street railway company's Bill, but it is specially brought to this Parliament because the company finds it cannot incorporate itself under the Street Railway Act of the province of Ontario. During this year the Ontario Legislature passed a general Act applying to electric street railway companies, which made provision for non-watering of stock, for a maximum passenger rate, for the protection of municipalities, and for many other matters connected with street or electric railways. In consequence of this Act, we find that those who wish to build a purely local railway now come to the Federal Parliament, and ask to have their road declared to be "a work for the general advantage of Canada." I claim that it is nothing of the kind. But if these men ask for legislation here incorporating this road, I say that it is only right that we should dictate the terms under which they may have their charter. To show you what progress has been made in the province of Ontario in the way of regulating these roads, I wish to read two or three extracts from the Bill passed by the Ontario Legislature last session. The Act was introduced by the Government and taken in charge by the Hon. Mr. Bronson. The Act is a very exhaustive one, and under the head of tolls this provision is made :

Tolls and fares to be levied by the company as nearly as possible shall be so fixed and regulated,

that after paying "working expenses," the balance of annual receipts shall not exceed 8 per cent, or $8 on every $100, on the total capital stock of the company actually paid up in cash and then issued and outstanding; and if in any year the gross receipts from tolls and fares shall be such, that after deducting therefrom the "working expenses," there shall remain an amount exceeding 10 per cent of the total amount actually paid up in cash on the capital stock of the company then outstanding, then all such excess shall be placed to the credit of a special account to be called "the surplus tolls account," provided that in no case shall the fares exceed the maximum rates prescribed by subsection 7 and 8 of section 43 of this Act.

Another clause reads:

The fares to be taken by the company for each passenger shall not exceed 5 cents for any distance exceeding 3 miles, and shall not exceed 1 cent per mile for any additional distance. Children under ten years of age shall be carried for 3 miles for 3 cents, and for any additional distance at the rate of ½ cent a mile.

The next section goes on to provide that all these surplus tolls shall be applied to the reduction of the passenger and freight rates on the road. Now, for this reason, and because there is this provision in the Ontario Act and because there is this definite regulation as to the duties of these electric roads towards the people and the municipality, these men come to Ottawa and ask that under the general provisions of our Railway Act, their railway—it is only a street railway—shall be declared to be in the general interests of Canada. I contend, Sir, that if we give them this franchise we should make conditions under which they receive it, and one of these conditions ought to be that we should fix the maximum passenger rate at 2 cents per mile. Again, this road is simply a speculator's road. If they get the franchise, they are taking power now to sell that franchise to other roads that have a 3-cent a mile rate, viz., the Michigan Central and the Canadian Pacific Railway. This House ought to guard against these large railway corporations gobbling up not only ordinary railways, but as well these street railways throughout the country. This electric street railway is proposed to be built through a populous district. It will not cost $8,000 per mile or anything like it. They will get the right of way for almost nothing, practically on the public highway, and as the cost of railway construction is less than one-half what it was twenty or thirty years ago, I say that it it is high time for this House to insist upon a maximum passenger rate. What have we seen in the case of these small roads running through different parts of the province of Ontario? There is running from Hamilton now, for a distance of seventeen miles, a road called the Grimsby and Beamsville Railway, and they are carrying passengers from Hamilton to Beamsville for fifty cents the return fare, which is a little over one cent per mile. Then there is the Preston and Waterloo Railway, very similar to the road we are asked to incorporate now, and this company ask power to gobble that road up. The Preston and Waterloo Street Railway carries a great many passengers and a great deal of freight, and they carry passengers at a rate of between 1 and 2 cents per mile. The Toronto and Mimico road is gradually extending in the direction of Hamilton, and they also promise to carry passengers for 2 cents a mile or less. If all these roads are paying roads, then I submit that it is the duty of this House, and it is in the interests of the country, and in the interests of the railway itself, that we should insert this maximum rate in the Bill. This road will operate in one of the most populous portions of Ontario, and I ask hon. gentlemen to try the experiment of inserting in the Bill a provision that the rate shall not be more than two cents per mile. I believe that if we insert that provision, not only would it be in the public interest, but that it will also benefit the shareholders as well. I wish to see a division on the motion to-night before the time allotted for its discussion expires.

Mr. MULOCK. Whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) has suggested the right remedy or not, at all events his mind is running in the right direction in endeavouring to establish some safeguard to prevent abuses such as he indicates. More especially is it necessary at this time that the Government should have a policy upon a question like this, because we are at the commencement of a revolution in railroad motive power. Whilst the old system of steam railways may continue, yet there is a well-settled opinion in the public mind now, that in rural districts a very considerable portion of freight and passenger transportation will in the near future be carried on by means of electric railways. They are destined probably to a large extent to drive off the roads the old-fashioned wagon, and perhaps the more modern carriage, so that this question cannot be taken up too soon. While the fixed maximum rate may not meet the requirements of this question, it is directing public attention in the right diection. As I listened to the hon. gentleman's quotation from the Ontario statute, providing for a maximum dividend, and that not on a fictitious capital, but on the cash actually expended on the road, I felt that that was a fairly good gauge by which to keep in check the charges made upon the public. For years I have endeavoured to press upon the Government the view, about which there can be no question, that a railway is essentially a monopoly. You may say that any number of capitalists may combine to build a railway; but, practically, a railway is a monopoly; and, that being the case, if we do not wish to have a large amount of capital destroyed

in the future in the attempt to escape from monopolies by the construction of other roads, we ought, at this early date, to adopt a policy to prevent an abuse of power such as is likely to occur. Under the old railway system, where we have great trans-continental lines, there is one way by which excessive rates may be successfully resisted at certain seasons of the year, as, for example, in Canada during summer, that is, by the competition afforded by the water system. But in the case of short roads, such as my hon. friend from East York has alluded to, if we allow lines to be constructed between neighbouring villages, and exploited to whatever extent the people are likely to submit to, a very serious injury may be done in the future. If this should involve an unnecessary expenditure of capital in the duplication of rival roads to serve the same district, that would be an additional injury. It will not do to say that a monopoly may be escaped from by constructing an additional line, for this involves an unnecessary expenditure of capital, which becomes a tax upon the community. So that I am in entire sympathy with the aim in view. I do not know whether the Minister has thought out the scheme and is prepared to assent to the particular preventive remedy that is suggested; but if that is not the best remedy, perhaps before this Bill is allowed to leave the committee, he would suggest a more suitable one. This is a large scheme. This company is taking powers to establish a gridiron of electric railways all over the western part of the peninsula. It is impossible almost to see where its powers will cease —what part of the western peninsula will not be tributary to it; and it is a dangerous thing for us to grant a charter to a company which may get influence enough to enable it to occupy that whole territory unframmelled by proper statutory restrictions. I have just that doubt in my own mind as to whether the 2-cent scheme is the right solution; and I am sure the hon. member for East York is not wedded to the 2-cent scheme.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). No, 1 cent will do.

Mr. MULOCK. Or any particular fixed rate, so long as there is some safeguard that will protect the public.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). New York has a safeguard in 2 cents a mile.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Minister will say that that meets the requirements of the situation, that might go a long way to satisfy some gentlemen.

Mr. EDGAR. While I feel a good deal like the hon. member for North York with reference to this question of 2 cents a mile, especially as applicable to a railway like this, still, I do not believe that the House has sufficiently considered what has been laid down by experience. We talk about a penny a mile railway rate in England. That was applied in the Act of 1844 to one train a day each way on a railway.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). How many a day are there now? As a matter of fact, it compelled every other train to adopt the rate.

Mr. EDGAR. I am saying what I understand the law to have been. The law instituted in 1844 was that each railway, from one end to the other, and on all its branches, should run at least one train a day on every week day at a rate not to exceed one penny a mile—for what? For third-class passengers. That is rather different from the present proposition, although I am quite free to admit that, for an electric road, such as this is to be, the proposition of the hon. gentleman might not be unreasonable. But there is a larger question involved in the hon. gentleman's proposition. He referred a few moments ago to the general Railway Act for the regulation of electric railways, passed by the legislature of Ontario last session. Now, if we are to assume jurisdiction over electric railways, as we are doing, I think we must make a general law for the Dominion which will govern all electric railways; and we might, therefore, very well allow the proposal of the hon. member for East York to stand over for consideration in connection with such a general law. As he says, if we apply to all electric railways such a law as the Ontario law, we shall get a less rate than 2 cents a mile. I beg to move, in amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for East York, that the following clause be added to this Bill:—

> The powers hereby conferred shall be subject to the provisions of any general Act that may be hereafter passed by the Parliament of Canada relating to electric railways.

That will include this difficulty, and a great many others as well. The hon. member quoted the Ontario Act in favour of his proposition, and said that it went a great deal further. Very well, if we make this charter subject on its face to the future general legislation of this Parliament, in regard to electric railways, then this company will not be able, in future, to come here and say: This is unfair and should not apply to us. We give them and the world notice that to the extent to which they build electric railways, they will be subject to the general Act which we may pass.

Mr. MACLEAN. (York). The hon. gentleman makes no provision for a maximum passenger rate. That is really the issue I raised. He proposes that this Parliament shall make a general Act applicable to electric railways. That is all very fine, but I want the House to declare the principle of a maximum pasenger rate for these roads, and we might as well declare it now as at any time, unless the hon. Minister says that

in the general Act he will provide for this and give us an opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. MASSON. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but some of the remarks which were made the other evening, and because of which I asked the adjournment of the debate, I do not wish to go unchallenged. In the first place, it was alleged that this is a purely electric railway. It is true that we asked for authority to run it by electricity. We have put two clauses in the Act specially providing to carry that out. In that only does this differ from other railway Acts, and foreseeing that in the near future, not only this road, but many others may be run by electricity, we have taken occasion to ask for special provisions to meet that condition of things. In that only do we differ from other railways for under the Railway Act all railways may use electricity or steam. The scheme has several branches, one of which is 60 miles in length, and we have not any experience of electric railways of that length. We, therefore, ought not to be treated purely as an electric railway. It may be that some portions of the scheme may be run by electricity; and so far as regards any portion of the scheme which may be run by electricity, it never was intended or expected that we would not be subject to electric railway rates, whether fixed by the province or the Dominion. We never did suppose that we would run an electric railway at steam railway rates. Therefore if the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) would confine his amendment to the portion run by electricity, or any other portion that might from time to time be run by electricity, it would meet with my approval. It was urged that the 3 cent rate is a crying abuse. That is one of the points that I specially wished the other evening to have contradicted. Instead of its being an exorbitant rate, it is the cheapest in the world, with one or two exceptions. I have before me Mulhall, from which I take the following figures. In the United Kingdom, the rate of carriage of passengers for ten miles is: First-class, 21 pence; second-class, 16 pence; third-class, 10 pence. That, you will see, is more than double our first-class rates, about the same as regards the second-class, and their third-class is fully equal to the average of our first. In France the rates are:

First class	20 pence.
Second class	15 "
Third class	10 "

In Germany—

First class	15 pence.
Second class	11 "
Third class	10 "

In Russia—

First class	18 pence.
Second class	14 "
Third class	8 "

In Austria, the same; in Italy, almost the same, the only difference being 13 pence for second-class. In Spain—

First class	21 pence.
Second class	16 "
Third class	10 "

being the same as Great Britain. I will not weary the House with going through all in detail, but I will say this, that with the exception of Norway and the State Railway of Austria, we have the cheapest railway rate in the world. But there is another feature to be considered. It is not only in the passenger but on the freight rates that we are lower. Where a high passenger rate is charged, railways can afford to carry freights cheaper; and if we were to put down the passenger rates, we would force the railway to charge more for freight. The general public, the farmers, the artisans, and the men who travel very little are more interested in the freight traffic than in the passenger traffic. I wish to call your attention, Sir, to the rates of freight, taken from the same report:

	Rate per ton per mile.
In the United Kingdom	140
In France	119
In Germany	82
In Russia	120
In Austria	115
In Italy	125
In Sweden and Norway (where the passenger rates are so cheap)	160 and 120
In Denmark	144
In Switzerland	165
In the United States and Canada	52 and 51

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Longer hauls.

Mr. MASSON. Of course, but you will see that it is not only the passenger but the freight rate which must be taken into account, and where you are dealing, as we are in Canada, with the necessity of having cheap freight rates, I think it would be a step in the wrong direction to cut down the passenger rates, as this would virtually force the railways to increase their freight rates. I do not wish to delay the House, but only desire to point out the statements which I thought required contradiction and to show that instead of the passenger rate for Canada being exorbitant, it is the lowest in the world, except in those countries where the railways are under the control of the state, and small affairs at that. To apply the rates proposed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) to a new railway just entering upon existence, while other lines covering the same territory have the higher rate, would be to cripple it at the start. There can be no doubt but that such legislation would interfere with the floating of the scheme financially. I am quite prepared to accept, on behalf of the promoters of the Bill, the suggestion made by the hon. member for East York to apply future legislation to those portions of the road that would be run by electricity.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I will accept the amendment in this way :

The powers hereby conferred as to an electric railway shall be subject to the provisions of any general Act that may hereafter be passed by the Parliament of Canada relating to electric railways.

Mr. MULOCK. If you look at the working of the Railway Act in the past, you will search in vain for a case where the Government have exercised their power of regulating tolls, and we have had twenty years experience of the Act giving them power to reduce the tolls. The scheme proposed is that the Government will introduce a policy applicable to electric railways and make it applicable to this railway. Whilst I approve of there being a clause in this Bill bringing home to the persons who may invest in the enterprise, that the enterprise will be liable to be affected by future legislation without their consent, at the same time I would not approve of this House surrendering its control, even into the hands of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The Government have never yet exercised the powers conferred upon them of reducing tolls.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I propose that Parliament should have that power.

Mr. MULOCK. But you are only by that amendment asking Parliament to exercise these powers until other legislation is passed ; and that legislation, no doubt, will take the form of leaving it in the hands of the Governor in Council.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Leave it to Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. But the Bill that will be introduced by the Government, I anticipate, will be to confer this power, in all probability, upon the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. MASSON. They have that power now.

Mr. MULOCK. I am aware of that.

Mr. MASSON. There would be no need to introduce a Bill for that purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. But the legislation will probably take some such form as that. While I would welcome a measure of that kind if there were safeguards in it such as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) mentioned ; as, for instance, that it should be illegal to exact rates for either freight or passengers that would pay more than a fixed rate of interest on the capital in the railway—that is on the money actually put into the enterprise. If you do not have some such limit by statutory enactment, the promised legislation is not worth anything at all, in my estimation. Railway companies have very much power with the Government, and I do not look for very much relief from that source. I would like the hon. gentleman to stick to the idea of a maximum rate.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I will stick to it.

Mr. COCKBURN. I do not know of a more inopportune time than the present for the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) to introduce a motion such as that he now has before the House. What are the facts ? We have to-day in the United States in the hands of receivers railway properties representing $1,500,000,000—roads that have been unable to pay either interest on the bonds or dividends to stockholders. And what have we seen even here in Canada a few weeks ago ? We have seen the national road, the Canadian Pacific, a road that is managed with every due regard to economy, unable to meet the interest due to its shareholders. And we select such a moment as this to tell these people how to deal with their roads, and we propose to reduce their fares by 33 per cent. This 2 cent per mile passenger rate has been proposed again and again on the other side of the line, but no state in the union has permanently adopted any such change.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). New York has.

Mr. COCKBURN. The New York Central and Hudson River Railway has partially adopted it, but only to this extent : that on one part of the road between Buffalo and Albany and intermediate stations a rate shall be charged of not more than 2 cents per mile. But this has been adopted owing to the peculiar circumstances of the case. This road was to run parallel with the Erie Canal, which was there a favourite property owned by the state which received tolls on all freight traffic ; and in chartering the road it was made incumbent on the road to pay over to the state the tolls, or an equivalent for the tolls they were receiving for transit by the Erie Canal. Our roads are in a totally different position from those in England or those alongside Boston and other large cities in the United States. There there is an immense local traffic and it would pay a company to charge only 2 cents a mile. But in Canada we are differently situated. Rates that will afford fair remuneration to these roads will simply mean the closing up of ours. My hon. friend points to the roads in Hungary and elsewhere. But the roads he has reference to, provide such accommodation that he would not put his horse or his dog into the cars in which the people there are compelled to ride. We have a higher notion of comfort here, and we are not prepared to descend to the position the hon. member for East York would have us descend to. We are perfectly able to deal with the position, and as for this cry of the workingman I am not prepared to treat the workingmen as a pauper. I wish to have him paid a decent wage, and I wish to see him pay the same for services rendered to him as other people. I do not wish to humiliate him in the eyes of the world by treating him as a pauper, and I do not think it is necessary to make special rates for

him. This would be simply an attempt on our part to give smaller wages to the workingman and then make it up to him in soup-kitchen style by enabling him to ride cheaper on the public railway. What we want is safe and speedy transportation, not so much merely cheaper transportation, and I think we can leave the men at the head of our national roads to take care of this point. It little becomes us, amateurs in the business, to rush in like fools where, perhaps, angels would fear to tread. I think for the time, a sufficiently low rate has been obtained, and as soon as the roads find it to their profit and to the convenience of the public to establish a lower rate, they will do so. We must not be led to forget the fact that our roads are not in the same position as the roads in other countries. We have here a large, sparsely-populated country. To attempt to fix for Canada the same rates of fare as are charged in thickly-populated countries would simply result in most inefficient service. I trust my hon. friend will fully consider the measure he has brought before the House and will not try to thrust upon the House an amendment that will deal only with one small road. I trust he will rise to a higher conception of the question and not try to deal with some little paltry road, not try to force special terms upon an individual road, but will bring forward a comprehensive Bill worthy of the gentleman himself. I trust he will lay before us a Bill that will deal with the whole subject in a broad and comprehensive manner. I regret to see the exceptional spirit in which he seeks to legislate——

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I brought forward a general Bill two years ago.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am aware the hon. gentleman brought it forward two years ago. My regret is that his ideas have not grown larger since that time. He is yet a young man, and I feel assured that he will grow in wisdom as in age, and that he will at a future time introduce a Bill that will be worthy of his years and his talents. I will support the amendment of my hon. friend on the other side (Mr. Edgar).

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The amendment does not deal with my proposal, and is not an amendment to it. Both of them might be adopted.

Mr. HAGGART. I think it inexpedient to embody the amendment of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) in this particular Bill. I think legislation of that kind ought to be general and ought not to be applied to any particular railway company seeking incorporation. This question is a fair one and might be considered in a general Railway Bill, or in an amendment to the general Railway Act. The remarks made by the hon. gentleman in reference to electric railways and the remarks made by the hon member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and particularly those made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) I fully concur in. Parties coming here seeking charters for electric railways ought to have embodied in the charters—as we have not now a general Act which applies to electric railways—notice that there will be electric railway legislation which will fix the rates that they may charge and other conditions upon which they may operate. It is impossible to prepare at the present moment such an amendment as would suit. This is properly a subject which would be left to the Railway Committee, to draft a Bill which would apply to electric railways seeking legislation. The local legislature, I believe, have embodied some special clauses in the different Bills which they have allowed to pass fixing the rates. The consequence is that the companies asking for incorporation as electric railway companies, instead of going where they ought to go, that is to the different provincial legislatures, come here, because they get larger powers here than they get there. I concur with the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) that general legislation should be introduced in reference to electric railways, and that this particular company, if it uses this road as an electric railway, should be subject to the general legislation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am unable to see why they should come here for incorporation at all. It seems to me it is purely a local undertaking, and ought to have been chartered by the province. I do not even find the ordinary declaration, not overly honest in most Bills, that it is to the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. MASSON. Yes, it is there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, it does not improve it in my estimation. The hon. member for East York proposed an amendment of this sort some time ago with regard to railways that are already incorporated in the country. Now, there were several roads in England a few years ago that ran in competition with each other, and cut down the rates far below those which the promoter of this Bill has read to us this evening.

Mr. MASSON. Those were not the maximum rates, but the actual rates taken from the receipts of the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Any one who will read Mr. Galt's book in favour of Government ownership of railways, will find there a statement of several roads in the United Kingdom that cut down the rates far below any which the hon. gentleman has mentioned this evening; and the experience of those roads, as long as that competition continued, was that their revenues from passenger traffic increased in proportion as the rates were diminished; and that during the period the rates were at the lowest

point, the revenues of the road were at the maximum. I suggested to the hon. gentleman, when he made this proposal some two or three years ago, that he should ask for a committee of the House to take evidence upon the subject. It seems to me that would be a proper mode of procedure in the matter, as the House would then have something clear and intelligible upon which to proceed. How far the population of this country would affect what is shown to be the experience of the United Kingdom, it would be impossible off-hand to say; and therefore I think that an inquiry into the matter would have been of great value before any proposal of this sort was brought into operation.

Amendment (Mr. Maclean) negatived on division.

Mr. CASEY. I think we should have some explanations from the promoters of the Bill as to how far it is intended to be an electric railway and how far a steam railway, as I see they have power to run either way, and our treatment of this clause would largely depend upon whether it is to be an electric railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Look in the "Hansard," and you will see all the explanations.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister suggested very properly that there should be a general electric Act, and I think it is a pity we had not such an Act this year. Electric railways are extending in all directions, and I do not see why the Government should not have been capable of compiling such an Act, as well as the Government of Ontario, who passed a law of that kind last session. I think it is not a matter for the Railway Committee to deal with, but it is a matter for the Minister of Railways to formulate in the first place, with the best expert assistance he can get. The Railway Committee is for the discussion of individual Bills, and is not well qualified to make model Bills and to compile legislation on general principles. That, I think, should be done on the initiative of the Government, but left freely open to amendment in the House afterwards.

Amendment (Mr. Edgar) agreed to.

Mr. BOYLE. I wish to move an amendment. Clause 19a is simply section 89 of the Railway Act, except that the limitation is five years instead of seven; that is, it requires that the railway shall be begun within two years and completed within five years from the passage of this Bill. I move this amendment:

If the construction of each of the railways mentioned in paragraphs A, B and C of section 3 of this Act, is not commenced, and an amount equivalent to 15 per cent on the amount of capital stock is not expended thereon, within a year after the passing of this Act, or if each of said railways is not finished and put into operation in five years from the passing of this Act, then the powers granted by the Railway Act, or by this Act, shall cease and be null and void, as respects so much of the said railway as then remains incomplete.

I will explain my reasons for moving this amendment. Any one who reads section 3 of this Bill will see that although it purports to be a charter for the construction of one railway, it is really for the construction of three railways. One of these railways starts from Hamilton and goes to the town of Waterloo, another goes to a point on the Niagara River, and a third to the town of St. Mary's. Now, under the ordinary limitation clause, it is possible for the promoters of this enterprise simply to begin work on one of these branches and expend 15 per cent of their capital upon it, while they may virtually tie up the other two branches and allow them to remain unconstructed as long as they choose. I do not wish to see any part of the country tied up in this way, in consequence of all the work being done upon one branch.

Mr. MASSON. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) is hardly fair in endeavouring to spring this amendment on the committee at this stage. The company has already been subjected to restrictions of greater stringency than have been proposed with respect to any other railway proposed by this Parliament. Instead of seven years in which to complete the undertaking, it must be finished in five years, otherwise the powers in regard to the uncompleted portion will lapse. Surely that is sufficiently onerous, especially when it is remembered that this road will cover about 150 miles. If the amendment were adopted, it would be necessary to start and build lines in half a dozen different directions. If the amendment had been proposed in the committee, I think the promoters would have consented to commence each portion within a certain time, but certainly they would have asked for more than two years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are not these three branches practically three roads covered by one charter?

Mr. MASSON. No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to point out that the charter asked is of a very sweeping character. It is practically what the hon. member for Monck has stated, not a railway company asking power to build branches, but a company seeking a charter to build three or four different lines, all starting from Hamilton, and running through different districts. Each section of the country over which this company is asking powers is already supplied with railway accommodation or companies are chartered to build roads through it. It is only fair in granting a charter such as this, that the work should be completed as the amendment proposes, and that, at all events, a certain amount of work should be done within two years. The promoters may rest

satisfied that if they show bona fides in going on with the scheme, at the end of two years an extension of time will be granted, if requisite ; but it is unfair to the sections of country through which the road is projected, and it is bad legislation on the part of this Parliament, to grant a charter of this kind without more consideration than we are giving it. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Monck is a very reasonable and fair one. It would be very unreasonable and improper to allow this legislation to pass without the limitation proposed, and if it is intended to go forward with the undertaking, and not hold the charter for the purpose of selling out to another company in existence, or some company that has a charter over the same ground, or for the purpose of making money out of the charter in any way, the promoters should be perfectly willing to accept the amendment. It gives the company two years to commence any of these so-called branches or lines from Hamilton, and the committee should be unanimous in its conclusion that this restriction should be imposed, because if the work is proceeded with, the company can always secure extension of time from Parliament.

Mr. TISDALE. I agree with the view presented by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), that this will be a very liberal charter, even if granted subject to the restriction which the hon. member for Monck has proposed. It is the most liberal charter that has been proposed to be granted during my experience in Parliament, because it is practically giving the company three charters in one. The only reason that appeared to justify it before the committee was that the different branches were not very long, but, as the promoters insisted in seeking those three charters, each should be made to depend on work being commenced on each of the branches, the same as if a charter were granted for each, and the hon. member in charge of the Bill should accept the proposition of the hon. member for Monck.

Mr. MASSON. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Monck may seem to be a very simple one, but, under its terms, the company will be forced to commence work on each of three roads or the whole charter will lapse.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MASSON. That is the only interpretation that can be placed on the amendment proposed. Besides, it will be necessary to spend 5 per cent, or 15 per cent, on the whole, on each of the three roads, otherwise the whole charter will lapse. It may be said that this amendment is a very reasonable one. It must be remembered, however, that instead of obtaining seven years in which to build the road, the time is limited to five years, and that of itself is a great restriction. In submitting to that restriction in the committee, I thought I was yielding a great deal to the hon. member for Monck, who was then pressing that amendment. Having obtained that amendment by consent of the promoters, the hon. gentleman now comes at this late hour and moves the present amendment, which, on behalf of the promoters, I must decline to accept, for it would cripple the whole road.

Mr. CASEY. It is very clear that we have been a little too hasty in shoving along this Bill as fast as we have done. The remarks of the chairman of the Railway Committee (Mr. Tisdale) are very much in point. Here are three charters in one, and we are doing a great deal for a road in granting three charters for the expense and trouble of obtaining one. It is fair that, having done so much, the committee should be careful that it is not chartering a company of speculators rather than a railway company. We have been too ready to give charters to everybody without any assurance that they were prepared to go on and operate these roads. We have put a weapon in their hands practically to blackmail other concerns. The amendment proposed is extremely liberal and ought to be accepted.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the committee rose.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 130) to further amend the Civil Service Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 10,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that this clause is quite inconsistent with the provisions of the Bill. Does the word "continuous" in the clause mean that when a person receives $600 a year he becomes a permanent clerk.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the expression "continuous" does not mean anything ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is continuous from $300 a year up to $600 a year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are applying a principle that is only applicable to permanent officers, to persons who may be dismissed at an hour.

Mr. CASEY. The point my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) makes seems to me clear. These are to be temporary clerks, but the word "continuous" is to apply to their service. If a person is to be employed for one year, would he be continuous if he were to be kept on for the next year ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose you dismiss him at the end of the year?

Mr. MONTAGUE. He would have to commence anew.

Mr. CASEY. Then that should be better expressed in the Bill. I am inclined very much to object to the principle embodied in this clause, which has long been a defect, to my mind, in the provisions of the general Civil Service Act. I do not think that the salary of a permanent employee should be increased merely on the ground of the length of time he has been in office, and without regard to any duties he has to perform. More especially do I think it improper in the case of men who are avowedly employed as temporary clerks or writers, to increase their salaries simply because they have been so many years employed. If a man is put to some more difficult or responsible work he should be entitled to higher pay, no doubt, but the provisions of an Act should not entitle him to higher pay merely because he remains in office for a certain length of time. The pay belonging to the different classes of duties should be graded, and these temporary clerks should receive remuneration, not according to the time they have been in, but according to the work they do. There is another objection to this proposal. This increase is not to be statutory, after all, as it is now, in the case of what I may call the covenanted Civil Service, but it is to be at the pleasure of the deputy head, endorsed by the head of the department. That practically means that the head of the department, who is the supreme master of the patronage, will be allowed to add $30 a year to the salary of those whom he favours, and to not add it to the salaries of those whom he does not favour. I object entirely to the practice of paying by length of time instead of by work, and more particularly to the practice of leaving that extra pay to the discretion of the head of the department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think my hon. friend has answered his first contention in the last contention he made. In the first place, my hon. friend objected to the general principle of increasing salaries of officers because they happened to be in office a certain length of time.

Mr. LAURIER. Of temporary clerks.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, he said he objected to the principle at all. Well, we have done away with that by this clause. Then my hon. friend proceeded to find fault because we have done away with it, and have taken power to leave it to the discretion of the head of the department upon a report of the deputy head, who has a thorough knowledge of just how thoroughly the officer deserves an increase.

Mr. CASEY. Allow me to correct the hon. gentleman. This clause does not do away with the practice of increasing the salary on account of length of service. The hon. gentleman says I objected to increasing the salary of a man because he had been in office a long time. What I said was that I objected to this practice in any service, even when regulated by statute, but in the case of a temporary service, I thought it entirely out of place. I object entirely to its being left in the hands of the head of a department to say that a man's salary may be increased $30 a year if he suits the head of the department. It amounts to leaving much greater facilities for favouritism than exists at present, or than should exist.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If I rightly understood the Minister, the intention of the Act is that where a party is employed for a longer period than a year, he shall be entitled to the statutory increase for the next year, but that if he were out a year, though he had served several years and had obtained the increase, upon his re-employment he would have to begin at the minimum salary. It seems to me that the only ground upon which you can justify the payment of an increase at all is that a man is worth more by reason of increased efficiency resulting from experience. If he is out a year and is then obliged to begin at the minimum rate, you are treating him as one without experience.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has not met my first objection, that the words of the clause do not express what he says is the meaning of the clause—where the employment is continuous.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no objection to inserting the words "extending over one year continuously."

Mr. CASEY. I suppose these Orders in Council showing who got the increases will be necessarily reported to Parliament.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They can all be moved for at any time.

Mr. CASEY. I think it should be specially provided in the Bill that they shall be laid before Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a standing order of this House that every Order in Council having the force of law should be published every year along with the statutes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is with reference to customs matters.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It has reference to all matters.

On the preamble,

Mr. HAZEN. I desire to move the addition of a section to this Bill. In 1892 an amendment to the Civil Service Act was passed by this Parliament repealing a pro-

vision in a former Act and providing that any person who had been in the employ of the Government of Canada on the 1st July, 1882, and had since been continuously engaged in such employ, might be promoted to any position in the service without having to pass the preliminary or qualifying examination, and without regard of age, provided he passed such examination concerning promotion as might be provided. I think the provision was by the deputy head of the department. That Bill passed in 1892. It contained a clause to the effect that no civil servant should be promoted, under its provisions, after the 1st July, 1894. During the session of 1894 we enacted a similar Bill, with a proviso that no promotion or appointment should be made, under the provisions of that Act, after 1st July, 1895. I wish to add a similar paragraph extending the time until the 1st July, 1896. My reason for doing it is this. I have in my mind now several cases of very faithful civil servants, in the outside service, who were in it prior to the 1st July, 1882, and have been continuously employed in it up to the present, and who, in the ordinary course of events, might be entitled to promotion during the next year; but if this provision be not added, they could not obtain the promotion, to which they are fully entitled, because they have not passed the preliminary or qualifying Civil Service examination and are beyond the age specified in the Act. I therefore propose that the paragraph which is in the Act of 1892 and 1894 be added to this Bill as paragraph 13:

Any person who, on the 1st day of July, 1882, was in the service or employment of the Government of Canada, or any department thereof, and who has since been continuously engaged therein, may, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, be appointed to any position in the public service, without regard to age and without being required to pass the preliminary or qualifying examination provided for by the said Act, subject, however, to such regulations as are made by the Governor in Council, or by the head of a department, prescribing examinations for appointment or promotion in the Civil Service; and any such person may also, notwithstanding anything in the said Act, be temporarily continued in the public service.

2. All appointments of such persons and all payments of salaries to them, heretofore made, are hereby legalized and confirmed.

3. No appointment or promotion shall be made under the provisions of this section after the 1st day of July, 1896.

Mr. LAURIER. Will you move the same Bill next year?

Mr. HAZEN. None of us can tell what may happen next year, and I would not like to promise. It might be better, perhaps, that instead of saying that this shall be ineffective after the 1st July, 1896, one should say after the 1st July, 1897. Then I could safely promise my hon. friend that I would not move the same Bill next year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is a proposition to exercise a dispensing power. Of course, there are always favourites or proteges of the administration or of its supporters, for whom it is necessary to make special provision. They do not belong to the vulgar herd who are obliged to go up in regular order and submit themselves for examination. It would be grossly unfair to treat them as ordinary mortals. Qualification is not as important in their case as it might be in the case of others. A little ignorance will do them no harm; a little incompetency on their part is no disadvantage to the public service. It is only necessary that the Government should have a dispensing power in order that those persons, whether qualified to do the work or not, whether capable of passing an examination or not, may be promoted. For such parties a clause of this sort is absolutely necessary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As Parliament passed last year the same clause, there does not seem to me to be any great objection to it this year; and if I had any objection at all, the hon. member for Bothwell has removed it.

Mr. LAURIER. In 1892 Parliament passed it for a year; in 1894 Parliament passed it for another year; and in 1895 for still another year. So that from year to year, like the Franchise Act, we are called upon to exercise a dispensing power to prevent the Act being put in force.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not believe anybody has taken advantage of it yet.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY—NORTH-WEST IMMIGRATION.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to draw the attention of the House, for a few moments, to the return which has been brought down with regard to bringing into the North-west Territories certain Jewish pedlars. I made the charge, when asking for this return, that a very considerable amount of expense had been incurred in connection with the bringing of these people to Calgary, that they had been found entirely unfit for settlement, that some of them had got into jail, and that the whole incident reflected considerable discredit on the management of the immigration branch of the Department of the Interior. I find in the return ample justification for all the charges that I have made. In the first plase, delegates were selected representing these people at Chicago, who, it was suggested, were prepared to emigrate to the North-west in large numbers. These delegates were taken by the Government to the Calgary district. Now, it is very remarkable that Mr. Pearce, who is the chief officer of the Department

of the Interior resident in the Calgary district, drew the attention of the department, after these delegates had come, to the kind of people they appeared to be, in a letter which I find in the return, dated 21st April, 1893. After making some reference to the delegates and what they had done, Mr. Pearce said :

Permit me, however, to suggest that a very careful inquiry be made as to the people for whom these men came up as delegates. If they are adapted as settlers, we should give them every assistance and encouragement they could reasonably ask. If, on the other hand, they should prove to be what some people assert they are, namely, middlemen, such as pedlars or people who live by the output of others, the country probably would be better without them. I am not satisfied, from what I have seen of these people, that they are as desirable settlers as we should hope to obtain or strive to secure.

At the same time, I know not enough of them to assert that they are not a desirable class ; therefore, I thought it my duty to suggest that considerable pains should be taken in looking through them before further steps are taken to encourage their settlement in our country.

It appears to me that that was a very clear and definite warning given by Mr. Pearce to the Department of the Interior, which should have induced them to exercise more than ordinary care to inquire into the kind and condition of these people before spending any money in endeavouring to obtain them as settlers for the North-west. However, Mr. Speaker, no attention appears to have been paid to the warning given by Mr. Pearce. On the contrary, some time after this a large number, some three or four hundred of these people were sent up to Calgary. And we should not be surprised, after what Mr. Pearce told the Government to find that this immigration should be proved to be almost an entire failure. After these people came we have the report from Mr. Pearce as to how they had turned out. There is a letter dated 21st June, addressed to Mr. Burgess, Deputy Minister of the Interior. I read some extracts from it because these reports are fully in the line with what I had charged from information obtained independent of the department :

I was surprised when Mr. Schumacher informed me that they had decided to go to Macleod, for which point they have left to-day. Mr. Schumacher came at once to my office, where we discussed the matter. He thinks very little of them as settlers, in fact, does not think they will prove agriculturists at all, and he also thought that the leader of the party—I cannot for the moment recollect his name—has some scheme on, which, however, he could not make out, nor can I conceive what it is. In any case, in view of what subsequently transpired, I am of opinion that Mr. Schumacher's assumptions are correct.

Then again, in the same report, which is a very long one, we find the following :—

Mr. Schumacher, who has now been with me for several days, states most emphatically that they are all Polish Jews, and will never make successful agriculturists, and will in a very short time leave farming and become middlemen, pedlars and traders. * * * I might add that the leader of this party, while in Macleod on his last trip, led the parties who hold the charter known as the Macleod Irrigation Company, to believe that he could easily raise the capital necessary to carry out their scheme, and he proposed to buy out their charter as soon as he returned with his party. I have not quite made up my mind as to whether this gentleman is really sane.

Then again in a letter which was marked "unofficial" and dated 26th June, and addressed to Mr. H. H. Smith, who is the commissioner of the Dominion lands in Winnipeg, he makes this statement :

All of Schumacher's party that went up to Macleod, returned on Saturday night, and a part of them have gone north this morning, and the rest will probably go north on Thursday. They stated to me that the reason they did not settle at Macleod was, that it was too windy.

On Saturday a robbery occurred at the shed by which some of the party lost three gold watches, and one man states he lost $78. The robbery was committed by one of their own party, who cleared out with a circus train which was leaving that night for the west. Whether the authorities will succeed in capturing him remains to be seen. At first, they tried to throw the odium on some outsiders ; but, as they failed in doing so, they explained that this man joined them at Winnipeg and did not belong to their society at all. But it is hard to believe anything they say. Mr. Singleton, caretaker of the shed here, informed me this morning that he thought it was never their intention to take up land in the country. It is asserted that they brought in as settlers' effects considerable dutiable articles, which they will be found trading and peddling around the country, and that they have no knowledge whatever of farming, or, in fact, any agricultural operations whatever, at least, the major portion of them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the face of these facts, Mr. Burgess, in the letter which accompanies these returns ventures to make the following statement :—

A number of the persons have taken up farms in the North-west, and are now engaged in farming ; and, so far as I am aware, or the records of this department show, none of them have been committed to jail in Calgary, and none of them have been formally charged with any offence.

One of the principal things I desired to learn was the actual location of these persons to find out whether any of them became actual settlers. Mr. Burgess, as I say, makes the statement that a number of them have taken up farms in the North-west. I have looked through the papers from one end to the other and, though there is a distinct inquiry in the motion for the statement showing what did become of these people and where they were settled, there is not a single sign of any evidence showing that a single man of them did settle in the North-west. Now, Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that an emigration department properly conducted, after spending a large sum of money in getting a particular class of people to come to the country, would be

able to show from its records the names of those people and what had become of them. I should think a record of that kind would be considered absolutely indispensable in a department that spends a large sum of money in inducing people to come to this country. Mr. Burgess undertakes to say from some peculiar knowledge he may have in his own head that a number of these people did settle on farms in the North-west. Though I have asked most explicitly for the location of these people, the files of the department in connection with the matter afford no information on the subject. I think this whole attempt to transplant a lot of pedlars, persons who are not fitted in any way for agricultural operations, from a large city like Chicago, shows the utter incapacity of the department and its officials to properly engage in the work of immigration. Word came to the Department of the Interior from the Rev. Mr. Phillipps, a former resident of this city, that there were in Chicago a large number of persons who would make fine settlers for the North-west and suggesting that inquiry be made into the facts of the matter. The department sent their inspector of agencies for the United States, Capt. Holmes, to investigate. He appears to have spent some four or five months, strange to say the very months during which the great exposition was going on in Chicago, in investigating this matter. Engaged in the same service, presumably, were a number of other gentlemen employed in the emigration branch located in Chicago. There was Mr. Schumacher, who has been mentioned; there was Mr. Montague, a brother of the hon. Secretary of State; there was Mr. Daly, a brother of the hon. Minister of the Interior. These gentlemens' names will be found inscribed in the report of the Auditor General as drawing their ordinary salaries and an allowance, I think, of $4 and in some cases $5 per day for expenses during the months the Chicago exposition was in full blast. I am informed that, not content with having this very choice privilege of sojourning in that city at the expense of the Government, and receiving a very fair allowance for expenses, during the months of July and August, when the temperature became too hot, the interest of the immigration branch of the Department of the Interior necessitated the removal of a number of these gentlemen, if not all, to one of the watering places of the United States. Now, remembering all the facts, remembering the ignominious result of the labour of all these men during those months in Chicago, in transplanting those Jews to Calgary, some of whom got into jail, and if they did not get into jail, they ought to have been put there, and none of whom became actual settlers in the country—remembering these facts, I say, we can understand why the Government are most unwilling to give the House any information as to the number of persons in their delegation to Chicago, and their expenses. Early last session I obtained the sanction of the House to a motion calling for full particulars as to the expenditure of the Government during that exposition. About the same time, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) also obtained from the House an order somewhat similar to mine. These two motions were carried early last session. The officials connected with the Chicago Exposition, Mr. Larke, for instance, was occupied here all last session, and I believe for some time after the session had expired, in winding up the business of the commission to Chicago. I had some correspondence with Mr. Larke with regard to this return, and I was induced to believe by that correspondence that he was busily engaged in preparing the returns. He requested me to consent to one return being brought in covering the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk and my own, and I consented to that, but no return was ever brought down. I may say that I drew the attention of the Government to the fact several times last session that these returns were not being brought down, and early this session I again drew the attention of the Government to the fact that these returns had not been brought down. I was promised that they would be brought down as soon as possible, but so far as I am aware, they have not yet been laid upon the Table of the House, or if they have been, it is only within a day or two. Now, I noticed to-day, that when the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) asked the Government some questions which were intended to draw from them information similar to that called for in these returns, the Secretary of States very blandly informed the member for Kent that he had better put his question in the form of a motion, knowing very well that a motion, at this stage of the session, would never be reached.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are not all the details in the Auditor General's report?

Mr. MARTIN. No, not by any means.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You will find them there.

Mr. MARTIN. The details are not there that I asked the Government for.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Every dollar that was paid is there.

Mr. MARTIN. Very much more is asked for besides that, information by which we will be able to determine how many other persons were engaged in Chicago besides Mr. Schumacher, Mr. Montague, Mr. Daly, and Captain Holmes, who were drawing salaries and large allowances for expenses during that exposition. Now, it is a mat-

ter of extreme importance to Canada at large, and especially to Manitoba and the North-west Territories, that there should be as large an immigration as possible into that country. It is the firm conviction of the people of Manitoba and the Territories that the large sums expended for immigration each year by the Dominion Government, are positively wasted, and I feel satisfied that the facts I have been able to adduce in this matter will tend to strengthen the belief of the people in that respect. It is a great pity that when Canada appropriates $200,000 a year, as it did, in an endeavour to bring people into the country, and to settle up our North-west country, that this money should have been wasted in the manner I have pointed out.

Mr. DALY. I am sure the House must be very much edified at the statesmanlike address we have heard from the hon. gentleman, who thinks he has discovered a mare's nest. I have had the honour of presiding over the immigration branch of my department for two years and nine months, the hon. gentleman has had an opportunity of investigating the work of that department during that time, and the only charge he has been able to make against my department is the charge that he has made here to-night, reiterating the statement that he made on the floor of this House some months ago. Now, Sir, what are the facts in relation to this matter, a matter that seems to disturb the hon. gentleman's dreams, that seems to affect him in such a way that he cannot get away from the subject? Notwithstanding the statements I made some weeks ago in this House, and notwithstanding the fact that the hon. gentleman has before him all the correspondence that took place in connection with this matter, which was brought down in response to an order of the House, he must come back to the charge again. Now, Sir, the gravamen of his charge is that we expended a large sum of money in taking a large number of Jews into Calgary, and that we should not have expended the money, that we should not have taken that large number of Jews into Calgary. Now, Sir, the whole cost in connection with taking these Jews up there, did not amount to $350; and, moreover, we did not take in over thirty people altogether, only three or four of whom were Jews. And yet the hon. gentleman has the audacity to stand up here and say, with the papers before him, in view of the previous statement I made here, that we took three or four hundred Jews into that country, when he knows, as a matter of fact, that the papers disclosed that we did not take in from Chicago over thirty or forty people altogether, and that there were not over three or four Jews. Then the hon. gentleman dwells with unction on the fact, and rolls it upon his tongue, that one of these men got into jail. Has he proved that this man was one of those people we took from Chicago? Has he proved he was one of those immigrants? On the contrary, the man had nothing whatever to do with the party, but attached himself to them when they got up to Winnipeg. But that does not satisfy the hon. gentleman; he thinks he can make a charge against the department. Now, Sir, as possibly some hon. gentlemen were not here when this matter was under discussion before, I will just lay the facts again before the House. In the spring of 1893, the Rev. T. D. Phillipps, who previously lived in Ottawa, a clergyman of the Church of England, and who, although still living in the United States, is yet interested in the welfare of Canada, wrote a letter to the department, pointing out the fact that in his ministrations he had come in contact with a number of people who were desirous of emigrating from Chicago and going into farming. I cannot do better than read Mr. Phillipps' letter, which I have here. This is dated Kenwood, Chicago, 4th May, 1893:

Dear Sir,—Some weeks ago I had occasion to write to Ottawa for information required by German residents of this city who contemplated removal to the Canadian North-west. My letter was duly forwarded to the Department of the Interior by Mr. Lowe. Shortly afterwards, Captain Holmes visited Chicago in the interests of the Government, was put by me in communication with these good people, and attended two of their meetings. As a result, four of their number, Messrs. F. Leeb, Wolf Sax, W. Berman and J. Leeb, visited the North-west, having been delegated thereto by the members of their association, going over the Canadian Pacific Railway in charge of an official of your department to Calgary and Edmonton, and subsequently south to the district around Fort Macleod.

These delegates returned last week and immediately reported to their countrymen entire satisfaction with the country, and brought back assurances that their personal observation had fully borne out the statements made to them by Government agents, no less than by myself, regarding the marvellous fertility of the soil and the perfect adaptability of the region visited to the requirements of experienced agriculturists, such as these prospective immigrants had been in their native Germany. Consequently, some 400 families are arranging to leave Chicago on or about 20th May for settlement in townships 9, 10 and 11 of range 26, west fourth; 11, 12 and 13, of range 27, west fourth, and 13 of range 28, west fourth. Ultimately, he thought, at least 1,600 other families would join the settlement.

A deputation, consisting of Messrs. F. Leeb, Wolf Sax, W. Berman and A. Brau, called upon me this morning and requested me to act as their medium of communication with the department. The following is the substance of their present wishes and intention additional to what is stated above:—

They would require temporary assistance while making their allotment on some 150,000 acres of land which they purposed taking up. Would it be possible, for instance, for an agent of the department to procure for them at very reasonable rates the use of tents for the summer?

2. As they deem irrigation to be a necessity of the near future, what are the steps to be taken in order to obtain a charter for the construction of an irrigation canal, with license to draw a supply of water from the Willow Creek, Old Man's River and other streams abutting on the settlement ?

3. If these settlers should take up, for instance, in township 9, range 26, west fourth, sections 16, 18, 20, 22, 28, 32, 34 (all now unoccupied, as shown in plans which the delegates procured from the Dominion Lands office), would it be possible for the Government to exchange for sections elsewhere, and off the line of this settlement, school section 29 (lying between 20 and 32) and other such sections as 11 B, No. 8 ? The object of the settlers is to secure sections as nearly contiguous as possible and on the line of the proposed irrigation channel.

As this association is very much in earnest, and it is composed of men, with scarcely an exception, heads of families, who would be, I am satisfied, very creditable, even valuable accessions to the population of Canada, may I ask the favour of an immediate reply.

Yours truly,

T. D. PHILLIPPS.

That letter was written by the Rev. Mr. Phillipps after the return of the delegates. In the meantime, as the hon. gentleman stated, Mr. Pearce, an officer of the department, having seen the delegates who had gone there, took occasion to write in his report a warning to the department. Mr. Pearce wrote to the effect that we should make further inquiries in reference to those people before encouraging them to come out and settle. In response to Mr. Pearce's warning, the department did not through its officers encourage, as Mr. Phillipps by his letter of 4th of May would have liked us to do, the scheme of those people in regard to irrigation or colonization, nor as regards encouraging 300 or 400 families to go to the North-west ; but by instructions given to Captain Holmes, after Mr. Pearce's letter had been received, he was cautioned particularly in regard to what Mr. Pearce had said and the necessity of making full inquiries in reference to those people. The consequence was that instead of 300 or 400 people being taken out or encouraged to go to the North-west by the department only 20 or 30 went, as I have already stated, and every one of them that had experience in farming the country from which he came, and it appears that afterwards three or four of them turned out to be Jews. As a matter of fact, a number of them settled there, took up homesteads and are there at the present time ; but because three or four happened to be Jews, and because a man attached to a party happened to get into Calgary jail, an opportunity was afforded to the Opposition press to attack the Government and the department and point out that this showed the failure of the immigration policy which they were called upon to condemn. On 20th June Mr. Holmes addressed the following letter to the department :—

Chicago, 20th June, 1895.

Sir,—In further reply to your telegram of 19th instant, received this a.m., re German party, who went to Winnipeg in charge of Schumacher, I explained to them fully before starting that they could not obtain Government land in large quantities in the Macleod district ; that it would be utterly impossible for them to obtain odd-numbered and Hudson Bay sections ; that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not give assistance to go to the Macleod district ; that the lands, even if obtainable, were unfit for settlement by people in their circumstances, and, finally, that those settlers who located in the vicinity of Lethbridge and Macleod country some years ago, have been obliged to abandon their homestead, and had been moved by the Canadian Pacific Railway to new locations in vicinity of Wolseley and Grenfell.

I wrote Mr. Smith, also Mr. L. A. Hamilton, Canadian Pacific land commissioner, explaining the matter fully, and requesting them to have them met by parties speaking their language and who would give them full information endorsing my statement.

Schumacher went with them as much for the purpose of assisting them to get a new location as for any other purpose, as he was familiar with the facts in regard to the former settlement in vicinity of Lethbridge, and has visited the new settlement at Grenfell.

The whole trouble arises from the fact that the Macleod people thought they as a community had considerable money, and would be prepared to go into a large scheme of irrigation. Consequently, when the delegates were there in April last, the Macleod people entertained them nicely, set forth in glowing colours the advisability of their locating in that vicinity, and, in fact, so filled them with stories in regard to the capabilities of the Macleod region that the delegates were unable to see any virtue in any other location, and, although we all did our best to show them that, so far from being the best, it was the poorest district in the Territories for men of their circumstances to go to. They seemed to go off under the impression that it was from interested motives we were trying to get them to go to some other district, and that we wanted to reserve the Macleod country for English-speaking people, personal friends, &c.

Mr. Hamilton wired Mr. Lee on Saturday that they would leave for their lands on 19th instant. So I took it for granted that the difficulty had been gotten over, and that they were satisfied to try some other location.

They are a peculiar lot. At times they intimate that they can obtain funds to accomplish anything they undertake. At others they can only average about $300 per family. There have been no misrepresentations made to them here, and the Government is not obliged to them in any manner.

Your obedient servant,

ALFRED T. HOLMES.

What that letter discloses is this fact, that the people had got it into their heads through the leader of the deputation that they would go into the Macleod country and enter into the irrigation scheme, and the whole trouble arose out of that circumstance. But the action taken by the officers of the department, and the Canadian Pacific Railway officers, who are equally interested in this matter with the Government agents, took the people away from the Macleod

district. I find a letter written on 12th February, 1894, to Capt. Holmes by the general passenger agent of Canadian Pacific Railway at Chicago, which details the inception of this movement. He says:

Chicago, 12th February, 1894.

Captain A. F. Holmes,

Stock Exchange Building, Chicago.

Dear Sir,—In regard to your inquiry as to the origin of the movement by which some 20 families and a large and constantly growing business was opened up from the United States to the Canadian North-west last spring: This business originated in January, when two Germans came into my office and made inquiries regarding the North-west, bearing letters of introduction from the Rev. Dr. T. D. Phillipps, of Hyde Park, near Chicago. I gave such information as I had, and referred them to the department at Ottawa for further particulars.

Shortly after this, the Rev. Dr. Phillipps called upon me personally and explained that there were a number of families in his vicinity who spoke to him of going to the Canadian North-west in the spring. He had given them information and had written to the department at Ottawa for printed matter, and, in his opinion, there would be 200 or 300 families to go, provided they were satisfied with the country. You will recollect that you called on me about the latter end of January, when I stated these facts to you in my office.

The next I heard of the movement was on your arrival in Chicago in March, after you had seen Dr. Phillipps and these people had made arrangements to meet a large number of them at Rochester Hall. The report made to me of that meeting was, that some 600 or 700 people were there, consisting of several nationalities and various religions. A few were Jews of German extraction. This meeting appointed delegates to go up and see the country. They did go, and made a favourable report, and some 20 or 25 of their number purchased through tickets from the Chicago Great Western Railway Company, in Chicago, to Calgary, taking the reduced rate over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Port Arthur and paying the full fare in the United States.

For some time in advance of this matter, Mr. P. F. Daly, long before his brother, the present Minister of Agriculture was appointed, had paid considerable attention to the working up of this and similar business. It was only proper he should accompany the party, and he did so. Mr. P. F. Daly was known to me when with the Erie and Lacawana Road long ago, and was especially competent on account of his knowledge of the railway business, to act as he did.

Yours truly,

J. F. LEE.

That letter from Mr. Lee discloses the fact that the origin of the whole movement was the coming of those Germans into his office at Chicago in 1893. They came with letters of introduction from Mr. Phillipps and subsequently the delegates were sent up there, and the only expenditure the Government incurred was the expenses of the gentlemen who accompanied the delegates. These delegates paid their own expenses to the boundary, the Canadian Pacific Railway furnished them with transportation after they left the boundary, and they paid their return expenses from the boundary line to Chicago. After their arrival, six or seven hundred of different nationalities held a meeting. They were a fine looking body of people, who declared themselves familiar with agriculture and who had farmed not only in the old countries, but in Dakota and other states. They had three or four hundred dollars to each family, and if we did not take an interest in those people who desired to immigrate and acquaint them with the resources of the North-west, then the officers of the department would have been open to the serious charge of neglecting their business. Believing that those people were what they represented themselves to be, they were taken to the North-west, and because we did our duty in that respect, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) and the Grit press of Manitoba blame the Government. If we had not taken advantage of the opportunity to take these people into that country, then, I say, we would have been blamable, but no blame can attach to us under the circumstances. Mr. Pearce had a better idea of these people after they arrived there, and when we were cautioned by him about them, instead of sending four or five hundred who wanted to go, we took care to select only a few of the best families. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) would give the House to understand that all the agents of the department in Chicago were engaged in this matter. Well, they had nothing whatever to do with it beyond what the papers disclose, and it only occupied them for a very short time. They were at the Chicago exhibition attending to their duties, and as the report shows they distributed thousands upon thousands of pamphlets. Our agents were not singular in being there, because there were agents from other provinces and states, as well as from the province of Manitoba, which had a side show on the outside of the exhibition grounds that cost the people of that province $86,000. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) does not take exception to that, nor does he criticise the action of his friends up in Manitoba.

Mr. MARTIN. This is not the place to discuss that.

Mr. DALY. I know, but I am only mentioning it parenthetically so that the hon. gentleman will not forget it.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not.

Mr. DALY. I do not think that either he or his party will forget it. Every one of our agents were at work upon the agricultural exhibition made by Canada. They did good and efficient work there as shown by the fact that we have added large numbers to the population of immigrants who came from the different states of the union——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They do not materialize.

Mr. DALY. They are there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You said you brought in 900,000, and there turned out to be only 150,000.

Mr. DALY. We do not want any further proof of the fact than that the census of the North-west taken a short time ago, shows an increase of population of 21,000 during the last three years.

Mr. MARTIN. Coming from Ontario.

Mr. DALY. They did not come from Ontario. The hon. gentleman will find by the returns that the homestead entries from Ontario have decreased year by year.

Mr. MULOCK. A great many of them came from different parts of Canada.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MULOCK. But you must not make mistakes.

Mr. DALY. I am not making any mistake. The records prove what I say. In spite of the general depression we have increased our population in Manitoba from 152,000 to 207,000, and we have increased the population of the Territories 21,000 during the last three years, and if the hon. gentleman will add those figures together, and deduct 10,000 for national increase, he will find that we have an increased population in Manitoba and the North-west Territories of over 65,000 since 1891. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that when they were in power, they spent $286,000 on immigration in 1878. I would ask them what benefit the country ever reaped from that large expenditure. Taking into consideration the depression that has existed in this country and every other country during the last three years, I say we got good value for the money we spent, when we have increased our population in the North-west Territories 40 per cent, and 47 per cent in Manitoba. We have done more than any of the Australian colonies during that period, and in proportion to the population of Canada we have had a larger immigration than they have had into the United States during that period.

Mr. MARTIN. They nearly all came from the other provinces of Canada.

Mr. DALY. I beg your pardon. They came from the United States and from Sweden and Germany and other European countries.

Mr. MARTIN. The immigration into Manitoba during the last three years, has been almost entirely from the other provinces of Canada, and brought up there by the efforts of the local government.

Mr. DALY. I take exception to the hon. gentleman's statement. The facts disclosed by the delegates from Manitoba to the Minister of Finance show the opposite. The homestead entries show that the immigration from the other provinces to Manitoba has decreased from 50 to 75 per cent during the last five years. The increase of population there comes from the United States and Europe.

Mr. MARTIN. Not in Manitoba.

Mr. DALY. I cannot convince the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin). If I were to open the hon. gentleman's head and put the book in it, it would not convince him.

Mr. MARTIN. I know about it.

Mr. DALY. Yes, of course, you know all about it, but the fact is you know nothing about it, and I would rather take the records of the department than the hon. gentleman's word on it. The records disclose a state of facts creditable to the officers of the department and creditable to the expenditure on immigration as compared with the expenditure made by the Liberal Government in 1878.

Mr. McMULLEN. We find from the returns that this Government expended last year $45,912.49 on immigration from the United States. The hon. gentleman has stated that they have increased the population of Manitoba some 21,000 during the past year. We would be disposed to give some little credence to what the hon. gentleman says if it were not for the fact that the census returns of 1891 clearly show that all the statements which were made for years previous with regard to the increase of population were not at all based upon facts. They have quite a number of immigration agents in the United States who draw more than an ample allowance for all the labour they perform. He has mentioned the case of Mr. Holmes. I see we have one James Anderson in Chicago, who drew last year $2,428.25, and he was away from Canada only five months. Then, James Anderson, another Canadian immigration agent, who was in San Francisco for seven months, has drawn altogether $3,686.74, including travelling expenses. L. O. Armstrong, another agent, has drawn $2,441.50, and he has only been engaged a short time. T. W. Child was at Lewiston, Maine, for sixty-one days, and he has drawn $554.45. A. R. Code, at Saginaw, Mich., has drawn $2,790.21, and it appears that he was engaged for twelve months. P. F. Daly, who was at Chicago, and was supposed to represent Idaho and Oregon, has drawn $3,241.10. James Gadsden, who is supposed to represent Nebraska, has drawn $1,194.09. W. H. Hall, at Philadelphia and New York, was only engaged four months, and he has drawn $688.61.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he is going into the expenditure of the whole immigration department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I merely want to draw the attention of the House to what the Government has spent on these immigration agents in the United States. E. Hetherington has been engaged only four months in Nebraska, and has drawn $862.42. Then we have Alfred R. Holmes, inspector of agencies, who lives at Napanee, and very often spends several weeks at home. He has drawn $3,857.76. He has drawn a salary for twelve months and a living allowance for 365 days. For the days he was in Chicago he drew $5 a day for living allowance, and for the days he was not in Chicago he drew $3 a day. It is very singular that he should draw a living allowance for every day in the year, while it is well known he is very much at home.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman challenges my statement. If the session lasts long enough, I intend to have Mr. Holmes before the Public Accounts Committee. As the Minister of the Interior has given some idea of what these American agents have done, I wish to show what they have cost us. We had Mr. Maclean at Tacoma, Washington: he was only engaged seventy-seven days, and he has drawn $806.55. J. W. Montague—I do not know who he is—was in Illinois only seventy-nine days, and he has cost us $560.60. Then, we had A. C. Munson in Chicago, Washington, Idaho and Oregon; he appears to have had a general travelling commission, and he has drawn $2,610.32; he was engaged in all eleven months. E. W. McCrae was in Minnesota four months only, and he has drawn $782.47. M. V. McInnes, Port Huron, Mich., was engaged four months, and he has drawn $1,002.33. R. McKay, Alpena, Mich., was engaged four months, and he has drawn $942.38. Steven Robertson, San Francisco, was engaged 223 days, and he has drawn $759. A. Schumacher, Chicago, Ill., was engaged 123 days, and he has drawn $841.85. R. F. Shaw, Seattle, Washington, is supposed to have been engaged 273 days, and he has drawn $1,806.73. Henry H. Smith—that is a name which is familiar here—has been in Nebraska, it appears, for four months, and he has drawn $979.45. C. O. Swanson is supposed to have been engaged twelve months in the New England States, and he has drawn $2,080.84. Then, we had Mr. W. A. Webster, at Aberdeen, South Dakota, who has drawn $407.80, and was engaged only some twenty-eight days. These are some of the most glaring cases of immigration agents we have in the United States. Now, I contend that there is no possible justification for keeping so many men at high salaries and at enormous expense, to try to persuade people in the United States to come and settle in Canada. I would have no objection whatever to furnishing general information at the Chicago Exposition, in regard to the peculiar advantages of our country; but to keep a lot of men of the stamp I have mentioned, who are still evidently in the pay of the country, at an expense of some $46,000 a year to try to persuade Americans to come and settle here, cannot be justified; and that the whole effort should have fizzled out, and have ended in bringing over a few Jews, common tramps evidently, from the report that has been furnished by my hon. friend to-night——

Mr. DALY. I will take good care that they see what you say. Send that speech to the Grit candidate in Alberta.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has not for a moment justified the effort to bring those people here. They were evidently a few pedlars who were picked up, and who played a trick on the Minister of the Interior and his staff of officials. Even his own brother and the brother of the Secretary of State were not sharp enough to detect the trap laid by those people to get themselves carried to the North-west to have a good time and to peddle a lot of trinkets around, and then to go back to the United States after they had got all the plunder they could. These are the kind of immigrants they brought from the United States at a great expense, to increase the population of this country. They were just a kind of dead-beats, as the evidence produced by my hon. friend has shown. The Minister of the Interior feels sore over that question, and realizes that he has made a mistake.

Mr. DALY. Not at all, but I realize that the time of the House has been taken up in a very nosensical manner.

Mr. McMULLEN. Any one who will read the papers in the return must come to the conclusion that the whole thing was a piece of great folly and extravagance, and that the money spent was absolutely wasted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As far as regards the wasting of time in the House is concerned, I would recommend the Minister of Finance to give his colleagues a little training and instruct them in particular that if they want to get the Estimates through, they had better confine themselves to the question in hand. So far as regards the value of any statistics supplied by the immigration department, I would just say this, that when the department, for a period of ten years, reports having settled, on an average, 100,000 people in the North-west per year, and when, as a net result, we have 150 of these people remaining, hon. gentlemen opposite have no right to complain if people afterwards do not regard the statements of the departments as worth the paper they are written on. With respect to the motion of which I gave notice the other evening, on the whole, I think I will give the hon. gentleman a run to-night, if he will come to an understanding as to when we will take up supply to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. About five o'clock to-morrow.

Royal Military College of Canada..... $70,000

Mr. DICKEY. I wish to reduce that to $65,000.

Mr. DENISON. This item is one I have always cordially supported, with the object of having a first-class military college in Canada to educate our young men in the higher branches of military art; but unless the institution is properly managed, I think the expenditure on it is a waste of public money which would much better be saved to the country. Most hon. members know that during the last year there was some trouble in the college over the hazing of a young man named Plummer. That, of itself, showed conclusively that the commandant of the college was not the right man in the right place, or that would not have gone on. Fagging, in the ordinary sense, would not be objectionable in a school of that sort, and I, as a parent of a boy who is going through the college, would not object to it in an ordinary way, but when boys are compelled to go in for raffles or to purchase eatables—whether through the bad food given them by the man who is supplying food for the cadets or not, I do not know—it is high time to object. There is no doubt that this is done very extensively at the college, and to those parents who are in straightened circumstances, it is certainly very wrong that young cadets should be forced to spend their money in that way. It is well known that this has been going on in the past. The commandant may say he is not aware of it. Well, he should be aware of it. He is put there for that purpose: and if he does not know anything about it, it is time that a change was made and a man put there who will take more interest in the college and attend to his duties more carefully. The present commandant is an officer who, I understand, was retired from the army about the year 1887 or 1888, on account of the age clause.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Your information is wrong.

Mr. DENISON. I understood that was so. I do not wish to make any statement which is not absolutely correct, but I understood that was the case. Anyway, he came out here, not on the active, but on the retired list. What we want is a man who is thoroughly in touch with the army at the present date, and not a gentleman who has been retired from the army. When the idea of a college was first started, it was understood—if it is not in the regulations—that the officers should come out here for five or seven years and then be changed, so that we might always have men thoroughly up in the latest scientific knowledge of the British army, and, at the same time, men whose youth and energy would prompt them to take an active interest in the college. I might mention to the committee that it is now seven years since the present commandant was appointed. For some years past, I have heard complaints about the management of the college, and concluded that at the end of five years, or, at the end of seven years, we would have a new commandant, and things would then right themselves. But I have heard lately—I do not know whether I am correct in stating it or not—that the present commandant claims that his appointment is for life, and that in August, 1895, when his time would be up under the ordinary rule, he would still remain on in his present position for an indefinite period. That is my sole reason for bringing up this matter to-night, and I bring it up entirely from a sense of duty to the college. I firmly believe that the college is a most useful institution if properly managed, but unless it is directed by a man who is in touch with the British army and who can secure the best professors, this college must deteriorate. It is certainly very painful for me, as a supporter of the Government, to have to attack one of the principal institutions under its control, but it is necessary that somebody should do it, and, as a matter of duty, I am taking the matter up to-night. If the motion I am going to introduce is carried, it will mean that we shall be without a commandant for the next year. The duty can be carried out by the senior officer for twelve months, and then I hope we will put an amount in the Estimates to place another commandant at the head of the college. The commandant, in his report, states as follows, at page 35 of the Royal Military College Report:—

> Yet those who present themselves for admission to the Royal Military College are insignificantly few in number; very many fewer than is desirable, and very many fewer than can be accounted for otherwise than by a general absence of knowledge of the education and training imparted there.

I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, this is caused by the want of interest in the college and lack of proper management. I have taken up the report of the last few years to ascertain the number of cadets that have passed in during the past few years. I find that in 1876 the number of cadets who passed in was 18, and the number each year since then has been as follows:—

	Cadets passed.
1877	20
1878	20
1879	25
1880	33
1881	12
1882	17
1883	15
1884	20
1885	23
1886	24

	Cadets passed.
1887	25
1888	24
1889	17
1890	17
1891	11
1892	24
1893	18
1894	14

In other words, since 1889, the year when the present commandant came into office, I notice a very serious falling off in the numbers; and, at the present time I believe there are 54 cadets in the college. I move:

That the item $70,000 for the Royal Military College be reduced by the amount of the commandant's salary, $3,163.32.

Sir JAMES GRANT. Mr. Chairman, before this matter is decided, I should like to make a few observations on the subject of militia matters of our country. I regret that I was absent when the previous discussion took place with reference to militia, for I think that at the present it is opportune time to make a few observations not only on the militia as it stands but on our future with reference to the defence of the Empire. All are aware that there is no subject at present arousing greater discussion or deeper interest than that of the militia force of Canada. I find in a recent issue of an Ottawa paper the following despatch:—

London, 26th June.—The "Times" says that it understands that the Duke of Devonshire, besides assuming the Lord Presidency of the Council, will preside over a committee of national Imperial defence, which will combine the Admiralty and War Office, such as was recommended by the Royal Commission over which the Duke, as Marquis of Hartingdon, presided, and which is now for the first time to be formally constituted.

In the light of this important statement we can see that there is a movement being made with reference not only to the military matters of Great Britain individually, but also with reference to the relationship that should exist between the colonies and the Empire in the matter of defence. Then in the Ottawa "Citizen" of 5th June last I find the following article:—

The unity of the Empire is also discussed in an article in the "Statist," urging the colonies to state clearly their views as to sharing the expenses of the general defence. The writer points out that the Pacific Ocean, with 800,000,000 people living on its shores, will be in the future an important highway of international commerce, and that Great Britain individually is at a marked disadvantage with Russia, Japan and the United States in respect of ports, coaling stations and the like. He suggests that Great Britain should come to a permanent understanding with the United States, which power he assumes to have no aggressive designs, and that the colonies also should enter into a systematic scheme for carrying out whatever policy the Imperial authorities might desire.

When this subject of the defences of the colonies came up in England some time ago as we know, no less an individual than our distinguished high commissioner in London impressed upon the public mind there the proper standing of Canada in reference to this matter. And his suggestions were so remarkably well received that not only in London but throughout the British Empire his statements on that very important occasion were taken notice of; and in fact he has been the main instrument in placing this movement upon the substantial basis on which it now stands, as far as Canada is concerned. Then again I find in the "Citizen" of 9th June, 1895:

A little leaflet has been sent out by the Imperial Federation Defence Committee which gives some interesting facts relating to the way in which the burden of defending the commerce of the British Empire is distributed. The commerce of the British Empire has a value of £930,000,000. Of this the United Kingdom owns £625,000,000; the self-governing colonies, £146,000,000. The colonial commerce consequently forms one-seventh of that whole. The naval protection of this vast property costs £20,269,000 per annum. Of this total the United Kingdom pays £20,000,000, while the self-governing colonies pay only £269,000. In other words, the colonies possess one-seventh of the trade, but contribute only one-seventy-fifth of the cost of protecting the trade.

The population of the United Kingdom is 38,000,000; that of the self-governing colonies, 11,000,000. While the population of the self-governing colonies is more than one-fourth of that of the United Kingdom, while their revenue is nearly half as great, and the value of their seaborne trade almost quarter, they contribute only one-seventy-fifth part of the naval defence of the Empire. Certain small contributions are made by Natal, Hong Kong, the Straits Settlements, Ceylon and Malta; but Canada, the West Indies, Cape Colony, the West Coast of Africa and Gibraltar contribute nothing.

As the committee point out, the self-governing colonies, including Canada, are depending upon the motherland for the defence of their commerce and shirking their own share of it.

That is a very important point, "shirking our own share of it." I say Canada shirks nothing. Canada has never been afraid to defend herself; she has never been afraid to take her part, not only in the protection of Canadian interests, but in contributing admirably well her share towards the defence of the Empire, as I shall prove.

The Empire must be defended somehow. That defence costs money, and if one part of the Empire fails to do its share, unfair burdens must fall upon the remainder. Defence is not a luxury, which can be indulged in or dispensed with, as times are good or bad; it is a vital necessity to every self-respecting people.

This is not, however, the whole story. If Canada has not paid directly its share of Imperial defence, it has done something towards the unification and strengthening of the Empire. The London "Times" of 31st May acknowledges this. After alluding to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the subsidizing of steamers between Vancouver and Japan, and Vancouver and Australia, and the proposal that the Imperial Government should join the colonies in assisting the establishment of a fast mail service across the Atlantic and the Pacific, as well as the construction of a Pacific cable, the "Times" says: "The

colonies have taken their part in the consolidating movement, for the furtherance of which the support and encouragement of the Imperial Government is now sought. Individual energy and state enterprise, of which the colonial tax-payer has borne all the burden, have achieved almost without direct Imperial assistance a large part of what has been already done."

Now, this last motive is an extremely important one, it is the one, above all others, that our High Commissioner pressed upon their public men, and, as a result, to-day they are cognizant of the fact that Canada has not been behind in the slightest degree in contributing her share towards the defence of the Empire. Now, when we talk of this matter of defence, we know perfectly well that since the very commencement of this session we have all been agitated about the question of protection. That is the subject and the theme that has been discussed in this House. But that protection should not alone be confined to trade and commerce; it ought also to extend to the protection of Canadian interests so far as militia matters are concerned. Protection of trade and commerce without protection in other respects, would be of little account; and for that reason I desire at this time to bring that question before the House and the country. Now, what have we in the way of a militia force in Canada? We have a permanent force of 1,000 men. We have an active militia of 36,000 men, composed of cavalry troops, field batteries, artillery, and battalions of infantry. I suppose these figures are all correct, because I have taken them out of the militia blue-book, which is yearly printed, and presented to this House, and I have no doubt as to their accuracy. The militia expenditure of this country at present is very little more than it was in 1870, when the Imperial troops were withdrawn from Canada. At that time, a very large and extensive grant of territory, until then owned by the British Government, was handed over to this country, with the positive understanding that when these troops were withdrawn we would look after our own interests. At that time we had only four provinces; to-day we have seven provinces, and a territory as well. Since that time what has taken place? We have doubled our population, our wealth and our resources. In 1870 we had no military college, we had no cartridge factory, we had no permanent force; all these have been added since, not as any extra charge upon the country, but the expenditure necessary to keep up these various additions to the militia force of our country, has been taken out of the ordinary grant given by the Government for the militia force. Now, when we inquire into this question, if the people of Canada fancy for one moment that they are overtaxed for the support of their militia force, I would wish to impress upon their minds the contrary. We find that the Imperial Government spends no less than $4 per head for its naval and military defence; the United States expends $1 per head for its whole 65,000,000 of people; and, besides that, each state supports a militia force of its own. Canada spends—what? About 25 cents per head, exclusive of the North-west Mounted Police. Public sentiment is not in favour of cutting down our militia force. Some think it is desirable to reduce the permanent force, as the Minister of Finance has recommended, owing to the falling off in our revenue. Well, we might cut it down to a small extent, for, as long as we have a substitute in the way of individuals who are thoroughly up in drill, and are able to drill the militia force of this country, we have all that is absolutely necessary. The spirit of military enthusiasm thirty years ago was vastly greater than it is to-day. At that time we find that the Conservative Government went in for thorough organization. We know well that no greater stimulus could be given to the force than was given during that time by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, whose monument was uncovered the other day. I was pleased and gratified beyond measure to find an evidence of what has been done in military matters on that very occasion, for we then saw assembled several corps of troops, going through their drill with as much activity, displaying as much skill, and dexterity, in military tactics, I might almost say, as seen in the British army itself. And why? Is it owing to the small pittance they get from the Government of their country? No, very far from it. It is their own energy, their own activity, it is owing to the efforts of their own officers to make the men of the force a credit to themselves and a credit to the country. That is what has brought it up to the state of efficiency that it now occupies. In 1870 the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), whom I do not see present, took an active interest in militia affairs, and he wrote a brocheur as we all remember, on military matters, and on the military defence of this country. At that time he was a member of the Conservative party, but he has left us, for what reason I know not. But, rely upon it, that since 1870, when he saw fit to leave the party of progress in this country, he has been ever since very much like the dove that went out of Noah's ark, he has found no resting place for the sole of his foot. In 1885 he seemed to have revived his enthusiasm, for he then seconded a vote of thanks to General Middleton when he returned gloriously from Batoche, where our citizen soldiers had distinguished themselves. We know what the annual camps have done for the encouragement of our citizen soldiers. We remember when they formerly gathered at Brantford, Drummondville, and London, when thousands of people congregated and showed their interest in military matters.

Was it for the mere purpose of self advancement that they went into these camps? No, far from it. It was to show their zeal for their country, it was to show their military ardour, it was to show a desire to protect our homes. The North-west mounted police, as we know well, has done a great deal, and has also accomplished a good work. It is a force which is a credit to our country; but the day is not very far distant when some change must take place in that great North-west country with reference to military matters. We are getting a large population in there, and, no doubt, we are not far from the time when we will have a militia force there the same as we have in the other portions of the Dominion. The North-west mounted police will gradually all be reduced in number, and act as a cavalry contingent in connection with the North-west militia, and in that way a great saving will be effected in the militia expenditure of this country. When the international conference was held at Ottawa all these subjects relating to military matters were discussed, and the Imperial Government is now taking into consideration this subject more than they have done at any other time? Why? A committee waited on Lord Rosebery before his resignation and placed before him the whole subject, as to what Canada was going to do, as to how much we were prepared to contribute in support of the defence of our own country and at the same time assist in the protection of the British Empire. Canada is a young country and it has heavy responsibilities. We cannot undertake too much. We are building railways, constructing canals and operating public works in every direction, and while we are willing to contribute our quota towards military matters we cannot be expected to raise a large army and tax our people for it. Very far from it. But whatever force we have, let it be thoroughly equipped and organized let it act as the nucleus of a force should such ever be required. We know perfectly well what organization has accomplished. I received a few days ago the "Herald-Mail" of Yokohama, Japan, containing a reliable statement as to the recent war. In that country we have a marvellous illustration of the development of a naval and military power, within the past few months, during which period it has gained a name, power and standing in the nations of the world such as it never before possessed. Only 32 years have elapsed since Japan was opened to trade by Great Britain; ten years before Commodore Perry had endeavoured to get into the country but without success. It has been opened to civilization only during that period, and yet see what its achievements have been in scientific, military and naval matters. This shows the importance of being prepared and thoroughly organized. The result of the war between China and Japan affords a remarkable illustration of what can be accomplished by organization, and on this point I will read some observations printed in the Japan "Herald-Mail," 28th May, 1895, to which I have referred, which is the leading political journal of the country and so no doubt its statements are accurate:

> They are wearied with the long campaign they have been engaged in, and no doubt were shrewd enough to think that had they to do battle with European troops, it would be something a little different to the sort of military promenade which had engaged their attention in the late war, when addressing themselves to a foe that almost invariably betrayed a more active disposition to retreat than to fight, as is proved by the statistics just published of the casualties of the Japanese from first to last. Of the killed, there were only 623, and those who died from wounds were 72; total mortality at the hands of the enemy, 795; with under 3,000 wounded only.

This statement shows that Japan was thoroughly organized. She was fighting a nation with more millions than there are days in the year, and she was successful in that campaign because of her organization and training. We know perfectly well that the strength of a country does not depend on the density of its population or extent of territory, for if we look at the nations of the world, what do we observe? The dear old British Isles only occupy a small space on the globe; yet what has England not done towards the advancement and civilization of the world. Are we not pleased, proud and satisfied to think that we belong to a country which has achieved such a name and reputation, notwithstanding the fact that the country is small in extent, but it is great in principle, great in power, strong in the enunciation of those principles which cement us together. Canada is not a military country, and we do not expect to raise here a great army. How are we placed on this continent? Here are five millions contiguous to seventy-five millions. But we are living beside a people who are happy, peaceful and prosperous and whose prosperity and happiness we are glad to recognize. In that civil war of which I had personal observation during a considerable period, I saw what they accomplished as a people; there the citizen soldiers of Canada united with the soldiers of the United States, and Canadian and American blood was spilt on the same field. For what object? For the abolition of slavery and for the advancement of civilization, and may that peace, comfort and happiness which extends over the North American continent ever continue, and may the people of Canada remain happy and contented, as we possess equal freedom and liberty with the people on the other side of the line, whose prosperity we enjoy, who are one people with us, one people in language and in literature, and though we are under different flags, let us at the same time be happy, contented with our lot on this entire continent. I wish to thank the Minister

for extending to us a small share of that revenue which is under his control in order that our military corps may have a certain amount of drill which is absolutely necessary in this country, for we know perfectly well that without such drill they would not be organized. When I saw the Estimates brought down they reminded me of a very interesting and important fact. When Her Majesty opened Wimbledon for the purpose of encouraging shooting matches there and holding prize competitions, two very celebrated individuals were contending for a prize, one an Englishman and another a Scotchman. I am reminded of this incident because I think the Minister of Finance must be of Scotch descent, and he puts me very much in mind of the Scotchman who carried off the prize, admirably represented by Leech—to which Jerrold contributed the following, "Punch":

'Tis said that the Scots
Turn out better shots
At long distances, than most of the Englishmen are.
But this we all knew
That a Scotchman could do—
Make a small piece of metal go awfully far.

I do not find any fault with the Finance Minister. His intention is to make the money go as far as possible, to extend it over the various requirements of our people. We are advancing in material interests. If we are not able to carry out every important improvement, do not find fault, have a little patience, Canada is prospering, great works are going on. We cannot accomplish every thing in a day. Rome was not built in a day; we must be content with what is being accomplished. But do not fancy there is a dark cloud over the country, very far from it. Great Britain would not take that interest in Canada which she displays if this was not the colony of all the colonies. I wish the organized militia of this country every possible prosperity. I hope that the Minister of Finance next year will give more money in order to enable the force to more perfect organization. I am glad to find the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the House now. I am glad that he takes an interest in military matters. I know that he occasionally fires a stray shot, but we must excuse him for that. I will say no more now, Mr. Speaker, further than to wish our Canadian volunteer force success and prosperity.

Mr. FRASER. I must congratulate the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FRASER. I mean the member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison). I congratulate him for bringing up this question. It is not often that we have a debate upon the militia estimates so truly a patriotic speech as has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant). Until I heard that eloquent oration I was inclined to think that we were spending too much on our militia. Although a few stray shots from his locker were dealt out rather unfairly to members on this side of the House, still the tone of his speech had the right ring about it, and in discussing a question of war we must expect, I suppose, to be a little hurt. I am glad to re-echo the sentiment, that not only so far as the militia of Canada are concerned, but so far as the men, and boys, and women of Canada are concerned, they are ready to take up arms on behalf of this Canada of ours. Only a Scotchman can appreciate that. Englishmen fight alone, but if Scotchmen are not sufficiently numerous to meet the enemy, Scotchwomen are always ready to take part in the defence of their country. I must enter a caveat, however, against one expression of the hon. gentleman (Sir James Grant) in connection with the militia. I think that the members of our militia are not any worse nor any better than the militia of any British country, but I think he was wrong in attributing their excellence to the liberality of the Finance Minister. The country is to be congratulated rather than the Finance Minister, because I feel that the Finance Minister would rather not contribute so generously, for had he withheld more money, his deficit would be much less than it is. I think myself that the training of men in Canada ought to be attended to more than the drill of the various militia corps. While there ought to be drill, I believe we should expend more in preparing men who would be ready at the proper time to drill others. Perhaps I am not the best judge, but I am only laying down the general rule. I have my commission and I am ready to fight, although I am not now in active service. I do not anticipate that we shall have war in this country, but a great European war might create an occasion, when it would be necessary for us to have men who could drill, not only the militia, but others who would enter the service of their country. I rose to add my testimony to what has been so eloquently said by the member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant). I hope that we may long enjoy such outbursts of eloquence in this House. It was refreshing to me to know that in so old a breast there was still so much loyalty and so much desire to see Canada prosper. If men who are growing old like the hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant) exhibit such a spirit, what an example it must be to our young men. I am sure the hon. gentleman, if the emergency should occur, would forget that he is now beyond three score years and would be ready to lay down his life in the defence of his country. That is truly patriotic.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant) has shown that he

deserves to share in the motto of the volunteers : " semper paratus," for he seems to be ready to make a speech on everything that comes up.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CASEY. I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite should laugh at the hon. member for Ottawa for his general readiness. I am sure they cannot be laughing at me, because they know that military matters are one of my specialties ! I was once a very good shot myself, and I am waiting now to hear about the cow. We can all agree with what the member for Ottawa (Sir James Grant) said in praise of the volunteers, though we may not perhaps go with him to the full extent in his qualifications of the High Commissioner, as to the manner in which he has placed the claims of Canada before other countries. Nor can we all agree with him in thanking the Finance Minister so effusively for granting money for the current year's drill. Why, Sir, we are all aware that the Finance Minister did not intend to give any money for that purpose. We are all aware that it is the Dominion Rifle Association and the Artillery Association and similar bodies, who are more to be thanked than the Finance Minister, because when they happened to be gathered here during the session, they brought such pressure upon him that he had to consent to expend that money for volunteer purposes. I wish to have it noted that the money which the Finance Minister was willing to grant was for that part of the militia expenses which are partly ornamental and partly of a permanent nature, and which do not go towards teaching the militia of the country their actual duties in the field, and that the part which he was not willing to grant, until he had to do it under pressure, was the part that is actually necessary for teaching the men their duties, and the part that is most widely scattered all over the country.

He was willing, for example, to continue this expenditure on the Military College, and ask for $70,000 for that institution, which I understand the Minister now requests to be reduced to $65,000. This is one of the points in regard to which I wish to attack the militia policy of the Government. I am sorry to have to attack the Military College, seeing that it was first put into operation by my own political friends ; but the fact is that that college, instituted with the best object in view, and managed while my friends were in power with economy and efficiency, seems to have declined to a far lower level, and to have become less an institution for the benefit of the militia of Canada than a select private school for the sons of rich men who have sufficient influence to get them in there, and sufficient money to pay a large annual fee after they are in.

I fail to see any connection whatever between the Military College as at present managed and the efficiency of the militia of Canada. For that reason I object to the outrageously large amount spent upon it in proportion to the work done, and the manner in which that money is expended. My hon. friend from Ottawa (Sir James Grant) talked as if there were some connection between this vote and the efficiency of the volunteers ; but it is true enough, as he pointed out in one moment of frankness, that the efficiency of our volunteers is not due to the money grants of the Government.

The pittance the volunteers receive does not actually pay them for what they lose by volunteering, while at the same time we maintain at Kingston an institution on a scale almost sufficient for a first-class university, with the result of doing what ? Educating to the point of graduation last year how many cadets ? Fifteen. We spent $68,000 last year on the military college, and fifteen cadets graduated. It cost an average of $4,533 apiece to the country to educate these cadets, besides what it cost their parents ; and what is the benefit to the actual militia of Canada ? How many of them have gone into the active militia ? Since this college was instituted, I believe, not 5 per cent of its graduates have entered the service of the active militia.

Mr. MULOCK. Only 11 out of over 200 in the permanent corps.

Mr. CASEY. That shows that my estimate was pretty nearly correct. Very few have taken commissions in the militia. A number have taken commissions in the Imperial army ; but it is no part of our duty to educate officers for the Imperial army or to tax Canadians for that purpose. The large majority of the graduates of the college have not only not taken service in our own militia, or even in the Imperial army, but they have gone to the United States and other countries to seek their fortunes as civil engineers, or in other civil occupations for which they were fitted by the education they received in the college.

We will take for granted, although I do not know that we have any proof of it, that the education given in this college is first-rate, and such as to fit a man for employment as civil engineer or in some other walk of life ; but the fact is that we have been there educating men who have not gone into the military occupations afterwards, but who have for the most part gone to take civil positions in the United States, to help to build up that country at our expense. The whole system is utterly rotten and absurd, with the actual result of graduating only fifteen or twenty cadets every year, very few of whom remain in Canada at all.

Mr. DENISON. Eight graduated this year.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend says that this year there are only eight graduates. Now, Sir, it would be a highly proper thing for us to have an institution purely for military instruction, for officers of our volunteers and our permanent corps. If we had such an institution and at a reasonable cost, it would be an extremely useful and proper thing to have. But, this military college being what it is, I say it is an outrage on the Canadian tax-payer to ask him to maintain it.

Let me for a moment compare the cost of this college with the cost of some of the other services connected with the militia. I have told you that it cost $68,000 last year. This year we are only asked for $55,000 for all kinds of stores, or $13,000 less than for the military college. We are asked for $55,000 for clothing and necessaries for the permanent corps and the active militia combined, again $13,000 less than for this swell college of Kingston. We ask for only $37,000 for grants in aid of the artillery and rifle associations, very little more than half as much as for the military college, and I can assure the House, if they do not know it already, that the different rifle and artillery associations do a vast deal more to keep up interest in military matters and to turn our men into the making of good soldiers than the military college has ever done.

Our cartridge factory, which supplied us with all the ammunition used during the past year, in all cost a trifle over $35,000, or $33,000 less than the military school which turned out this year eight cadets, as my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Denison) reminds us. Our whole ammunition cost us $35,000, and those eight cadets cost us over $8,000 a year each! Which is the service that is useful and proper to be maintained, and which is the service that is kept up for the purpose of sham and ostentation? I say that the military college is a perfect sham, as compared with these other services. Take a few of the other military expenditures. The pay allowance for the permanent corps of active militia for the year is only $40,000, or $28,000 less than what these cadets cost. The clothing of the militia and permanent corps only cost $33,000, and so on.

It is asserted that this institution gives us grand results in the way of education. What does the commandant claim for it? After going into an analysis of the marks, he goes on to tell us who visited the college during the year and so on. But finally he states:

> There is all but an unanimous opinion amongst the parents of Royal Military College graduates, that the result of the education and training here has been very highly satisfactory.

"An all but unanimous opinion"—perhaps the commandant refers to the scandals which took place this year in connection with that college. I do not remember the particulars, but we all have a general recollection of the ill-treatment to which some of the cadets were subjected, leading to a great deal of inquiry and implying a great deal of disgrace, to my mind, on the management of the college. It is not unnatural that the parents, if they were not the parents of the particular young men who were ill-treated there, might have a very good opinion of the educational training, considering it cost so much to the country. But the commandant admits:

> Yet those who present themselves for admission to the Royal Military College are insignificantly few in number; very many fewer than is desirable, and very many fewer than can be accounted for otherwise than by a general absence of knowledge of the education and training imparted here.

Yet we find $700 or $800 in the Public Accounts charged for advertising this institution as if it were a proprietary boarding school. Then the commandant goes on to say:

> It is true that the number of students who can be received here is very small, but it does not adequately meet the aims of this national college to attract merely enough competitors to ensure securing a sufficiency of candidates to occupy all available accommodation.

That is a sentence I can hardly parse. But it seems to have a general meaning that the accommodation is too small for the number of cadets that ought to be accommodated at such an institution, and it is a very remarkable sentence to come from the head of an educational institution.

> The aim is to prepare men for the public service, and the selection of these should not be limited to a group of thirty or forty candidates, for the larger the number of competitors, the higher will be the average standard of ability and attainments in those selected.

The commandant himself condemns the system of admission to the college, but we find some reason to congratulate ourselves on the progress of the cadets of last year, for the commandant tells us:

> The graduating class, fifteen in number, increased 412½ pounds in weight during their residence here, making the average increase 27½ pounds.

How much a pound is that at the figure down in the Estimates? About $165! The commandant also informs us that the graduating class also increased 27½ pounds on an average, and we are asked to congratulate ourselves on that. And he adds that the average increase in height has been 2¼ inches, and the average increase in chest measurement, 2½ inches. Surely we have something for our money when we can prove that we have fattened fifteen young men and made them grow to this extent. The commandant says further:

> No prize is assigned to this important department of college business. I may, therefore, here mention that had a prize been available, it would

have been won by a most distinguished competitor, for he added to his chest breadth, 5¾ inches; to his weight, 69 pounds, and to his stature, 8¼ inches.

Well, we can boast of having one cadet who, "by taking thought" has added so much to stature.

I do not know that I need read further from the report, it is all of the same valuable character. I did not hear all the arguments urged by my hon. friend from West Toronto in support of his motion, but this report has fully satisfied me that I ought to vote for that resolution to knock off the salary of the commandant. It will be well for this House and country to know some of the details of this last expenditure, to know what we are paying for the instruction in this college as well as fattening the cadets.

Speaking generally, the teaching staff cost $28,400, which is about $3,500 per head for the eight cadets who graduated this year. The subordinate staff includes mostly servants, a few staff sergeants, and so on, costing $8,000. The total staff of the college cost $36,000, or $4,500 per head for the hon. gentleman's eight cadets who graduated. Coming down to individual salaries, we find that the commandant receives $3,163; seven professors receive over $2,000 each; and the salaries of the others range from $1,292 up to $2,000. There are, in all, fifteen professors, getting $1,300 each to educate eight cadets, at least to secure the graduation of eight cadets out of the total number there. Two professors to each cadet, almost. One might think that these cadets would absorb a vast amount of learning from having two professors apiece for each. We almost put them in the position of having private teachers supplied to them at the public expense, and I do not think that the hard-working electors will care to see their money going in this way.

In the expenditure for the subordinate staff, a large amount went for servants. I find $320 a year for a butler. Fancy young fellows getting a military education for services in the volunteers requiring a butler? Or perhaps it was the commandant who required the butler. Then there are other servants, at $240, and so on. At all events, $8,000 is spent for servants for these young men and their teachers—about $1,000 apiece for those who graduated this year. Then I find that their clothing seems to have been bought bit by bit from one George Creeggan, whoever he is—of Kingston, I suppose. I do not know whether he is a Kingston dealer or whether he is the regular contractor for military clothing. At any rate, the payment to him is $2,629.

Their food appears to have been bought of one L. J. Williams, at the rate of 46 cents per day each. I should think that in a college of that kind messing arrangements could be made more economically than by paying a caterer in the way that is done in this institution. At all events, $7,382 went to this Williams for messing the cadets. I do not know whether he got the job by contract or by favour, but I should think that these young fellows could have been supplied at less expense.

Then I find that the stationery and printing department here received $5,861 for the benefit of these few cadets. I do not know what so small a number as were there could have done with something like $6,000 of stationery. That is, perhaps, several hundred dollars a piece.

Mr. MULOCK. It is a little over $100 per head.

Mr. CASEY. I stand corrected—it is over $100 per head for stationery and printing for cadets who are supposed to get only an ordinary military education.

I am sure, Sir, the cost of educating these young men is far greater than for educating young men in any other military college, royal or republican, in the world. There is not a military college in England where anything like such expense is incurred on behalf of the cadets, nor is there in the United States. I do not think that in a peaceful country like Canada, where our efforts should be to have a large number of our population ready to take up arms, able to shoot and having some rudiments of drill, we should attempt to give to a few any such education as should be obtained from the figures I have quoted. I say we ought not to attempt to give such an education as ought to be obtained for these figures. In fact, the education they get is not at all in proportion to the cost, as shown by the commandant's report.

Now, the hon. member for Ottawa has referred us to the case of Japan. And very justly. He has told us that Japan has gained her late great military success by a thorough system, and by the thorough education of her soldiery. That is perfectly true; but where the comparison exists between Japan and Canada, or what reference this has to the Royal Military College is one of those things it seems to me, that no fellow can find out. Japan is above all things a business-like country. She does not spend $7,000 or $8,000 a year in educating each of her officers. She adopts an effective business-like plan in military matters. Her soldiery are well drilled by competent instructors, and they are economically handled. If there is anything calculated to show by illustration how utterly rotten our military system is, it is the comparison of affairs here with the state of affairs in Japan.

I do not pretend that we should make ourselves a military nation as Japan has done. But we should spend our money so as to get the largest return, and not spend vast sums on ornamental excrescences, while starving the actual fighting force of the country. I speak without bias in this matter. There is not a volunteer organization in my riding, but I have sympathy with the volunteers for old times' sake. The real volunteer force

has been starved, while the staff, the military college and other branches have fattened at their expense. I shall vote for the amendment of my hon. friend from West Toronto, more as expressing my general disapprobation of the management of this college than for any special objection to the commandant, as I do not pretend to have any special knowledge in the matter.

Mr. AMYOT. There is one word used by the hon. gentleman which I cannot allow to pass unnoticed. He says that the volunteer system is rotten. That is very unfair. As to the military college at Kingston, I presume that the object of the hon. mover of the amendment is to obtain an expression of opinion from this House, because it is perfectly impossible for this Government to stop at once the system and close the college. I am sure the Government understand, as we all do, the onerous legacy left to them which created that college. But experience has proved beyond all possible doubt that this military college has become a very costly emigration school for the country. We educate young men, very intelligent young men, and after they have received their instruction, they leave us and go to some other countries. This shows that the college is not a success, and the sooner the Government see their way to abolish it the better for the country.

Mr. MULOCK. At this late hour I will not take up much of the time of the committee. Last year I called the attention of the House to this institution which is now before us; and, inasmuch as I find that the debate of last session has produced apparently no results, I feel that it would be quite within my right to again refer to the matter. The military college was established for an express purpose. It was established as an adjunct to the militia system of Canada, a college to train young men in fortification and military engineering, the knowledge to be applied for the benefit of Canada. But now we find that the object of the department in carrying on the college is entirely changed. I think I am perfectly correct in saying that the Government is largely responsible for the failure. We have not carried out the objects of Parliament in creating the college and supplying it annually with funds, by giving to graduates appointments in connection with the militia. As a result, the graduates of this college have in some instances entered the Imperial army, in others, as mentioned by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), they have left the country, and in other cases, have entered private walks of life. Now, I would remind the Minister of Militia that it is no part of the duties, nor is it within the letter or the spirit of the Confederation Act that the Dominion Government should embark in the business of general education. That is a duty assigned to the provinces alone, and the Dominion Government, I submit, is only entitled to promote education of a special character connected with subjects that are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion Government, under the Confederation Act. But if you turn to the Military College now, you find they are advertising in the prospectus and in the press, that their labours are not now exclusively confined to military education, but that young men at that college are prepared for entrance into business life, into professional life, and all the ordinary walks of life that are open to young men. They have as a college entirely abandoned the only right they have to an existence, the imparting of a military education. I ask the Minister of Militia, and I ask any hon. gentleman in this House, if he can for one moment justify the great expense in connection with this college, compared with the small results. Even if for a moment we lose sight of the fact that the graduates do not pursue a military calling in connection with our own militia, and for the moment giving the college credit for all its educational work as if it was properly within its scope, there stands before us in plain figures this state of affairs, that we are now educating 54 men this year at a cost to the country of $70,000, or thereabouts. As I gave the figures last year, I can repeat them, they have not materially changed since. There have been only 11 graduates of this college received into the permanent force since the establishment of the college, at a cost in all these years of over $1,000,000. It amounts to this, that for the 11 graduates of this college that we appoint to positions in connection with the permanent corps, the country has been obliged to pay for the general education of each one of these men, no less a sum than $91,000. Now, in addition to the loss of this money, it has another injurious effect upon the very system we are desirous of benefiting, the militia system. We are annually granting for the maintenance of our militia a sum of money in the vicinity of a million and a half—this year very much reduced. But I will take the year 1892-93, as I find it in the Auditor General's Report, and the reason I refer to it is because I find the expenditure is classified there in a way that makes it more easy for one to discuss the details of the expenditure, and as there has not been yet any material change from these figures, the quotation I make fairly illustrates the state of affairs to-day, although we are promised a change. I find that the expenditure for 1892-93 for militia, amounts in all to $1,419,000, there was expended on the military college and the permanent corps, artillery, cavalry and infantry schools, $538,000; in other words over one-third of the whole grant for the militia was eaten up by this college and these schools. How much then goes for the encouragement of men in the rural districts and in the cities, the volunteers and others connected with the force? There is a feel-

ing throughout the country that the men are not getting fair-play, that the bulk of the grant which the people, with more or less cheerfulness, have been paying, is not doing the best good, is not reaching the men for whom it is intended. Since we had the debate in this House a few weeks ago, I have come across several military men connected with our service, and I have yet to find the first man from amongst the officers or men, who does not indorse the attitude of those gentlemen in this House who have pointed out, as was pointed out here a short time ago, that the present system of training officers for the militia through the agency of these permanent schools, is against the best interests of the militia. Now, my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) referred to some of the expenditures connected with the college. I would call your attention to this fact. Last year I brought to the attention of the House the numerical strength of the staff of the college, and the figures I then gave were that in order to qualify 58 students, there were then on the staff 18 subordinates, or servants, and 15 superior officers, in all, a staff of 33, consisting of the commandant, professors and others, in connection with the education of 58 men. Sir, I think the House had a right, when these figures were brought before us last year, at least not to have an intensification of that unfair state of things; and yet on examination of the Auditor General's Report for the last fiscal year, I find that although the number of students has fallen from 58 to 54, the number of the staff and others at that college has increased from 33 to 42. I find that according to the last report of the Auditor General there were, at the date of that report, 25 subordinate officers, and 17 superior officers, a total of 42 in connection with the education of 54 men. I am sure the Minister will agree with me that the mention of these figures is quite sufficient comment. Now, I am not going to hold the Minister responsible for the expenditure, that would be unfair, as he has only recently come into the department. But I will ask him, how can he justify advertising this college in 76 papers of this Dominion, at a cost of hundreds and hundreds of dollars? In conclusion, I would ask the hon. gentleman himself to compare the educational work done by this institution with that done by the largest educational institution we have in Canada, I refer to the University of Toronto. The hon. gentleman is aware that there are hundreds of students receiving their training at that institution in many faculties. I will not venture to say the number for fear of making a mistake, but it is sufficient for me to say that they probably exceed one thousand by two or three hundred. And yet the cost to the country of the maintenance of that institution does not exceed the cost to the country of the maintenance of the Kingston Military College. That I think is in itself a sufficient condemnation of the extent of the expenditure going on at Kingston. When I say it dose not exceed to the country, of course, I do not wish to mislead the committee. The maintenance of the University of Toronto does not depend solely on the public revenue, but is supplemented to a considerable extent by the fees of the students. The same remark applies to the Kingston military college, and even to a greater extent, because the fees at Kingston are, per capita, very much greater than those at the university at Toronto. I do not wish to be held to figures, for I have not them in my mind very accurately, but I am within the mark when I say that not $70,000 of the public money per annum is paid towards the maintenance of the university in all the work it accomplishes; yet that amount is expended in the education of fifty-four men at Kingston, very nearly all of whom leave the militia service when they graduate.

Mr. DICKEY. I think it is only fair to the committee, and to myself that I should say a few words about this matter, although the committee will understand that, personally I cannot be expected to have very much knowledge of the details. The course which the hon. member for West Toronto has taken is one that is somewhat unusual. He has made a personal attack upon the commandant of the Royal Military College, and invited the committee to censure him, and declare him to be an officer not fit to govern the Royal Military College on the statements he has made before the committee, which the commandant has had no opportunity of answering. Let us see what the hon. gentleman said. In the first place, he said there was trouble with respect to hazing. I know nothing whatever about the details of the matter. I believe that it was very much exaggerated, and while not in the slightest degree desiring to lend any countenance to a laxity of discipline in the college, or endorsing any hazing, must say that, personally, if a young man who is being educated for a soldier cannot stand the hazing that well-bred Canadian youths will put him through he had better find out sooner rather than later that he has missed his avocation. I have been through a Canadian college, and suffered the usual amount of hazing, and I take it that in college students, as a rule, as I know them, there is a very small percentage who are vicious, or inclined to do anything cruel or brutal in regard to hazing. The students themselves unanimously repudiate anything like brutality or cruelty in connection with this matter, and though you may say they are interested witnesses, it is also due to them to say they are young Canadian gentlemen, trained in a high standard of morality and perfectly willing, so far as you can judge from their bearing, to take the responsibility for anything they may do, and they made these statements when all chance of punishment in connection with the act was over. Even supposing it to be true, surely the hon. gen-

tleman would not hold the commandant liable to discharge because of one act of hazing in the college. The hon. gentleman spoke of raffles having been held. His statement is the first intimation I ever had of that, and it is a fair illustration of this way of trying a man. Here is the statement made in the committee, not known to me before, and of which I have not had the slightest intimation, still, the Government is asked to act on that and strike out the salary of this officer. The commandant of the Royal Military College is not appointed for five years or seven years. The Order in Council appointing him does not limit his term in that way. There is only one point that I was able to find in the hon. gentleman's statement which was a material one, and one that required consideration at the hands of the Government, and it was the smallness of the number of students now attending the college. There is no doubt that this is a very striking fact. This struck me immediately I came to look into the affairs of the college. I do not wish to repeat private conversation, but on my recent visit to the military college at Kingston, I took pains to inquire into that matter personally, from the very best possible sources, not, I need scarcely say, from the commandant himself or any of the staff, but from what I considered the very best possible sources, and I did not find the opinion of the men with whom I talked to agree with that of the hon. member for West Toronto. There was three causes—and I will be perfectly frank with the committee—stated by those gentlemen to whom I talked, for the falling off in number. The first clause was that the advertising was not done judiciously, that the money spent on advertising might be spent more profitably, and that even more might be spent. It was stated that there is some idea in the country that the students at the Royal Military College are only taking a course of study such as the long and short courses taken by officers to qualify for the militia, and that the college is not known as an institution of learning, except where the graduates of it go out. It was pointed out very clearly that the graduates, or, at all events, a very large percentage of them, come from a few centres, from Halifax, St. John, Fredericton, Quebec, Montreal and Toronto, and Kingston itself, and that the people in the country whose sons might probably go there, really did not know the standard of education given. Another reason they gave was an increase in the fees. It is to be noted, from the figures read by the hon. member for North York, that the decrease in the attendance of the college occurred almost contemporaneously with the increase of the fees. I am not expressing any opinion as to whether the fees are too large or too small. I think any Minister who tries to make the college a success as regards numbers will take the fees into consideration almost first of all. The fees are very high for a democratic country like this, and it seems to me that a change might be made in that regard. The third cause which they mentioned was to me, perhaps, the most important of all. It is a very simple thing, but it seems to me that it would account in a great degree for the smallness of the attendance. It is a matter which is easily remedied and which I have given orders to have remedied. The subjects for the matriculation examination for the Royal Military College are peculiar to the college itself. Where all the other educational institutions of the country will have a book of the Aeneid as part of the examination in classics, the Royal Military College will give a book of the Georgics, and so on with the other classical branches. The result is that a boy, in order to enter the military college must make up his mind to it two or three years before so as to take that special course in classics. The obvious remedy is to have the classics of the Royal Military College the same as the other educational institutions, such as the Toronto University, so that a young man may take his course up to the time of his matriculation, and then make up his mind to enter the military college instead of having to do so a few years before. That seems to me a matter of really very great importance in this connection I do not think any member of the House should say anything against the education given in the college, unless he has very fully informed himself upon the subject. I would refer to the report of the Major General commanding the military college and read what he says about the work done there. He says:

> The value of the technical military training given at the Royal Military College has been thus proved to be of a character which, in the event of any serious emergency, would be of inestimable value to the Dominion. The practical nature of the general educational training has been so frequently enlarged upon by the commandant that it needs no more than a word of admiration from me. I would, however, draw attention to the great advantge that would accrue to the service were a larger number of graduates of the Royal Military College appointed to the permanent force of Canada.

That is a complaint that has been made here to-night.

> The want of early military technical training is a deficiency which cannot easily be remedied. A knowledge of drill alone does not make a man an officer, and the scientific knowledge of his profession which is essential to an officer of the present day, cannot be attained unless his educational acquirements are of a suitable character.

I need only appeal to the positions which our young men who have gone from the college to the Imperial service have taken wherever they went. Of all the young men who have gone into the Imperial service from the college there is not one who has failed as to ability, as to the standard of his technical training, or as to his moral character. The graduates have been invari-

ably as successful as we would expect Canadian young men to be. It is said that it is not a military school. I can assure the committee that it is essentially a military school. Although there are branches of study taught there which are essential in other walks of life, yet the college itself is essentially a military one. I would mention one fact to the committee to prove that. Every man in that college has to drill, one, two, or three hours, according to his year, every day of his life. He is a soldier from the time he enters until he leaves. The other day in the Royal Military College I came to the chemical laboratory, a magnificently fitted up laboratory, and I said to the commandant: Chemistry is not a military matter, why do you teach it in a place like this? He said: On the contrary, it is absolutely necessary. The science of explosives now is such that no military officer of high class would have a complete education unless he were familiar with their chemical nature. It is the same with drawing and other such branches. Every branch of education there practically bears on the military training. Now, the hon. gentleman from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), and others have spoken of doing away with this college. It has been said, because our young men go into the Imperial service, that we are paying for the training of men for that service. Well, if we did so, it would be a very small contribution indeed towards the magnificent defence that the Imperial troops furnish us at all times. But it is far more than that. Hon. gentlemen realize that there is to-day no legal tie between this country and England, no tie that could not be snapped in a moment if Canada wished to snap it. And every man who is thoughtful, every man who is watching the signs of the times, sees that there is a web being woven between this country and England, in a way that we had never thought of. It is a line of ties without direct intention, but which are binding this country to England more and more closely. One of the most important of these ties is to be found in the fact that we send these young men to the Imperial service to show what kind of stuff Canadians are made of, and to present the cause of Canada in every mess-room and in every barracks that they enter. If we have 77 men in the Imperial service we know that Canada has 77 firm friends in the British army; some of them pretty high up, and perhaps they render as effectual service as politicians, although they do it in a different way. I regret every graduate of our military college who goes to the United States. I begrudge him to that country, or to any other country outside the motherland. But every graduate that goes to the Imperial service or to any other colony becomes one more tie to bind the Empire together. Although it would be better to employ him in this country, still if he leaves us, I do not regret that he joins the Imperial army. The hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Mulock) made a good many statements about the details of expenditure. I am not able to deal with that phase of the question. The hon. gentleman is, I think, a little mistaken about the expenses of the Toronto University. Although from his official connection with that institution, I suppose I ought to accept his authority, yet I fancy that Toronto University spends a much larger sum for its graduates annually, than he supposed. It is not fair, for instance, to charge against the eight graduates of the present year, as has been done, the $70,000 for the whole college staff and expenses, and to say that they cost us $8,000 a piece. The fact is, that we could provide there for twenty-four men each year in each class. As a matter of fact, in 1880, when this class came in, which was shortly after the rise in the fee, only eleven were in the class. That cannot be attributed to the management of General Cameron, because he had then only been there, I think, two years; and two years afterwards a class of twenty-four came in. Of the eleven who came in that year eight have graduated this year. The record of these young men shows that the first three of them made higher marks than had been made before in the history of the college, with one exception, and the whole class has maintained a standard equal to to that of men from the Royal Military College, who hold commissions in the Imperial service, having graduated in years past. So that we have gained greatly in efficiency if we have lost in number, which I, of course, very much regret. I do not intend to discuss this matter further than to say that if there is any blame connected with the administration of the college, I wonder that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) did not direct attention to the board of visitors, who should visit this college every year, and inquire into matters such as he has brought up, and who would be in a position to sit in judgment on the commandant in a much fairer way than could be done by a committee of this House in the course of a debate like this. That board has not visited the college for years past. It is my intention, however, if I continue to administer the department, to reorganize the board of visitors. I think it only fair that the graduates of the Royal Military College should be represented on the board of visitors by a man who will be in close touch with the graduates, and who could lay their views before the board. I can also assure the hon. member for West Toronto that this board of visitors, when it is re-constituted, will certainly visit the college; and if he or anybody else has any charge to make against the commandant, those charges will be investigated either by that machinery or by some other. I am not here to defend General Cameron. If he is found to be unworthy of

the position he occupies, the Government will at once exercise the right they have of dispensing with his services, without any notice whatever. But I appeal to my hon. friend to put himself in General Cameron's place and to say whether he thinks it is fair to get up in the House, without evidence, necessarily without being able to prove anything, and without any opportunity being offered for defence, and ask this committee to strike out the salary of the head of an educational institution which the hon. gentleman himself admits has done fine work in this country: because, to amend the vote in the direction which the hon. gentleman proposes, would certainly be the ruin of the college for a year, until more money could be furnished. On the general question of the militia force, I think it is too late to make any statement. The only thing I would wish to say is this, that I feel that there is a good deal to be said in favour of the view advocated on the other side of the House, that the training and drill of the militia force is the whole essence of the maintenance of our militia force. It is what I consider the most important feature in the whole of our militia service: and so long as I administer the department, I shall consider the vote that is put in my hands as Minister of Militia to be held in trust for the rural and city corps of the Dominion, and that whatever is spent upon the permanent corps and upon the other branches of the service, is spent there only with the view of making the general militia of the country more efficient. I say that simply to acknowledge at once that that is the crux of the whole position. If Parliament exercises its past generosity with regard to the militia force, though I may possibly have to ask for a little more, I do not see why, with a reduction of the permanent corps and some other slight reorganization, the command of the statute should not be obeyed, and the whole militia force of Canada be drilled every year. I do not want to infringe upon the annual passage of the Mutiny Act, as they do in England, and establish a regular army here: but I would like to see the drilling of the militia of Canada accepted as an annual obligation that had to be provided for by the country, no matter what other economies had to be made. Whether that is possible or not is a matter for future consideration. I believe the larger proportion of the militia force could be drilled by making some sacrifices in the permanent corps and in other directions. I have here some answers to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) about the list of properties about which he asked me the other night; but as he is out of the Chamber at present, I suppose it is not worth while to go into them. I also wish to say to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that I have inquired into the case of Lieut.-Colonel Lazier, about which he spoke the other day; and it gives me great pleasure to read to him, so that it may go on "Hansard," and be made public, the statement of my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Patterson, who, having considered the matter, came to this decision:

Memo. re case of S. S. Lazier, late of 15th Battalion.

Having carefully gone over the evidence laid before the board of inquiry in this case, I find that the charges are not sustained. Rescind general order of 2nd June, 1894, dispensing with Lieut.-Col. Lazier's services, and substitute therefor one allowing him to retire with rank.

(Signed) J. C. PATTERSON,
Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the date of that?

Mr. DICKEY. It is not dated. The General Order will show the date. I do that simply in compliance with the hon. gentleman's request, in order that it might be made public that the department had entirely exonerated Colonel Lazier of the charges that were made against him. I hope, if the hon. member for West Toronto insists on dividing the committee on this item, that the committee will refuse to accept his amendment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is altogether too late to enter into a disquisition on militia matters in general; but I want to call the attention of the committee, and especially the attention of the Minister of Militia himself, to the undoubted fact, which he can verify if he chooses, that the military college at the present time is not maintaining anything like the high standard which it maintained a few years ago. I am very sorry indeed to differ entirely from the Minister and his authorities on that subject; but I speak with knowledge, after having consulted men who are at the very least quite as well qualified to offer an opinion upon it as the Minister of Militia can possibly be. I state here on my responsibility, that it is a known fact—right well known to the old graduates of the college and right well known, if the hon. gentleman chooses to consult them, to many officers in Canada and in the British service to-day, that the college is not maintaining anything like the high standard which it attained a few years ago. I want the hon. Minister to understand that distinctly. I make that statement, on my responsibility, as one of those originally concerned in founding the institution, and who takes a great interest in it. I further say that there is no doubt whatever a first-class mistake was made when an officer on the retired list was put in command of the college. I do not want to say a word against Major General Cameron in his personal capacity, but it was a most unfortunate and ill-advised act when an officer who had ceased to be actively concerned in the management of any military force was put

in command. If you are going to keep the college up to anything like the standard it has maintained until recently, you must have an officer in command who has a live interest in the service, who has not retired, but is looking forward to active employment, and who has a distinct personal interest in keeping himself in touch with all the latest military improvements and advance in military science. That no retired officer can by any possibility do. It is not done at this moment, and men who are in active service to-day, graduates of that college, are perfectly aware of the facts which I have stated. The college is not maintaining and will not maintain its high reputation until you obtain, as commandant an officer in active service with a future before him. That is absolutely essential if you are going to do any real good, and the longer the Government delay to recognize it, the longer they maintain any gentleman—I do not care what his qualifications may be in other respects,—in command of that college after he has ceased to be a member of the Imperial army in active service, the more surely will they contribute to the ultimate downfall of the college.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman knows that the teaching staff of the college is young. The charge is made that it is too young, too modern. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the commandant is not, as such, one of the teaching staff, and he also must admit that the teaching staff itself is young and fully up to date as regards acquirements. It is unpleasant to mention names, but he knows the officers there are highly efficient in every class of their work. The last charge to make against the institution would be that it is not up to date in military matters. The question of Major General Cameron being a retired officer cannot affect the matter very materially. I do not see why there should be any difference here from what there is in England. The commandant of Sandhurst is a retired officer, I believe. It is General Hewitt who was very successful in the military college in Canada, and obtained his position, I believe, at Sandhurst on that account, so that I do not think that the fact that General Cameron is not up to the standard of age should affect the question at all. The hon. gentleman is the only one I have heard find fault with General Cameron's educational acquirements.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I am the first, then your information must be of a most desultory description.

Mr. DICKEY. He has always been admitted to be a thoroughly educated man in every branch of military science, according to the information I have. I have also not come in contact with any gentlemen who say that the standard of education in the college is falling off. I never heard that statement until the hon. gentleman made it. The class that went out this year has made the finest record of any class that ever went out, beyond all comparison. The young men, in physique and everything else, were of the best possible character, and their education is justified by the marks they have made, so that I do not see how the hon. gentleman can come to the conclusion that the standard is falling off.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I make the statement with full knowledge and take the responsibility of it; and if the hon. gentleman chooses to prosecute his inquiries, he will find that the statement I have made will be sustained by numerous other parties. It is a most disagreeable thing to find fault with any particular officer connected with the college, but I repeat most distinctly and emphatically that you cannot maintain a high standard of efficiency unless the officer in charge be himself a man at least equal in scientific attainments to the officers who are under him, and that I think, with all possible respect to his personal character, General Cameron is not and never was.

Mr. DENISON. I think the hon. Minister stated a moment ago that General Hewitt was a retired officer. I think he is mistaken in that, because I know General Hewitt was in command as late as 1893, and I believe he is still in command.

Mr. DICKEY. I may be mistaken.

Mr. DENISON. The hon. Minister spoke of my being able to make some charges. I do not think it is necessary for me to make any charges. The ground I take is that the commandant has been there nearly seven years, and it is time we should have a change. If I wanted anything more than that, the statement of Mr. Plummer, a townsman of my own would be quite sufficient justification to me. Young Plummer's hazing, no doubt, will leave more or less a slur upon him all through life, and that was brought on no doubt by not having proper discipline in the college. There is an old saying that if you have a good colonel, you have a good regiment, and if you have a bad colonel, you have a bad regiment. If you have a good commandant, you will have a good college. The only way to improve the college is to have a good commandant. I want to effect that object, and I took this means, when I saw no other way of doing it. If this motion carries we will require a new commandant. Otherwise, from the statement of the Minister, we will have the present commandant continued for life. That is the real reason why I take this course. I have nothing against the college, but, on the contrary, am a firm believer in it and wish it to succeed; but from what I have seen of the commandant he has not the necessary tact and discretion to manage an institution of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend carries his motion he defeats his own object. He may protest against the present commandant but he will also prevent any further commandant being had in the course of the year.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the length of his term of office.

Mr. MULOCK. At will.

Mr. HUGHES. Then it is pretty near time that we should look around for a new commandant. I agree with many of the remarks that fell from the Minister of Militia, but I certainly do not agree with his remarks on the subject of hazing. It is well known that the incident that has been referred to by the hon. member from West Toronto (Mr. Denison) is one which is causing a great deal of discredit to the management of the college. In the old days, when my hon. friend passed through the university of Toronto, his hazing probably consisted in being introduced to the town pump, or a march down the cellars. But he is not posted in the manner in which hazing is conducted in some of the institutions at the present time, which would be a discredit to the undergraduates of any university even in Timbuctoo. I was very sorry to hear the hon. Minister throw out the remarks he did on the subject of hazing, because they will be taken up, not only in the Royal Military College, but in other educational establishments throughout Canada, and the result will be that the faculties of these institutions will have very great trouble in keeping the boys in line. I would suggest to the hon. Minister a few points in connection with the examinations. We have throughout the length and breadth of every province, colleges, high schools, collegiate institutes, and similar institutions, where examinations are held. The examinations of these institutions are now almost entirely uniform throughout Ontario, and they correspond very well in other provinces. Why not accept the matriculation or other examination of any of these colleges or schools, as the entrance qualification to our military college. It would certainly be one of the best advertisements this military college could get. The fees should be reduced, and if these other examinations were accepted, it would solve the questions of classics, and everything else. I do not want to enter upon a full discussion of this subject at this late hour, but I want to say that there is altogether too much stress laid upon the fact that these young men go into foreign countries. Where are the graduates of our universities? They are scattered throughout the world, wherever they can find fitting and congenial employment, or make more money for themselves. Go down to the railways in Brazil, or the South American republics, and there, as I have been informed by gentlemen who have visited those countries, there is scarcely a road on which you will not find young Canadian engineers, graduates of our Ontario institutions, or the Royal Military College, or of the Quebec and maritime provincial schools. These young men are making their mark in the world. So far as concerns the men who have gone from this college to the British army, they have certainly had everything favourable thrown in their way that could possibly be expected. I agree that the men who go to the British army are doing Canada a great service. In regard to placing these officers in the permanent corps, I would not endorse the idea that all the positions in the permanent corps should be given to these graduates. The young men who come from this college are not any further ahead, relatively, than those who come from our universities. They should take their places as citizens, and join our militia corps. At the present time, there is a spirit abroad among some of these graduates, I can tell the Minister of Militia, they are a little above becoming attached to our volunteer corps. That is a spirit we do not want to see increase, and it shall not be encouraged so far as I am concerned. These young men are drilled, as the hon. Minister says, but as for this fitting them to become officers or instructors in corps, it is not to be compared with the practical instruction they receive in going through one of the schools, bad as they are, in connection with the permanent corps. If a lad were obliged to go through one of our military schools before going to the Royal Military College, he would be much better fitted to become an officer in a volunteer corps.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I wish to express in a word my concurrence with what the hon. Minister has said. The active corps throughout the country and those who take an interest in them will be glad to know that the hon. Minister has taken so correct a view with regard to the expenditure. I am glad the hon. gentleman is at the head of the department, for he seems willing to learn something from the experience of others, and to take the opinion of those best qualified to give opinions with regard to the practical working of the force. His determination that the expenditure shall be upon the essentials, and not upon the accessories, will meet with general approval. Hitherto, the opposite has been the rule, the expenditures being upon the accessories, while the really essential features have been neglected. With regard to the military college, I do not profess to have sufficient knowledge of the subject to be able to form an opinion upon matters of detail. However, I do not for a moment go the length of the resolution. If the hon. member had moved for a reduction in the salary that would have answered the purpose. But the motion has called attention to the subject, and there has been a very full debate upon it, and I think the hon. gentleman would do well to rest satisfied with this result, and withdraw the motion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that the term of engagement of the present commandant expires this year. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, in the face of the discussion that is now taking place, whether it is the intention of the Government to continue General Cameron in his present position or not. I think we should have that announcement.

Mr. DICKEY. I stated before, Mr. Chairman, that any charges against General Cameron would be investigated. The board of visitors will visit the institution during the coming year, and will investigate as to all that has been said in this debate, and will report to the Government. The Government, holding General Cameron as at their disposal at any time, would not hesitate to deal with him if he was found inefficient or if his retention was found to be against the best interests of the college.

Mr. MULOCK. In regard to the action of the Minister of Militia in placing upon record the minute of his predecessor regarding the finding in respect to the charges against Lieutenant-Colonel Lazier, and his reinstatement, I wish to make my acknowledgments. The Minister has done only what was due to Lieutenant-Colonel Lazier. But, at the same time, I thank him for his prompt action in the premises. But now, I may call the attention of the Minister and the committee to what has occurred to see whether everything in connection with that incident has been concluded. What are the facts? Lieutenant-Colonel Lazier was summarily dismissed from the service on charges made by his superior officer the Deputy Adjutant General. Lieutenant-Colonel Lazier made a statement to the Government that there was malice in the charges made against him and demanded an investigation. On the floor of this House on his behalf certain members, myself among them, demanded an investigation. Up to that time no charges had been made, and Col. Lazier did not know for what he had been dismissed; and from a statement I have received from him during this session, he was not furnished with that information until the evening before the commencement of the inquiry. It appeared to me at the time a most cruel and high-handed procedure, that an officer of the Canadian militia who had spent 20 years in connection with the battalion, and large sums of money, and had devoted a great deal of time to the service, should have been treated in that cruel way, and held up to this country for a time as unworthy of wearing Her Majesty's uniform. No more cruel treatment could have been administered to a loyal officer in the force. He must have been at least for a year before the public as an officer unworthy to be in the militia force of Canada. Now, an investigation has taken place, the charges are held to be baseless, and he is reinstated with honour to his former position. Is the officer, the Deputy Adjutant-General, who made these charges, which were unsustained, but which, for the time being, misled the Minister of Militia, to be allowed to continue to occupy his position, and perhaps treat others in the same way, or is there going to be an investigation into his conduct? The fact that you have found those charges to be foundationless now, I think, casts that duty upon the department, nothing less than that will do complete justice. One more word with regard to the Military College. I think the Minister of Militia will find himself compelled to reduce the cost of this college. Either that must take place or however well inclined this House may be towards it, the college will go. The radical mistake which has been made in the past in connection with the educational system of that college, has been that you are taking young men and imparting to them a portion of their education at the exepnse of the Dominion, which could be better acquired at the various educational institutions properly established for that purpose. For example, why should we have to train these young men in languages, chemistry, and in mathematics, except that portion of mathematics that has to do with the military calling, fortifications, engineering, &c., and in those branches of learning that the student can acquire in 20 places in this country? And inasmuch as this college is situated in Kingston, with a university standing in the vicinity, if you want the two classes of education to go on pari passu, you ought to be able to utilize Queen's University, and in that way save a large portion of needless expense. If the Minister will turn up the debates that took place when this college was established, he will find that the then Premier, or the Minister of Militia, thought it would only involve the appointment of two or three professors, at a total cost to the country of about $8,000 a year. It was not in contemplation that you should take young men and take complete charge of their education in matters, lay as well as technical.

Mr. DICKEY. In regard to Col. Lazier's case, I will say that I only saw the file of papers to-day, it is of tremendous size, and I have not been able to go into it at all. I observe, however, that there were two investigations given to him, one after the other, and both under the direction of General Herbert. I may say, however, that I do not think that the preferring of a charge carries with it any necessary imputation of wrong-doing on the part of the superior officer. But, of course, I am prepared to consider what ought to be done in that respect.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to correct the Minister. The investigations were directed by the order of this House, and not

by General Herbert, who again and again distinctly refused an investigation into the matter until the House took it up. Now, speaking of this interference from the department, those who visit the brigade camps this year will find each commanding officer supplied with a little petty detail of what he has to do from 6 o'clock in the morning until the sun sets at night, how he has to follow this section of squad drill, and that section. These instructions are supplied from headquarters at Ottawa, and I wonder that any self-respecting commandant would take charge of a camp after having such a thing issued to him from Ottawa. If that officer is not fit to command a camp, he should not be there, and these matters should not be issued to him by some second-class clerk down in the department at Ottawa, instructing officers commanding these camps how they are to proceed. I have several times drawn the attention of the department to it in writing, and I merely put my protest on record again, hoping that in the future this interference by headquarters' clerks here in Ottawa shall be stopped.

Amendment (Mr. Denison) negatived. yeas, 8 ; nays, 26.

Department of Indian Affairs, Ontario and Quebec $70,686

Mr. FLINT. What Indian schools are there in the maritime provinces ?

Mr. DALY. There are schools in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, they being on the different reserves.

Mr. HUGHES. How is the money expended ? Are these schools under clerical control ?

Mr. DALY. All the schools in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the hon. gentleman taken any steps to put these Indian schools throughout the Dominion under national control ?

Mr. DALY. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Then it is high time this was done.

New Brunswick—Salaries, &c..... $5,600

Mr. FLINT. Has any correspondence taken place with the agent at Yarmouth with regard to the South Shore Railway Company taking land in the Indian reserve of Yarmouth County, and has the Dominion Government received any compensation ?

Mr. DALY. I cannot recollect any correspondence, but if land is required for railway purposes, it must be acquired in the usual way under the Railway Act.

Mr. FLINT. It is stated by parties who profess to know that the company being in a hurry to continue operations, obtained some sort of permission by telegraph, either from the Government or its agent, to go through the reserve. It is further stated that no steps in regard of expropriation proceedings have been taken, that the Government has received no compensation for the land, and also that the agent of the Government was treated by the contractors with considerable disrespect, he being ordered off the land. I should suppose if there was any dispute or difficulty there should be some correspondence, and if any has taken place, I will bring the matter again to the hon. gentleman's attention in order that he may present it to the House.

Mr. DALY. I shall be very glad to obtain the information for the hon. gentleman.

Manitoba and North-west Territories.... $700.50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In regard to implements and tools, I observe a very large reduction, and which appears to me to be an inexpedient reduction, the vote being reduced from $9,483 to $3,667. Under what circumstances is this reduction made ?

Mr. DALY. It appears that about $2,000 of the Estimates of last year was for repairs to implements. These are expected to be less during the ensuing year. The amount also covered axes and supplies, such as paint, and it is intended to reduce this expenditure so as to bring the vote within the amount asked. We are not lessening the amount of implements that are furnished to the Indians under treaty. It is only in connection with the tools and harness that we make the reduction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should imagine that that was about the last item on which it was desirable to economize.

Mr. DALY. We can effect the economy without lessening the efficiency.

Mr. McMULLEN. If I understood the suggestion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) it was that one of those items should be reserved, and on that item we can discuss the whole question of Indian affairs.

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the Houes.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 4th July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 139) for the relief of Julia Ethel Chute (from the Senate).—(Mr. Taylor.)

CUSTOMS OFFICERS—FORT ERIE, ONT.

Mr. LOWELL asked, 1. How many landing-waiters or customs officers are employed at Fort Erie, Ont.? 2. What are their names, and what are their respective salaries? 3. When were they appointed? 4. What is the nature of their duties?

Mr. WALLACE. In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say: 1. There are twelve customs officers at Fort Erie, including the collector. The name of each, salary, date of appointment, and duties, I find to be as follows:—E. W. Brookfield, collector, appointed 1st May, 1895, salary $1,400 per annum. J. T. Johnson, preventive officer, appointed 18th June, 1880, salary $600 per annum. Thos. Schofield, preventive officer, appointed 1st June, 1890, salary $600. C. W. Lewis, clerk and landing-waiter, appointed 1st December, 1875, salary $700. J. Schryer, landing-waiter, appointed 28th February, 1874, salary $600. T. L. Newbigging, landing-waiter, appointed 27th February, 1874, salary $600. W. T. House, landing-waiter and clerk, appointed 1st June, 1877, salary $600. O. F. Wilkins, landing-waiter and clerk, appointed 1st September, 1884, salary $600. C. Young, tidewaiter, appointed 18th May, 1892, salary $500. R. White, preventive officer, appointed 27th August, 1893, salary $1.50 per day. J. Noble, preventive officer, transferred to this port on 20th February, 1895, salary $600 per annum. Also there are certain customs officers stationed temporarily at summer resorts adjacent to Fort Erie.

AMERICAN MILK CANS.

Mr. LOWELL asked, Whether the Government intend to admit free of duty American-made milk cans brought into Canada for the purpose of being filled with milk to be exported to the United States?

Mr. WALLACE. The law does not admit American-made milk cans being brought into Canada without paying duty.

. FOSTER.

PIER AT BAIE ST. PAUL.

Mr. CASEY asked, Who was the contractor for the building of the pier at Baie St. Paul, county of Charlevoix, and what was the amount of said contract? Was it let by tender, and if so, what were the names of the tenderers and amount of their tenders? Who furnished the materials for said pier? Have they been paid for, or if not, what are the arrears? What wages were paid to the workmen employed? Have they been paid, and why was their payment delayed?

Mr. OUIMET. In reply I beg to say: 1. Ludger Lemieux, $5,700. 2. Yes. Ludger Lemieux, $5,700; Geo. Lavoie, $6,680; Viau Lachance, $6,950; Nap. Tremblay, $7,200; J. Paquet, T. Powers, and A. Lortie, $7,781; Heney & Smith, $7,997; E. Dussault, $8,222; Cimon & Gagnon, $8,400; Crain & Mix, $10,956; J. Bourque, $11,500. 3. The contractor has not furnished a list of the parties who supplied him with materials. It is not customary. 4. The department has no information on the matter. 5. Amount of wages paid by the department and charged to the contractor, $158.38. 6. Yes, delay was caused by the necessity of obtaining sworn declarations and of ascertaining that only claims for wages were being paid, as these claims are the only ones the department has a right to pay under the contract.

MAILS BETWEEN BAIE ST. PAUL AND CHICOUTIMI.

Mr. CASEY asked, Who are the contractors for carrying the mail between Baie St. Paul and Chicoutimi? What is the amount of the contract? What is the distance by land and by water? How many trips a week? Was the contract given by tender? The names and amounts of other tenderers and tenders?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1. The conveyance of mails between St. Paul's Bay and Chicoutimi is under three contracts:—St. Paul's Bay and St. Urbain; Grande Baie and St. Urbain; and Chicoutimi and Grande Baie; the contractors being T. Tremblay, A. Fortin and P. Gagnon, respectively. 2. The amounts paid are: St. Paul's Bay and St. Urbain, $150 per annum; Grande Baie and St. Urbain, $1,137.94 per annum; Chicoutimi and Grande Baie, $348 per annum. 3. The distance is 85 miles by land; and 180 miles by the route followed by the steamers of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company. 4. Six trips per week are made over each of these routes. 5. The St. Paul's Bay and St. Urbain contract was let by tender. The Grande Baie and St. Urbain contract was a renewal of a prior contract. The Chicoutimi and Grande Baie contract was let by tender. 6. The tenderers with the amount of tenders were as follows:—

ST. PAUL'S BAY AND ST. URBAIN.

T. Tremblay	$150 00
A. Gauthier	185 00
Geo. Larouche	199 00
S. Ouellet	204 44
A. Gagné	211 67
D. Fortin	212 00
T. Fortin	215 28
N. Fortin	225 00
R. Fortin	250 00
A. Fortin	299 00

CHICOUTIMI AND GRANDE BAIE.

P. Gagnon	$348 00
I. Lavesque	354 60
X. Drechene	327 47
A. Lavoie	380 00
Hugh Gobeil	431 94
F. Boly	436 80
J. Gaudreau	437 00
B. Redaud	449 00
E. Laverge	438 00
M. Girard	465 00
A. Guimond	469 00
P. Lavesque	530 40
J. Simard, $1.70 per trip, or	532 10
L. M. Simard	546 00
R. McLean, $1.75 per trip, or	547 75
R. Hamay, $1.75 per trip, or	547 75
E. Bouchard	561 60

DEEP WATER TERMINUS, HALIFAX.

Mr. FORBES asked, 1. What is the amount per cubic yard charged in each tender, giving names respectively, for excavation for foundation at the Deep Water Terminus, Halifax, including the tender of McManus LeBlanc and the rejected tenders? 2. What is the amount charged in each tender for cross walls and footing per cubic yard? 3. What is the amount charged in each tender per lineal foot for timber for foundation? 4. What is the amount charged in each tender per lineal yard for rubble masonry, the Government finding the stone, and what is the price for the same the contractor finding the stone?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. The prices per cubic yard for excavation made necessary to place timber under walls are as follows:—Jas. W. McDonald, Halifax, 29 cents; S. M. Brookfield, Halifax, 60 cents; Theophilus LeBlanc, Moncton, 35 cents. 2. Prices per cubic yard for stone rubble masonry in walls including excavation, Government finding stone, as follows:—Jas. W. McDonald, Halifax, $4.50; S. M. Brookfield, Halifax, $3.45; Theophilus LeBlanc, Moncton, $2.70. 3. Prices per 1,000 feet B.M. for labour, removing and laying timber and deals under walls in soft ground, timber and deals to be provided by the railway, as follows:—James W. McDonald, Halifax, $2.50; S. M. Brookfield, Halifax, $10; Theophilus LeBlanc, Moncton, $3.50. 4. Prices per cubic yard stone rubble masonry in walls including excavation, contractors providing all materials, as follows:—James W. McDonald, Halifax, $5.25; S. M. Brookfield, Halifax, $5.15; Theophilus LeBlanc, Moncton, $6.50.

SALE OF BINDER TWINE BY THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. FEATHERSTON asked, Is the Government selling binder twine at less than cost of manufacture, or did they intend doing so? If so, was it after that date that the Government received communication from the Patrons of Industry Cordage Establishment, Brantford, with a view to keeping prices up to the cost of production?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Government is not selling binder twine at less than the cost of manufacture, nor has it ever intended to do so.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. LAURIER. I would renew the question I put a few days ago to the leader of the House with regard to the business of the House. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to give any information as to the business and as to the measures we may expect?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman any further information to-day. I hope I shall be in a position to do so to-morrow afternoon.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the Minister if he can give me any assurance that the returns I asked for so long ago will be brought down. About a fortnight ago the hon. gentleman told me that in ten days he thought they would be before the House. I have been around the departments and I find very few, if any of them, have these returns ready. It seems to me there is no reason why they could not have been got ready if it was the intention of the Government to bring them down at all. Large numbers of returns that nobody seems to want, and that nobody seems to inquire for, have been brought down. But this return is one that all the British Columbia members wish particularly to have this session. I think that if the Government had done what they ought to have done, the returns would have been ready. Though there are perhaps difficulties in the way of getting out these items, still I think it should not be impossible to get them out.

Mr. FOSTER. In reply to my hon. friend, I beg to say to him now as I said to him before, that it is utterly impossible to get the return out any faster than it is being got out, and that it is impossible to produce a return that will be a complete reply to the order. The division of expenditures and revenues in some cases it is utterly impossible to make. It does not depend upon the Finance Department entirely; that part of the work has been put into the hands of a gentleman who is one of our best clerks

and he has worked at it assiduously and has been helped a part of the time by another man. These returns have been asked for from other departments. Some say they cannot furnish them at all, some that they can give them partially and others that they will put them through as rapidly as possible. I cannot do more than I have done.

Mr. McMULLEN. As to a number of returns for which I have got orders, I am sorry they are not brought down, particularly that regarding superannuation, and that respecting moneys paid to members of Parliament. I notice that there have been about 120 orders given for returns, and I think about 60 returns have come down. So it will be seen that there are about 60 returns ordered that have not been brought down at all. Unquestionably the members who have put notices on the paper and asked for these returns have an object in doing so. They want to get some particular item of information before the House, and it is only reasonable that this should be done. If the business of the session is going to be rushed through so rapidly as both sides evidently desire, there must be a better staff provided, in order to furnish the House with the information necessary to the proper carrying on of the public business. It is folly to ask for returns from week to week and have those returns postponed and not brought down until after the session closes. In my humble opinion the Opposition have been lax in not urging their right to have returns brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. I think no charge will lie against the Opposition as to inactivity in calling for returns. If they have called for 120 returns and if 60 have been brought down, I think the facts prove two things: first, that the Opposition have shown great industry in conjuring up subjects to ask returns about; and, second, that they have shown great persistency in urging the production of returns in answer to their demands. With regard to the superannuation return, I have no variation to the answer I have given on four separate occasions. If Parliament porogues within a few days I am afraid the hon. gentleman will not see his return this session. But it will be forwarded to his residence as soon as it is ready. With reference to the other one, I will make inquiry.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have asked for very few returns this session, but one covered information I wished particularly to get—an abstract of the cargoes carried by the subsidized steamers from the maritime provinces to the West Indies. I wanted that particularly, because it was my intention to discuss the matter of subsidies before the session closed. The hon. gentleman intimated privately in a conversation across the House that if the whole return could not be given an abstract would be made. I did not want the information in great detail, and I would ask if that abstract is likely to be brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought that had been brought down. Are you sure it has not?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have not seen it and I have watched for it very closely.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I want to thank the Government for the attention given to the orders passed for papers called for by me. I have been getting a great number of orders for nine years past, but I have never had a return yet.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend's reward will be all the greater by and by.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to inquire from the Government when the papers in connection with the Noble Bros. will be brought down?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Any papers that will be brought down under that order, I think, will be ready in as short a time as possible. Some of the papers cannot be brought down until the trial and investigation are completed.

Mr. MULOCK. I see the Secretary of State is in the House, and I would remind him that I have had very bad luck in getting my returns. I had a return ordered two years ago, and at the commencement of this session I reminded the new Secretary of State of the fault of his predecessor, and I received most excellent promises from him. But we are now very near the close of the session, and the return has not yet been produced.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may say that in order to expedite the hon. gentleman's return, I had it placed out of its order and put at the head of the list, and the clerks are now preparing it. I expected to have had it yesterday; I am sure I will have it to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. In replying to my hon. friend from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior), I omitted to state that I gave orders yesterday to the clerk in my office to immediately prepare what he himself had tried to get from the other departments, and I would bring it down partially.

Mr. PRIOR. I did not mean to say that the Finance Department has not done its duty, but the other departments do not seem to be in any hurry.

THE TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Mr. FOSTER moved third reading of Bill (No. 126) respecting commercial treaties affecting Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that it is necessary to renew the discussion at length, but for myself I entirely dissent from the view expressed by the Gov-

erment. I entirely dissent from the idea that we are to be bound by the favoured-nation-clause, and I desire so to record my protest against the third reading.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose this is the last day upon which this House would be requested to pass any legislation about the little French treaty; and while I do not propose to challenge a vote of the House on the third reading, I would like to say one or two words about the position in which I think this whole affair leaves Canada to-day. Now, the House will know, and the country remembers perfectly well, this treaty was closed by the ambassador extraordinary for Canada without instructions from this Government to close it. Not only that, but it is abundantly clear that that treaty was signed on behalf of Canada by Sir Charles Tupper, not only without instructions, but absolutely against and contrary to the instructions of this Government. I only need quote the language of the Minister last year on that point, because he told us, as to the most-favoured-nation clause of that treaty, that:

> It was not the intention of the Government, as will be seen by a telegram which was sent to our commissioner in January, in which it was expressly stated that we agreed to the most-favoured nation treatment, so far as the articles named in the treaty are concerned. Our commissioner there, through error, or for reasons which he explained in his correspondence, signed the treaty with the clause in it as I have read, giving the most-favoured-nation treatment to France in all articles of our tariff.

Now, this treaty which we are taking the final steps to ratify and confirm to-day, was thus signed against the express instructions of this Government. Then if you look at it for a moment on its merits, it is unquestionably one-sided. As to this most-favoured-nation treatment, it is promised to France in respect of all articles, and it only exacts it from France in respect of the small list of articles upon which Canada has reduced the duty. But what is this legislation that is asked for to-day? The treaty a year ago was ratified by this House as a treaty, and why on earth are we asked to legislate upon it again to-day? Why, Sir, we have been asked in the most peremptory manner by the Colonial Office to do so. A Bill was introduced early in this session which was intended to meet the case that had arisen, but that Bill was not satisfactory to the Downing Street authorities, and therefore they ordered this Government to pass this piece of cast-iron legislation which we are asked to read a third time to-day. The effect of this legislation is simply this, that we admit, by a solemn legislation of this Parliament, that we can never in the future make a reciprocity treaty with any country in the world on their terms. We can never make a reciprocity treaty with the United States on their terms, because the benefit of that treaty will not only accrue to the country which we negotiate, but will be received for nothing, for no consideration whatever to us, by about twenty other countries, by Great Britain and by all the colonies of the Empire, too. If we make a treaty with any country under the sun, we are bound, and we admit here for the first time, that we are bound by this legislation, to give these twenty other countries, with which Great Britain had entered into most-favoured-nation treaties, exactly the same benefits which we might have from any country that we negotiate with. What would be the result if that condition of affairs remains? We will never be able to make a reciprocity treaty with any other country in the world. Assuming that this French treaty was a good treaty in itself, we get a little, and we give something. The question is whether they balance one another. One would suppose that was the question. That was the question when this treaty was first introduced to the attention of the House two years ago, that was the question when this treaty was ratified by the House one year ago, and it was not until this very Bill was introduced that we knew that we were doing something else, that we were bound to do something else before the treaty would come into force. When the explanations were given in 1893 this arrangement was not understood by the Government, or, if it was understood by the Government, it was kept back from the House, and that would be worse, for I am sure they would much prefer having the implication of ignorance made against them than that of want of good faith. It was either one or the other. A blue-book was brought down to inform the House, in 1893, as to what the effect would be upon our customs revenue if this treaty were negotiated. And what did that show? It showed: first, the direct effect of any reduction upon our importations from France, and next it showed the indirect effect, so-called, upon our importations from other countries. That is to say, that if we lower the duty in favour of France, of course, we could not expect to import as much and obtain as much revenue from importations from other countries, because France would send us more, and that would be an indirect effect of the treaty on the trade with other countries. But to show that it was never in the mind of the Government in bringing down these returns to the House that there should be any particular country in the world that was to share in that benefit given to France, I simply point to the fact that among the countries which were in that indirect list were Spain and the United States; and Great Britain has no most-favoured-nation treaty with them, and, therefore, it could not have any relation however to our conceding those rights we gave to France to all those other nations. It did not suggest it, and it was not so explained. So much for the blue-book. Then

the Finance Minister in the debate of 1893, in explaining to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) what would be the loss—this will be found in "Hansard," at page 2277—he mentioned $82,922 as the loss involved arising from France alone. He did not even then speak of any indirect loss to the revenue of the country, and the hon. gentleman used these words: "That was the maximum of our loss." Sir, it was quite clear what was his view then. But, curiously enough, he went in a little while to the other extreme. When we on this side of the House had been pointing out the benefits of a reciprocity treaty with the United States, we were taunted by hon. gentlemen opposite that it would involve a discrimination in favour of the United States, and the Finance Minister was horrified, at least, his party were horrified at the idea of discriminating in favour of the United States. I was very anxious myself to find out what was proposed to be done in that respect in the French treaty, and I wanted to know whether that treaty would discriminate in favour of France, or not, as against the world. I thought it was very extraordinary if the policy which had been suggested by the Opposition of the reciprocity treaty with the United States, in which, perhaps, we might discriminate in their favour in such a matter as agricultural implements, should be adopted by the Government, and they should propose to discriminate in favour of France in such a matter as the importation of wine; so I was a little anxious to find out whether that was a discrimination in favour of France or not. So I pressed the hon. Minister of Finance on that point. What did he say? In 1893 he said: "We propose to discriminate neither against Great Britain, nor the United States, Germany, Belgium, nor is it our present intention to discriminate against any other country in the world." That had nothing whatever to do with this question, and it gave us no information as to the intention of the Government to discriminate only against countries with which there was no most-favoured-nation clause, because the hon. gentleman expressly mentioned the United States, and "any other country in the world," and that did not give us any indication that he was going to exclude the United States, as he is doing to-day, and include those other countries. So that I say there was nothing to indicate that this was the position of affairs when the House, last session, was asked to ratify that treaty in terms. What happened this session? The Government introduced a Bill early in the session. What was the effect of the Bill? It was to give the Government power, by proclamation, to issue an order allowing the most-favoured-nation countries and Great Britian and the colonies to send their wines into Canada on the same terms as France, not doing it, but giving permission to the Government by proclamation to do it. That was a modified admission on the part of this House of our liability to those most-favoured-nation clauses. That was done, evidently, on the direction of Downing Street, because in an abstract of the missing papers, which I take from the newspapers, and I suppose it is correct, we find that only last November—and this treaty was ratified by us in last July—Lord Ripon wired that the assent to the French treaty would be given only on the distinct understanding that the reduction of duties granted to France would be extended to the nations entitled to the benefit of the most-favoured-nation clauses and to the rest of the British dominions, and he trusted the Dominion Government would give satisfactory assurances on this point before issuing the proclamation. That is, the proclamation relating to the treaty. In order to meet that demand, the Government introduced, and I suppose a copy was sent to the Colonial Office, the Bill first presented to us this session. Was that satisfactory? Would the British Government trust the Canadian Government in that matter, and leave to them the option of issuing a proclamation if they chose? Would the British Government ratify the treaty and trust to the Canadian Government to carry out their part afterwards? Not at all. A most extraordinary refusal of confidence in the Canadian Government was manifested in the letter Lord Ripon wrote on the 4th April last to the Canadian Government, in which he said:

> While there is every confidence felt in the intentions of the Dominion Government, the Government of Great Britain would not feel justified in leaving anything open, and they are reluctantly compelled, therefore, to postpone the exchange of ratifications with France until legislation has been actually passed by the Dominion Parliament extending the benefit of the extensions to all nations entitled under treaty to the most-favoured-nation clause and to the rest of Her Majesty's dominions.
>
> Lord Ripon, in conclusion, states that the French Government have expressed some irritation at the delay which has already occurred, and expresses the hope that no time will be lost in obtaining the necessary legislation.

So, the Government of Canada consider it consistent with their dignity to accept that snub, and they withdraw the other Bill and bring in this piece of cast-iron legislation saying that for all time, as far as the Parliament of Canada can do, we are bound to that interpretation of the treaty. Sir, it is an interpretation which has not been accepted by the world heretofore, which is not accepted by the United States, which has not always been accepted by Great Britain, and has not been accepted by Canada before. I am sorry to see it accepted by Canada to-day. It is a most serious matter that we should be asked to do this. This acknowledgment of our rights is a

very costly price to pay for the small benefits we might derive from our treaty with France. In dollars and cents even, the price is ruinous to us. By this we lose the pretty considerable revenue which we have been deriving from the importation of sparkling wines from Great Britain. I am not concerned to ascertain how on earth they come to manufacture champagne in Great Britain or whether it is from cider, or gooseberries, or what, but they do manufacture it and we import a great deal of it. It will now come under the reduced tariff that we have with France. The Cape Colony also will, I presume, send in their cheap wines as well as France, and we will have to make a reduction in their favour. When the delegates were here from the Cape last year, they looked around to see what they could export profitably to Canada so as to make a treaty of reciprocity, and their cheap wines were what they expected to negotiate about.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Apart from ostrich feathers.

Mr. EDGAR. Yes, apart from ostrich feathers. The Cape wines will now come in under the terms of the treaty with France, and we will get no benefit from the Cape in return. I contend that this concession has been too hastily made to Great Britain, by our Government. I am afraid it is on a par with the concessions this Government have been making to England on the copyright matter. They have been very brave in their words. They have taken sound Canadian grounds about our rights to self-government in this particular, but they have done nothing more. They have allowed the thing to drag on for six years and we are now no nearer a settlement than ever. The Copyright Act of 1889, passed unanimously by this Parliament, and supported since then by addresses from this Parliament, has never been ratified or sanctioned by England. Although the Canadian Government has shown a proper spirit in their words, they have not done so in their deeds. We were a party to the Berne Convention, and there was a provision of the treaty that Great Britain on giving one year's notice could denounce that treaty on behalf of Canada. Five years ago an Address was unanimously passed by this House asking the Imperial Government to do that, but they have not done so, and this Government has failed to take further action. Then what about the Belgium and German treaties ? These are a couple of countries with which England has a most-favoured-nation clause, and so we are bound to give them the full benefit of our treaty with France. What they have to sell to us will come in here at reduced rates, and we get no privilege in return. Why is that ? It is not because we did not know the difficulty there ; it is not because this House did not, several years ago, at the instance of the Government pass an Address asking the British Government to denounce these treaties so far as Canada is concerned. The Government by this Bill now before us puts another yoke on our neck in these commercial matters. If this is the record of the first attempt that we have made to negotiate our own commercial treaties, then I hope it will be a long time before this Government, at any rate, has an opportunity to bind Canada in such a way again.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has done good service in directing attention to the peculiar nature of the legislation now before us. This Bill might have passed with but little notice, being generally accepted as a mere implementing of our previous agreement for a reciprocity treaty with France, but my hon. friend has made it perfectly clear that this Bill makes the treaty in question not a reciprocity treaty with France alone, but a reciprocity treaty with practically half the world. Not only do we have to give these privileges to the long list of countries with which England has now treaties containing a favoured-nation clause, but we will have to extend them to other countries with which Great Britain may in future conclude treaties having a similar clause.

Mr. EDGAR. It is not a reciprocity treaty with them at all.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edgar) very properly corrects me. It is not a reciprocity treaty with these other countries at all. To some extent we get reciprocal treatment from France, but in the numerous other cases we give these privileges without any return. We are pledging ourselves to what we do not know in the way of privileges to foreign countries, and by this arrangement we are taking away from France the advantages she expected to derive.

This was sprung upon the country as a treaty that would be beneficial to the French people in France, to the French people in Canada, and to all the people of Canada. But by this Bill we extend the same privileges to other nations, and where, I ask, can the special benefit to France come in ? What is there in this treaty to engage the special sympathies of any class in this country ? Nothing. On the contrary, there is a good deal to engage the special antipathy of several classes of our community.

This Government profess to act upon a policy of protection to Canadian interests ; they profess to protect not only manufactures, but agriculture, and all other interests in the country. It was shown last year to the satisfaction of the House that there is a considerable interest in Canada which would be directly affected by this treaty—the interest concerned in the growing of grapes. I will not say merely the wine-making industry, because whatever affects the use of grapes will affect the price

of grapes for all purposes, and to many farmers in western Canada the price of grapes is a very important consideration.

But, Sir, that is not the worst of it. I do not wish to speak as the special advocate of the wine-makers; but in removing the protection, such as it was, which was given to the wine-makers and grape-growers by existing laws, we are removing taxation from just that class of imported goods which ought, in the minds of most of us, to bear the highest taxation. We are removing taxation from luxuries; and we shall have to make up for the taxation thus removed from luxuries by an increased tax on the necessaries of life. This very session we are putting a tax of a cent a pound on raw sugar, and completing arrangements for taking a tax of 30 per cent off champagne. If this Government claims to be a protectionist Government, it is acting wildly in opposition to its claim. In this treaty it has succeeded in doing three things in opposition to its declared principles: it has removed protection from a Canadian interest, it has removed taxation from luxuries and it has imposed taxation on necessaries. A more inconsequent system of taxation than that I can scarcely imagine.

If the Government are prepared not only to adopt the principle of reciprocity with France, but to grant superior advantages to nations which do not deal with us reciprocally, why can they not turn their minds to the great question of reciprocity with our neighbours across the line? If it is a fitting thing to give special privileges to Argentine, Austro-Hungary, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Muscat, Egypt, Montenegro, and various other places too numerous to mention, why could we not properly consider the question of reciprocity with the United States of America? In the latter case, there would be great advantages to be gained; in the other case, we are simply surrendering a certain amount of revenue without obtaining anything in return. And it must not be forgotten that a surrender of revenue in one direction means an increase of taxation in another, unless, of course, the economy in the general public expenditure, which we do not seem to see a gleam of, should supervene.

I do not for a moment suppose, as a matter of fact, that the Government have deliberately adopted this principle of the favoured-nation treatment towards so many nations which do not give it to us. I believe the true opinion of the Government was expressed in 1893, when they refused to ask the House to ratify this treaty, and, at the time, just before the session of 1893, when they instructed their representative not to agree to its provisions. But I believe the High Commissioner went on, regardless of instructions from here, and regardless of Canadian interests, with the intention of securing a treaty at any cost, for his own glorification—a treaty which might show that he was doing something for the large sums of money he draws from this country. I believe that he insisted in his usual dictatorial manner, on doing what he thought best, to a large extent; that the result of his labours was not pleasing to the Government here; and that they refused to ask the House to ratify the treaty in consequence.

Then, during last session, the influence of the High Commissioner, exerted through the Colonial Office, or exerted directly upon the Government through some member of it, or by his own predominance over the minds of the Government, forced them to eat up their former declarations in regard to the treaty, and to ask the House to adopt what they admitted was not a desirable arrangement. This year they have gone further still. Finding that what they had done last session was not sufficient to please the Colonial Office, whose ear is possessed largely by the High Commissioner, they come down with the legislation now before us. The whole history of this treaty is a history of incompetence on the part of the Government, and of the undue predominance of the High Commissioner. Instead of the High Commissioner being the servant of the Government and of the people of Canada, it would seem that the Government is an appendage of the High Commissioner. It appears that that extremely expensive gentleman first led us where we did not want to go, and where he was told by his nominal superiors not to lead us; and it appears that the Government saw no way out of it but to follow his lead and submit to his dictation. We are prepared to allow that confession of the Government's incompetence to go on the statute-book. Last year we had a vote on this question, and I voted against the principle of the treaty; I voted that we were not bound in good faith by anything done up to that time to accept it. This year perhaps, the situation in that respect is changed. We may be bound in good faith by our legislation of last year to adopt this extra proposal which is needed to carry it out. All that appears to be open to us to do at present is to point out whither the previous action of the Government has led us—to point out the position of powerlessness in which they have landed us, and to call upon the people of the country to mark and appropriately reward their conduct.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think hon. gentlemen will find that this Bill will assume a very much larger importance before the House, and in the estimation of the country, than it was supposed to possess when the hon. Minister first proposed it to this House for consideration. My hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has shown very clearly that when the Government discussed this subject before, they did not suppose, nor did they lead the House to

suppose, that all the consequences which are disclosed by this Bill were likely to follow from the ratification of the commercial treaty with France. The more the House investigates this subject the more serious will they consider it to be. This goes a long way to destroy the commercial freedom and the commercial opportunities which this country may have before it in the future. Sir, if you look at this Bill, you will find it is a Bill to extend to other countries the rights which we have by treaty conceded to France. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) spoke of the treaty as a reciprocity treaty. It is not a reciprocity treaty, because we are giving and we are not receiving. We extend to every country to which this favoured-nation clause would bind us, no matter what restrictions they put upon our commerce, the same privileges and rights that by this treaty are conceded to France. Now, this is a new doctrine. It is true that the Government of Great Britain has occasionally recognized the principle that if you adopt a commercial treaty with one country, the most-favoured-nation clause will carry it into operation with other countries which enjoy this clause; but that is not the doctrine which has been uniformly acted upon. It is true that in maintaining the right to send certain products into Cuba when Spain had made a treaty with the United States, that principle was recognized: but when Great Britain made the treaty with France, known as the Cobden treaty, and Spain insisted, under the most-favoured-nation clause, on sending her wines into England on the same terms, Great Britain demurred, and maintained that the special concessions made to France did not entitle Spain to like advantages. Now, I ask what is the object of the Government? Why are they ready to sacrifice, not merely the rights, but the commercial opportunities and the freedom of legislation of this country, in return for the paltry arrangements that have been made under this treaty with France? Why, Sir, to my mind, there is but one explanation. It is in order to impose upon this country, for all future time, restrictions which did not exist before. Why, we had a treaty of reciprocity with the United States which was in operation for eleven years. Did Great Britain insist, before that treaty was carried into operation, that we should concede to other nations, with the most-favoured-nation clause, the same rights as we conceded to the United States? No such demand was made; and I contend that the Government to-day are, by this arrangement, undertaking to tie the hands of this country for all future time, in her negotiations with other countries. What will be the result of this arrangement if this Bill be adopted, and I call the attention of hon. gentlemen on the back benches, who represent rural constituencies, to the provisions of the Bill. I say if we pass this Bill, although we should repudiate the treaty with France or denounce it to-morrow and give notice of its termination, in order that we might freely negotiate a treaty with the United States, this legislation would stand in our way. It would restrict that freedom. The Government of England would say: You have conceded to the United States the free entry of certain articles, manufactured in the United States, or otherwise, and you must concede to Germany and Belgium, and all the other countries with whom Great Britain has this most-favoured-nation clause the same rights and privileges that you concede to the neighbouring republic. Could we negotiate a treaty with the United States on these terms? Would it be possible to carry out an arrangement with the neighbouring republic, no matter how anxious they might be to negotiate with us, under such a restriction? It is preposterous to suppose that we should. They would say at once: We are ready to negotiate with Canada and make concessions if Canada will make like concessions in return; but we are not ready to throw open the market of Canada, under that arrangement, to the goods of half of Christendom in order that they may compete with ours in the limited Canadian market on the same terms. Is it not evident that would be the result? You would be putting Canada in a different position when it comes to negotiate with the United States from what it was ever in before. I am ready to enter into favourable arrangements, in commercial matters, with the United Kingdom. They have dealt freely with us, and we should in our turn be prepared to deal generously, on a commercial line, with them. But that is a very different proposition from the one before us. If Great Britain, in her own interests, has made treaty commercial arrangements with Germany and Belgium and Austria, and has introduced into these treaties the most-favoured-nation clause, that is to bind us, without any concession being made to us at all, and that is what will be the effect of this arrangement, we should enter our protest against it. We should say to the Government of the United Kingdom, respectfully, but with all earnestness, that a treaty of reciprocity or a commercial arrangement, which is to have a binding effect upon us, must be a treaty for our benefit and advantage, and not a treaty solely for the advantage of the United Kingdom. The grounds upon which foreign goods and products are admitted into the Canadian market must have reference to the interests of Canada, and the concessions must be concessions made to those interests, and not to the interests of any other portion of the Empire. That is the way in which this matter stands at this moment; and I say that the Government could not commit a greater injury to the future prospects of this country than they propose to commit by the Bill now before us. The Government of the

United Kingdom would not take a declaration of our executive; they were not content with the declaration of the executive, but wanted a more solemn compact, something that the people of Canada could not subsequently repudiate or renounce as being against their interests, because they have voluntarily accepted the yoke which was offered to their necks. I am not prepared to take that position; I am not willing that our people should thus throw away their opportunities. I would rather a hundred-fold that we had no trade with France than undertake to tie our hands in this way. What is there in that treaty that will make it worth our while to tie our hands and admit the goods of all Christendom, not upon any consideration of the interests of this country, but in consequence of some arrangement which the United Kingdom has made, without any reference to us at all? That is the position in which this matter stands; and I call the attention of this House and country to the very serious injury that is now attempted against the commercial interests and the future prospects of this country by the legislation now proposed.

Mr. LAURIER. As the gentlemen on the treasury benches do not seem at all disposed to reply——

Mr. FOSTER. We will answer you, but we want to have it altogether. We will answer all your arguments at once.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman at any rate shows no haste, and I take it that indicates a disposition, so far, not to answer the arguments from this side. It will be well to point out how far the Government have fallen from the position they took on this question in the session of 1891. Surely the Minister of Finance cannot have forgotten that in 1891 a petition to Her Majesty the Queen was adopted by this House and subsequently by the Senate—praying for what? Praying to be relieved from the effects of two treaties which at present have the most-favoured-nation clause with Great Britain—the treaty with Belgium and the treaty with the German Zollverein. That is to say, the treaty with Belgium and the treaty with the German Zollverein. The petition read as follows:—

> Your memorialists desire, in the first place, to draw attention to certain stipulations in the existing treaty with Belgium and with the German Zollverein, ordinarily referred to as the "most-favoured-nations" clauses, which are extended to other countries whose commercial treaties with Great Britain contain a "most-favoured-nation" clause, and which applies to British colonies.

Now, the prayer of the petition was this:

> The Senate and the House of Commons, therefore, humbly request Your Majesty to take such steps as may be necessary to denounce and terminate the effect of the provisions referred to, as well in the treaties with the German Zollverein, and with the Kingdom of Belgium, as with any other nation, in respect of which such provisions are now in force.

The reason that was given to the House why Parliament should ask that Her Majesty the Queen should terminate these treaties was set forth in the following very pregnant language:—

> Your memorialists consider that these provisions in treaties with foreign powers are incompatible with the rights and powers subsequently conferred by the British North America Act upon the Parliament of Canada, for the regulation of the trade and commerce of the Dominion; and that their continuance in force tends to produce complications and embarrassments in such an Empire as that under the rule of Your Majesty, wherein the self-governing colonies are recognized as possessing the right to define their respective fiscal relations to all foreign nations, to the mother country, and to each other.

That was the main reason that was given, a reason which has as much force to-day as it had then, and which was accepted at that time unanimously by the House. Speaking upon it my hon. friend the Finance Minister made the following remarks. After showing in what manner the provisions affected were commercially unfavourable, the hon. gentleman proceeded to say:

> So that, if with any other country Canada with the consent of Great Britain, makes a reciprocity treaty or a preferential arrangement for trade, we shall be obliged by these clauses to give to the German States of the Zollverein the same deductions, differentiations or advantages we give to this third power.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was quite right in asking the Imperial Parliament to free us from the operation of these treaties. But the petition of this Parliament, I am sorry to say, has not been heeded by the Imperial authorities. I do not want to enter into that part of the discussion at the present time, but it seems to me that the Government have been derelict in not striving harder to obtain the prayer of that petition. If that prayer had been pressed, there is no reason why the Imperial Parliament, in pursuance of the policy adopted some fifty years ago, of giving the colonies absolute legislative and fiscal independence not only as regards foreign nations, but as regards Great Britain herself, should not have granted it. If such a prayer had been followed with the persistence which should have been put into it, it is reasonable to presume that it would have been granted. But, instead of following it up, the Government allowed it to remain in abeyance, and in abeyance it has remained. What is the position to-day? In 1891 the Government anticipated that we might negotiate treaties with other nations, that we had come to the time when we had the power to offer advantages in return for advantages received. The hon. gentleman petitioned to have this prayer granted to him with respect to two treaties only; and now, instead of maintaining the position he assumed three years ago, he is

willing to concede that the treaty with France should operate not only with regard to the German Zollverein and Belgium, but with ten or twelve other nations as well. Now, Sir, when we discussed the treaty with France, we imagined that it was a treaty with France and with no other nation. We imagined that we were giving to France advantages in return for favours received from France. But instead of that, what is the position? While we get from France some advantages—scanty advantages, I must say—we are bound to extend the same privileges as we extend to France to some ten or twelve different nations from which we do not receive any adequate compensation whatever. That is to say, under the operation of this treaty if it becomes law, we shall be bound to receive free or at a certain rate of duty the goods stipulated in the French treaty, not only coming from France, but coming from ten or twelve other nations as well, while these other nations shall not be bound to receive the goods from us which enter France free of duty. We have a reciprocity treaty with France to some extent, but it involves a one-sided treaty with some ten or twelve other nations. The hon. gentleman can see that that is altogether a different position from the one we occupied last year.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes. It is a different position because no one expected last year when we ratified the French treaty that we should be bound to extend the same privileges to a dozen different nations. We thought we were extending the privileges to France for adequate compensation. But now the position is reversed from that which we occupied three or four years ago when the hon. gentleman moved that petition to the Imperial authorities. Now, the question involved is one which goes beyond the scope of this treaty—the question of Canada's commercial independence. The hon. gentleman knows, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) points out, that his hands are tied if he endeavours to negotiate a treaty with the United States or with any other nation, because immediately, all these other nations brought into trade relations with us through the operation of the French treaty will claim the same advantages we grant to the other nation. Under these circumstances I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the case—and not in any carping spirit, but simply to induce him to renew the efforts he initiated four years ago in order to enlarge the commercial independence of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. My justification has been abundantly given by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, as to some charges which were made by the gentleman who initiated this discussion this afternoon. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said that I had deceived the House in 1891——

Mr. EDGAR. I did not use that term.

Mr. FOSTER. It practically amounted to that, but not spoken in any offensive sense—that the House was not taken into full confidence in 1891, and he sought to support this by referring to certain returns which at that time were brought down and from which he argued at that time it could not be inferred by the House that we would have to give these privileges to other countries besides France. And my hon. friend who has just taken his seat says that the position that we occupied in 1891 was different from the position we occupy to-day. He answered himself before he got through his short argument. He read from a speech delivered by myself upon the question of an Address to the Home Government to rid us of these most favoured-nation clauses. He read a portion of my remarks in which I laid down very plainly and fairly before the House that one reason why the House was asked to pass this Address was that in case we made a reciprocity treaty with any third power, we would be bound by these treaties to grant the same privileges to these treaty powers that we granted to the third power. The hon. gentleman has read from "Hansard" the statement made by me as representing the Government when I stated that doctrine fully before the House. The French treaty was discussed in this House after that statement was made. The French treaty was ratified by this House after that statement was made, when the two hon. gentlemen who have raised that objection knew that the statement was made and knew that the position of the Government was clear and certain as regards that point. Now, Sir, my hon. friend who has just taken his seat thought he had made a strong point against the Government and myself when he said that we went to a great deal of trouble in 1891 and passed an Address to the British Parliament to do away with those clauses in the most-favoured-nation treaty, and that here we are to-day asking for legislation which shall lead to the ratification of the French treaty and confirming every principle which we tried then to get the British Government to do away with in regard to those treaties. But does not the House see in a moment the difference in the position. Those treaties with Germany, with the Zollverein, were treaties which were made by Great Britain, treaties which we cannot terminate, treaties which cannot be terminated except by the will of Great Britain, and, by reason of the commercial conditions, by the will of Great Britain acting in accordance as mutual interests are concerned with the treaty powers. But the House sees, and my hon. friend knows, that with reference to this French treaty, we are in a position to give notice

of its denouncement at any moment, and that in the correspondence which has been brought down, the British Government has give us its pledge that no consideration shall deter it from giving our notice and terminating the treaty whenever we ask it to be done, so that my hon. friend's ground slips away from under him in that respect. My hon. friend says that in 1891 the House was not taken into its confidence with reference to the extension of this privilege to most-favoured nations. I refer him to the argument of my hon. friend who has just sat down, a statement that was made when that Address was passed, as sufficient answer to that. But from the fact that certain returns were brought down which classed the revenues and the importations from France under one head, and the importations and the revenues from other countries under another, he leaped to the conclusion, in face of that ground stated by the Government in 1891, that this would not be extended to most-favoured nations. That is his own fault, not mine. He made an inference which was wrong, an inference which he had no right to make, after the plain ground of the Government was stated in 1891. But, Sir, my hon. friend voted for that treaty last year. It is true that in 1891 he tried to destroy it by sundry motions which he moved; it is true that he spoke against it very vigorously and very strongly; but when it came to the decisive moment, he voted for that treaty, last year, he voted for that treaty in face of my own and Sir John Thompson's statements made in the course of discussion upon that treaty last year, that other nations having most-favoured-nation treaties with Great Britain, would have these privileges extended to them, and the sister colonies also would have these privileges extended to them; so that my hon. friend has come after me with a club to-day for a statement which was mainly made to the House before he voted upon the treaty; and when he voted upon that treaty in the affirmative, he lost to himself the right to reproach me, or to reproach the Government, with any argument on that behalf. But, Sir, the statement is made that this is altogether one-sided, that although we make a treaty with France, we have been included in treaties made with Great Britain with other nations by which we give the same privileges to these other nations, and that therefore we are getting nothing in return. We have been getting something in return ever since those treaties came into operation, because those treaties had as their very essence that British products and Canadian products as well should go into those markets unde the most-favoured treatment, and we have been getting the advantage of that all the time without giving any like advantage in return. My hon. friend smiles, but that is a true statement of the case. If he will look up the returns a little more assiduously, and bestow a little more pains in informing himself in that respect, he will find that from Belgium and from Germany we have, during the last five or six years, been reaping signal advantages because of the position in which we stood with reference to them on the most-favoured-nation treaty basis, and that our goods could go in cheaper there than to most other countries. He says that if this is signed it will put a bar to the negotiations of any other treaty. Yet, Great Britain, and, at the present time, nearly every nation in Europe, have this most-favoured-nation clause, and it does not debar them from making treaties almost every year. I was going to say, almost every month of the year, for almost every month we see an announcement of some new treaty that is being made by some Government with other countries where the most-favoured-nation clauses do come in and apply to the different powers that are making the treaty, and they are not a bar to making a treaty. Well, Sir, the simple ground is this, that the position has been well understood in reference to Great Britain, the position has been well recognized by this Parliament. We are a part of the British Empire. We have the advantages of belonging to that Empire, we have the advantages of the treaties that are made. The commercial independence which was talked of by my hon. friend as being given by Great Britain to us, has been given. But he must make a distinction between treaties which were made years ago and treaties which are made to-day. The treaties which have been made since 1882 have never included Canada unless Canada was willing to be included. That is where we are given our commercial independence. But it is a different thing entirely to say that in the case of treaties made 20 or 30 years ago in which we were included, whether by our consent or not, therefore these treaties are to be ruptured, that the obligations are not to be kept whilst we are part of the Empire. He charges us with lack of diligence in not pushing to a conclusion the abandonment of these clauses by the British Government. We are not culpable in that respect. We have made our representations through both Houses of this Parliament passing an Address; we have been making them since 1882 or 1883. But there are serious difficulties in the way, and although the sympathies of prominent members of the British Government, as expressed in the House, were with the colonies in their demand in that respect, there are grave difficulties in getting rid of these treaties. There are treaties in which Great Britain is much interested, in which her commerce is very much interested, but she did press upon both those nations at the time of her negotiations that they should let Canada out from the operation of these treaties. The position taken by those governments was this: We cannot do away with one single party to the treaty without having the whole treaty

revised. Now, if Great Britain was willing to have the whole treaty revised, then Canada could be let out, or the other colonies let out; but when it became manifest that there was great benefit to the commerce of Great Britain involved in those treaties, it made them stop and consider before asking that the whole treaty in every respect should be got rid of in order to relieve Canada from all obligations with reference to that treaty. Call it selfish, if you like; it may be a sort of commercial selfishness; but there is an interest. Now, so long as we are a part of the British Empire I think we will have to subscribe to the doctrine that we are really bound by a British treaty, we are really bound in this respect, and we must submit to it. It has been stated that we have been snubbed by Lord Ripon because he asked us to make the legislation certain and binding. I do not look at it in that way, nor do I think it is a fair view. If there is anything the British Government is particularly careful about, it is in the scrupulous maintenance of every one of her treaty obligations. Lord Ripon's action did not imply any lack of confidence in Canada. We said: Here is the legislation which we propose, we will pass it giving us the power, and on our proclamation, it shall come into force. Lord Ripon looked at it in the light of their treaties, and said: We must keep scrupulous faith with those powers with whom we have treaties, and I do not want it even to be subjected to a contingency in my answer to them. I must be in a position to say to those countries with whom we have made these treaties, that it is absolutely certain and denominated in the law that you shall have the most-favoured-nation treatment? I do not consider this as a lack of confidence? I do not consider the position as implying any lack of confidence, but it simply means that Great Britain desires to observe scrupulous care in carrying out her treaty obligations with other powers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It commits this Parliament to a new doctrine.

Mr. FOSTER. It commits this Parliament so far as this treaty is concerned.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, but to the doctrine generally.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman says the case goes further than that, and affects the doctrine generally. If the hon. gentleman will take the Bill prepared before this Bill was brought down, in which I had the idea of making a Bill that would cover the case of every treaty, if we had passed that Bill with those positive enactments, it would have committed us in every case; but, instead of that, we make a positive enactment with respect to a positive treaty, and to one treaty alone. It is an argument, I grant, that if we pursue a certain line of policy in one case it is fair to suppose that a similar course will be pursued in another case. But it is not conclusive. There is with respect to this treaty with France that which will make the treaty applicable to most-favoured treaty nations, but it does not hold that it will affect every treaty we may hereafter make. So far as that argument goes, the actions of the Government may be due to one cause or to another, but the principle referred to is not absolutely binding or conclusive with respect to other treaties. The fact to be remembered in this treaty is this: That we have so arranged it that it is entirely in our own power, after twelve months, at any time to give notice, and so the treaty may be entirely removed as regards any obligation concerning it rests on this country. My hon. friends have gone over a good deal of the ground of the French treaty, the worth and value of it, the merits of it. We have fully discussed that question. If the hon. gentleman who, facing me, believes all he said last year, he should have voted against the French treaty, and not for it, and if hon. gentlemen opposite to-day feel the force of the words they utter, they should vote against it to-day, and not for it; but, under our peculiar position with respect to Great Britain, and as part of the Empire, and connected with it by treaty obligations, we cannot have the French treaty unless we extend its provisions to other countries. And has not too much been made of that? Count, if you like, twenty or thirty powers which have the most-favoured-nation treaties with Great Britain, you must count, on the other hand, the articles which come in from France. And how many of those articles will they send to us? It is very well to talk about Uruguay and Algeria, but they send us no trade in that respect; all the wines and other articles that come from the most-favoured-nation countries are a mere bagatelle, the great preponderance of such trade comes from France itself.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I should like to ask the leader of the House if he can answer the question put to him the other day in regard to admitting free alcohol for Canadian wine-producers.

Mr. FOSTER. The wine-producers stated their case in a petition asking for certain things. Being opposed in the main to the French treaty, they asked if the treaty be passed, their interests should be considered in certain particulars. I made answer to that question after giving it fair consideration, and my answer is recorded in "Hansard," and that answer I am prepared to repeat to-day, with this addition, that the Minister of Inland Revenue and myself are looking into this matter to see if there is any well-founded disability under which they are suffering, and in the second place, whether we can meet them in any reasonable way.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the House desires to be carried away into a discussion as to whether the French treaty in itself is a good one or not, or whether it is one that Parliament should ratify or not. That question has been discussed and decided, and, speaking for myself, I do not desire to reopen the discussion. I might remind the hon. gentleman that when he urged the House to adopt the treaty, he used as one very strong argument in favour of adopting it, that, after a careful calculation, made by him, there would be a gain to Canada if the treaty was adopted. The hon. gentleman placed the maximum of loss at $82,000. The hon. gentleman in his speech, delivered on 13th March, 1893, declared it to be the fact that, "$82,000 would be the maximum of loss, and $30,000 would be the maximum of loss as regards French duties." The hon. gentleman, at that time, was urging the adoption of the treaty, and he made use of that fact as one of his principal arguments. He has not considered the ratio of loss that would accrue from the extension of the treaty to other nations. We do not know what will be the maximum of loss after this treaty is adopted, and this reciprocity with France is extended to other nations which have the most-favoured-nation clause with Great Britain. But that is not the point now before the House; the question before the House is a very simple one, and, at the same time, a very serious one. It is that if Canada enters into a commercial treaty with any nation, we must, as a matter of principle, so soon as we have entered into that treaty, extend the advantages of the treaty to all nations that have treaties with Great Britain containing the most-favoured-nation clause. We, in this Bill before the House, are asked to assent to that principle. It is not a matter whether the treaty is a good treaty or a bad one. The question is entirely foreign to that issue. Suppose it to be a bad one or a good one, according to the point of view, the question is: Are we prepared, in addition to ratifying this treaty, to agree to a statutory enactment declaring that as a consequence of passing the treaty, we must extend the privileges given to France to other countries having the most-favoured-nation clause with Great Britain. That was not the case in days gone by. We had a commercial treaty with the United States, the Elgin treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. An exceptional case, entirely.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was the most important commercial treaty that Canada ever had.

Mr. FOSTER. That might be.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There was no such concession sought to be wrung from it.

Mr. FOSTER. The cases are entirely different.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They are not. The leader of the House is asking us, not to ratify a treaty with France, but to agree to a statutory declaration that when that treaty is ratified, every privilege we concede to France shall be conceded to every nation that has commercial treaties with Great Britain containing the most-favoured-nation clause. If we agree to that principle to-day, I ask hon. gentlemen if we are not binding our hands as a Parliament for all future time? The hon. gentleman states that these obligations are binding on Great Britain. The hon. gentleman is well aware that Great Britain has few, if any, reciprocity treaties. She had one treaty with France with regard to wines, but when other nations claimed the same right as regards sending wines to Great Britain she repudiated it, and would not consent. But we are asked to-day to do what Great Britain refused to do then, and if we should make a reciprocity treaty with the United States, which every hon. member would unite in concurring would be a good treaty, should we not be bound the day after to introduce a similar Bill to extend to every nation of Europe the advantages granted to the United States? It will be argued, you have done it in the case of France, you have acknowledged the principle as binding, and so you must do it in this case of a treaty entered into with the United States. So this is a serious question that we are considering to-day. The question is not whether we approve or disapprove of the French treaty, but it is whether the advantages of the French treaty so enormously preponderate as to compensate us for giving up our commercial freedom and extend privileges to practically all nations, when we negotiate a treaty with a certain nation. The question of the repeal of the treaty has nothing to do with the question, and it is not the issue before the House. Suppose that, during next year, or the year after the treaty should be denounced, does that affect, in any sense or way, the statutory declaration which it is proposed to make to-day? Not at all. We are declaring before the world that if we concede certain reciprocal advantages, we are bound to extend those advantages to every nation in the world with which Great Britain has the most-favoured-nation clause: and, therefore, unless the advantages of the French treaty are so overwhelming that we are prepared to accept them and surrender our commercial freedom, we should not pass this measure. I think the question is far more serious and grave than the leader of the House would lead us to believe. The hon. gentleman did not discuss its gravity, because it was not his policy to discuss it. He wished to lead off the discussion to the merits of the treaty itself, to the fact that my hon. friend voted for the treaty after moving or supporting a number of amendments against it. What has that got to do with the question before the House? It is

only trifling with the House. It is altogether foreign to the question now before us, which, in itself is a most important one, and which will affect our commercial future very, very seriously.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am glad to endorse by word of mouth and to record my vote in favour of the Bill which the Government have just brought before the House, in order to remove the last objections to the ratification of the French treaty, a consummation which has, for so long a time, devoutly been wished for. Far be it from me, Sir, to criticise the action of the Government for delays, much to be regretted, forsooth, but of which, however, it can readily be understood by every one, in a matter of such weighty moment. I venture to say that such a momentous question should be dealt with apart from all party considerations. It is a matter of too great an importance for any one to allow himself to be swayed by party interest. True, I am a party man, having pledged myself, when returned to Parliament, to support the eminent men who have, for so long a time, been at the head of affairs. I mean to fulfil that pledge, so long as the Government shall continue to deserve the confidence of the country and of the House. Still, I feel it to be my duty to deal with the matter, from the standpoint of the public interests, which have a primary claim to our consideration. It is from such a standpoint, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to express my views on the question before the House and I shall now explain why I think it desirable for the country that the French treaty should be ratified at the earliest opportunity. From the outset I realized the difficulties that stood in the way of negotiating such an important treaty. The scheme was one of the planks of the Government platform in connection with our foreign trade. I need not remind the House of all the steps which have been taken by the Government and by the Prime Minister, with a view to open new outlets to our industries and to the trade of Canada, and how negotiations have been carried on in that direction with Spain, the West Indies, Australasia, Cape Colony, &c. Now, we want the French market to be thrown wide open to Canadian products, such as lumber, cheese, butter, fish, leather and shoes. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that in expressing these views, I voice the sentiment of the Canadians of every origin, who have nothing so much at heart than the extension of our foreign trade. As a member of French descent, I, no doubt, entertain strong sympathy and admiration for "la belle France," a country whose alliance is eagerly sought for by the other powers, now as in the time of the Crimean war. It is owing to the fact of France being so rich and powerful a nation that I desire an extension of our trade relations with that country, and I wish to see the ties of friendship which bind us to France still more strengthened. I am quite aware, Mr. Speaker, that in giving expression to those views, far from being disloyal to the great British empire of which I am proud to be a subject, I am but voicing the sentiments of our Most Gracious Sovereign, who never misses the occasion of spending the summer season, in order to recruit her strength, in "la belle France," whose cordial and respectful greeting evinces the union of both France and England, a union which our Sovereign has ever sought to cement, as she realizes that the union of France and England is calculated to promote the best interests of civilization. I am happy to find that the efforts of Her Majesty have been successful, and that that friendship she professes for France has been instilled into the heart of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and of all the Royal family. Now, to come back to the treaty, as our chief imports from France are likely to be French wines, it has been urged that the treaty would interfere with our wine interests in Ontario. I may, perhaps, be allowed to give utterance before this House to the views I expressed, last session, to the hon. the Finance Minister, when I told him that being, as I think, a merchant of some experience in that line, I was satisfied that the ratification of the French treaty would not in the least injure the grape-growing industry of this country. There are, I may say, two classes of consumers in Canada: there are those, first, who, were you to offer them fine Canadian wines, at a nominal cost, would still object to buying them, on account of their being too acid; and we have those consumers, on the other hand, who would not pay even twenty-five cents a gallon for our best home-grown wines. Now, let our friends from the Ontario grape-growing districts, be assured that the ratification of the French treaty cannot but result beneficially to their trade, by stimulating the consumption of wine in the country. There is no ground for fearing less the future of our wine interests should be placed in jeopardy. That immense benefits are likely to accrue to the country from the exportation of our products, is a matter which the press of the country has pointed out, and I need not here dwell upon it at present. Now, Mr. Speaker, when urging the Government to hasten the ratification of the treaty, I do not voice only my own opinion, but I re-echo the feelings of a large number of influential merchants of the city of Montreal, and of the city of Quebec, who think that the trade in French wines is now being seriously interfered with, on account of the ratification of the treaty being withheld so long. Now, I shall not trouble the House by dealing too extensively with figures, but I will give a few figures of some of our imports of French products:

Timber	$40,000,000
Furniture and staves	6,000,000
Lobsters	1,000,000
Salmon and other canned fish	1,000,000
Canned meats ..... from 2,000,000 to	4,000,000
Apples	1,000,000
Condensed milk	400,000
Wood pulp	4,000,000
Paper	1,000,000

As will be seen from the foregoing, Canada can export nearly all the above products, and with the spirit of enterprise which characterizes our business men, undoubtedly, our trade relations with France would thereby be considerably enlarged. Therefore, I believe the House should hasten to bring to a conclusion the first treaty which Canada has ever entered into with another nation, through the exertions of Sir Charles Tupper. I say this, Mr. Speaker, that it behooves us, at a time when the attention of France is more than ever rivetted on Canada, and she shows herself favourably disposed to establish closer trade relations, it behooves us, I say, following in this the example set to us by the mother country, to make of France an ally and a friend. Let the Government bring about this result, and they will thereby have claims to the gratitude of the country and to our support.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is read a third time, I wish to offer to this House a few remarks about the impression created in France with regard to this treaty. All of us remember that the treaty was signed in the month of February, 1893. Now, during the session of 1893, the ratification of the treaty was brought before the House, as is shown from a question put to the Government by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier), on the 9th February, 1893. It may be noticed that the leader of the Opposition, when putting the question to the Government, was careful to state that it was a welcome news for the country to learn that a treaty had been entered into between France and Canada :

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to inquire from the First Minister if he is in position to impart to the House any information with respect to the welcome news cabled to the press that a treaty of commerce has been signed between Great Britain, France and Canada.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I may be able to do so to-morrow ; but the letters from the High Commissioner have only just arrived, and have not been laid before the Council.

We all know that after all the papers in connection with the French treaty had been laid on the Table of the House, several questions were put by members as to whether the Government intended to move the ratification of the treaty. Notwithstanding repeated questions put by members on this side of the House, the Government were always heard to state that they did not know whether they would ask the House to ratify the treaty or not ; and, finally, they declared that they would not do so, because certain clauses needed to be more fully elucidated. In support of my statement, let me refer to the declaration then made by the now leader of the House (Mr. Foster.) To a question put by the hon. leader of the Opposition, on the 29th March, 1893, the hon. gentleman answered :

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the hon. gentleman to make a statement he promised with regard to the French treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. I have to ask my hon. friend for further delay. A telegram has been received this morning which is now being deciphered, and I would not care to make an answer before knowing the purport of it. My hon. friend, I am sure, is anxious for all the information.

On the next day, the hon. leader of the Opposition came back to the charge and put the following question concerning the treaty :

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he has any more information to give us with regard to the treaty with France ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have a few words to say with reference to the French treaty. The House will remember a statement I made when that treaty was laid before the House about a fortnight ago. At that time, after having explained the terms of the treaty, I said that, owing to certain points which were touched upon then, I did not propose at present to ask the House to ratify the treaty ; that communications had been opened with the British Government and the High Commissioner with reference to certain clauses and other matters in connection with the treaty, and we were waiting the result of these communications. * * *

And further on, he said :

Parliament will not be asked to ratify this treaty this year. I think it is also well to state that one of the chief points which the Government have to keep in view, is with respect to the favoured-nation clause.

It will, therefore, be clearly seen from the above answers made by the hon. gentleman, that, in 1893, the question whether the treaty should be ratified or not, was never brought before the House. The Government never meant to submit to the consideration of the House the ratification of the treaty. Still, notwithstanding the position then taken by the Government, behold what transpires to-day in connection with that question. It appears that the French Government was informed, through communications sent to France, that the non-ratification of the treaty was brought about, not because further explanations were needed, but owing to the opposition offered to the measure by the Canadian Liberals in the House. In support of my statement, I may refer the House to a high authority, the report of the French Committee on Customs. In 1894, after the treaty had been ratified, the question came up before the French Chamber of Deputies ; it was referred to a committee on customs, presided over by Mr. George Berger, who reported to the French Chamber as follows :

On the 2nd of February, Mr. Develle, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Develle, Minister of Commerce, Industries and Colonies, had brought before the Chamber of Deputies a Bill expressing approbation of the arrangement entered into at Paris, on the 6th February, 1893, to determine, in connection with the customs tariff, the trade relations between France and Canada.

This Bill having been referred to the Committee on Customs as soon as the 28th February, had been favourably reported upon, and the report was about to be laid on the table of the House, when, to the utter dismay of both French and English Governments the news spread that the Canadian Parliament had thrown out the arrangement agreed upon in Paris by the Canadian plenipotentiary, and the representatives of France and England.

The tacit reason of the refusal to adopt the arrangement may be found in the fact that through our recent Act on the mercantile navy we had just granted allocations for wooden ships built at our own ship-yards. Canadians, in fact, used to supply us with wooden ships for our fisheries at St. Pierre Miquelon ; they might have felt aggrieved at seeing themselves threatened to lose an important outlet for their lumber, the value of which had gradually declined 30 per cent within a few years.

The protracted and lively debate which took place in the Canadian Parliament, at Ottawa, between the Ministry in favour of the arrangement, and the Opposition in no way elucidated the grievance above alluded to.

A primary cause of the failure of last year may be found in the proscription of the official teaching of the Catholic religion and of the French language in the schools of the Canadian Northwest, under a law passed by the local legislature. This question has given rise among so-called Canadian Liberals to a party of francophobes who seize upon any pretext or opportunity to advertise themselves.

In short, the Canadian Government stood their ground, and finally their measure was carried through the House, which adopted the arrangement that is now embodied in the new Bill presented to the Chamber of Deputies on the 28th July last.

Behold then, Mr. Speaker, a most extraordinary fact, and a state of things well worth drawing the attention of the House to. Here we have the "Commission des douanes" in France making, in an official report, the statement that the French treaty had not been carried through the Canadian Parliament in 1893, owing to the fact that opposition had been offered to it by a section of the Liberal party, consisting of francophobes, who gave that piece of information to the French Ministry! Did it spring from our own Ministers, who, being unable to account for their backdown in 1893, had thought fit to resort to that subterfuge? I am satisfied, at all events, that the scheme originated with some of the Ministerialists in this House. Where else in the world could the French Ministers have found that information, if not in the official papers and communications sent to them by our Ministers? I venture to say, this official paper, issued from the French Government, gives us a pretty fair idea of the cogency of the reasons put forward by the Canadian Government to palliate their unwarrantable delays in the matter of the treaty. But why did not the Ministers tell the French Government the truth about the non-ratification of the treaty? I would like to know how it happens that Mr. Berger should have mentioned it in his report? The Government, I presume, being unable to justify their conduct, resorted to that explanation, to which I have seen reproduced in several French papers in the province of Quebec. As I was one of those who voted in favour of the ratification of the French treaty last year, I thought it my duty to enter my protest against the insinuations contained in the report of the French Committee on Customs of the Chamber of Deputies. While, on the other hand, I do not think the odium of it should attach to the author of the report, I am of opinion that such a report would never have been issued had our Ministers correctly informed the French Government about the transactions of this House.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) I do not think the hon. member was in earnest when making such a statement as that about the Government or some member of the Government having given the preposterous information upon which was based this report of the Committee on Customs, of the French Chamber of Deputies. The hon. member said also that some French papers in the province of Quebec had spread the same report. I should like to know on what authority the hon. member grounds his assertion, and also the names of the papers he mentioned. The hon. member seems to think that the French members of the Ministry have given information of such a nature as to vindicate the report of the Committee on Customs of the French Parliament. This allegation is as groundless as the statement made by him in connection with the French papers in the province of Quebec, and with regard to that important question, I do not know of any French paper published in Canada having attempted in that way to vindicate the course followed by the Government. Nor did the Government resort to such methods in order to justify their action in the matter. And previous to coming before Parliament and calling upon it to ratify the treaty, they have endeavoured, as in duty bound, to get a clear understanding of the obligations involved in it. During the first session which followed the signing of the treaty, the Government did not insist upon its ratification, as there were certain clauses in it whose meaning was not quite obvious ; and it was thought desirable first to have the right interpretation put upon those clauses, which could not conveniently be done before the close of the session. But last year, the treaty was submitted to Parliament for ratification, and that was done at the earliest opportunity. It seems to me that if anything could have induced the French Government to believe that there were people here who did not wish for the ratification of the treaty, it

needed for them but to read the speeches of certain hon. members of the Opposition to see all doubts dispelled on the matter. If the hon. member for Rouville, in drawing the attention of our French cousins across the sea to the debate in Parliament, wished to throw blame upon the Government, and especially, if he wished to induce them to believe that the only people who loved France and wanted to see closer trade relations and bonds of friendship with her, were to be found in the ranks of the Liberal party, he was greatly mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I claim the indulgence of the House for one moment. I would not have asked if somewhat persistent misrepresentations had not been made with reference to what I said on the calculations as to duty. I merely wish to set myself right. If hon. gentlemen have the curiosity to look at "Hansard," page 5695, of last year (1894), they will find that, in answer to a question of Mr. McCarthy, I stated as follows :—

Nor is it the intention of the Government to withhold from the sister colonies at present equal treatment with respect to the same kind of wine as is given to the French products.

Then Sir Richard Cartwright asked me with reference to the wines of other countries, and I said :

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the wines of countries which have most-favoured-nation treaties, the clauses of which bind us, then wine of the same quality would come in under the same conditions as French wines.

That includes foreign nations that have treaties with Great Britain. Now, as to the revenues that would be lost, Mr. McCarthy and Sir Richard Cartwright both asked with rederence to this, and on page 5697 of the "Hansard" will be found my remarks in reply :

Mr. FOSTER. I will read the figures for 1892. In 1892, according to the importations, the loss on the non-sparkling wines would be $30,499, and on champagne and other sparkling wines, $41,695. On the importations of 1893 the loss would be, on the first class, non-sparkling wines, $30,234, and on champagne and other sparkling wines, $41,313 ; total, $71,547. Then, with regard to countries other than France, 1891 and 1892 are given in the blue-book. I will give the figures for 1893. On wines imported from other countries than France, the reduction would involve $76,568 on the non-sparkling wines, and $8,722 on the sparkling wines. So the total loss would be about $150,000.

Mr. EDGAR. As the hon. gentleman has spoken, I will be allowed to say a word. That list from which he has read includes Spain and the United States and all other countries except France.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave the total loss as $150,000.

Mr. EDGAR. Yes, from all the countries in the world. It includes all the countries in the world, including Spain and the United States, with which there is no most-favoured-nation clause.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend has no quarrel that I did not go to the maximum of the loss.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may remark that it only shows how exceeding little value the treaty is.

Mr. FOSTER. I know your side has that view of it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, on a division, and passed.

SUPPLY—VACANCIES IN THE SENATE.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to a matter which was brought before the House in reply to a question of mine some weeks ago, but which we have had no opportunity of discussing up to the present time. I have no doubt, Sir, that the facts are tolerably familiar to the recollection of the House, but nevertheless it may be well that I should recall them in case hon. gentlemen may be present who do not exactly recollect what passed on that occasion. It appears that a few months ago a letter was addressed by Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the Premier of this Dominion, to an hon. gentleman in this House, which reads as follows :—

Privy Council Office,
Ottawa, 2nd April, 1895.

A. McNeill, Esq., M.P.

My dear McNeill,—I have no doubt you have seen, as I have, notices in the papers that you had been or were to be offered a senatorship. I know of no man in the Commons whom I would rather see elevated to the honourable and responsible position of a Senator than yourself ; but the rumour must have been set afloat by persons having some ulterior object in view, as no such offer has been made, nor has it been considered. Certainly a senatorship was never asked for by you, either directly or indirectly. Moreover, such a step is precluded for the present by the fact that there are no vacancies that have not long since been promised.

Trusting that you may be successful in the contest before you.

I remain, &c.,
Sincerely yours,
MACKENZIE BOWELL.

It looks a little as if the hon. the Premier of this country, on April 2nd, expected immediate dissolution. However, that, as the Minister of Finance would say, is an inference. Now, Sir, upon that letter having been made public, I demanded of the Government an official declaration as to when these various senatorships had become vacant. There were ten vacancies ; one-eighth of the whole number of the Senate, which

is a so-called federal body. These seats in the Senate had been vacant for five years, for four years, for three years, for two years, and I think, in all instances but one, for at least one year. Now, Sir, with respect to this letter, although I consider it a most improper one, I am bound to say that in some respects it is most guileless. I have endeavoured, as far as I could, to put myself—and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to put yourself—into the place and the mental attitude occupied by the Premier of this Dominion, so far as it is possible for one man to do that in the case of another. I think we will all admit that two things are perfectly evident from the letter which the Premier addressed to my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill). First and most curious, is the utter (if I may say so), although unconscious, contempt with which the Premier, himself a member of the Senate, regards that honourable body. It is perfectly clear that it is impossible for the present Premier of this Dominion to recognize the Senate as anything, except as a sort of donkey engine to the Conservative party. He looks upon it as his chattel, his private property, a thing that he has a right to dispose of autocratically, a thing which he is under no constitutional obligation to administer or to appoint to, for any conceivable reason except his own will and pleasure, and the will and pleasure of his colleagues, and the political advantages that may be derived by his party from these appointments. It is a matter of no consequence in the eyes of the hon. Premier, whether a vacancy in the Senate has existed for five years, for four years, for three years or for two years. If it suits the convenience of the Government, apparently for all the Premier of this Dominion cares, it might remain vacant for fifteen or fifty years. He recognizes no sort of obligation—it is perfectly evident from the tenor of this letter—on the part of the Government of this country to maintain the Senate at the number which was fixed by the constitutional Act creating this House and creating the Senate. And although it is a co-ordinate branch of this legislature, and although it is nominally, at any rate, the particular body in which the proportions between the several provinces are more especially bound to be observed for the sake of protecting the provinces in their various rights; nevertheless the Premier of this Dominion does not consider it of the smallest consequence apparently whether a large fraction of the entire Senate remains vacant from year to year. I am bound to say, in view of what has occurred, that there may be persons found in this Dominion who would think that if it is a matter of no earthly consequence whether one-eighth of the Senate remains vacant for several years, it may be a matter of no earthly consequence whether eight-eighths of the Senate were to remain vacant for several years. Then, Sir, underlying it all, it appears very clear what is the true—I hesitate to call it Conservative idea—perhaps I should say, the true Liberal-Conservative idea of the usefulness of the Senate. Looking at the letter and reading between the lines, there is no mistake as to what purpose the Senate is intended to serve in the mind of the writer. Quite evidently, the Senate is very useful in his mind, partly for purposes of bribery and partly to be used in certain contingencies as a weapon to thwart his political opponents. But from first to last it never seems to have occurred to him that it is the bounden duty of the Government administering the affairs of this country for the people's good, nominally at any rate, to take good care that a very important branch of the legislature, possessing in almost all respects equal legal powers with ourselves, should not be so treated as to be brought into contempt in the eyes of the public at large, and even in the eyes of the members of the House itself. Now, Sir, it is quite clear, if the theory, or at any rate the practice, which is here expounded by the Premier of Canada is to regulate the treatment which the Government will mete out to the Senate, that the Senate under such treatment has ceased to be of any value for good, although I am free to admit that it may remain a considerable power for mischief. While I am not going on the present occasion to enter into any elaborate disquisition as to the value of a second Chamber in the abstract, or as to the way a second Chamber in Canada should be composed to render valuable service to the state, I do say that the worst enemy of the Senate in Canada never injured that body so much as the Premier, himself a member of the Senate, has injured it, by the writing and publication of this letter. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, in writing this letter and making it public—and there is no doubt from its terms that it was intended to be shown to a reasonably large circle of the hon. gentleman's friends at any rate—has justified, and more than justified, every charge that has ever been brought against that body on this side of the House or in the country at large. There is no doubt that in a constitutional point of view the Senate was essentially faulty from the commencement. I know of no legislative body in any English community which is similarly constituted. It differs wholly and entirely from the House of Lords, and it differs wholly and entirely from the American Senate. There is absolutely no provision for bringing it into harmony with the popular branch or with the well understood wishes of the people. But I am bound to say that I do not believe anybody ever contemplated such a mode of treating the Senate as is revealed to us in the letter to which I have just called attention. Whatever we may think of the motives which actuated the framers of the confederation compact in drawing up the rules under which the Senate is constituted, I do not

think it ever entered into their minds that we should see the spectacle of a large portion of the Senate remaining unfilled, and remaining unfilled, although as stated by the Premier, the vacancies have long been promised. Now, Sir, certain questions naturally suggest themselves to the inquiring mind with respect to this remarkable statement. These vacancies have long been promised—to whom have they long been promised? why have they been promised for so long a time? and why have the promises not been fulfilled? It used to be said that good Americans when they died went to Paris; and it appears to me that it is part of the Conservative creed that good Conservative members of the House of Commons, after they have supported the Ministers for so long a time that the country has ceased to have any further use for them, are expected to go to the Senate; and that apparently is the reason why, according to Sir Mackenzie Bowell, these vacancies have long since been promised. Sir, I can understand that there are very good reasons why promises made to members of this House should have remained long unfulfilled; but I fail to understand why promises made to other gentlemen throughout the community, who may have served the Conservative party, have not been implemented long ago. I think we are entitled to know, and the country is entitled to know, how many representatives of the people come under the category of parties to whom these promises have long been made, and what particular services they may have rendered—I do not say to the country, but to the Government of the day—to entitle them to carry about in their pockets a promise of a seat in the Senate when the time shall come. What are their services? Why and wherefore is it that a man should have for a long time the promise of a senatorship if he behaves himself and staunchly supports the Government of the day? Sir, we can imagine some of these services. We can imagine, for instance, the case of a member of this honourable House who, if I may say so without offence, is serving the purpose of a warming-pan to keep a seat for the Minister; we can imagine the case of a gentleman who may find it inconvenient under certain circumstances, especially if he sits for a close county, to incur the expense and fatigue of a contest, except under the promise that if his services are not appreciated by the people—and there are plenty of precedents for that—he will be promoted to a seat in the other branch. Then, we know that there are applicants for places which it is difficult to obtain; and peradventure it may be that some of these promises are contingent, to be fulfilled only provided no better job than a senatorship can be found for a gentleman who has served his party long and well. I will not suggest that there can be any who have been promised senatorships on condition that they are sufficiently liberal contributors to the party funds. I will not suggest that, more particularly as I rather fancy that they will not be found to be members of this honourable House.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that the case with your opponent in Oxford?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another side to this question, which I much regret, that is, the attitude of the Senate itself after these matters had been brought to its attention. It is now more than two months since these facts were publicly known, since they were commented on in the press, and since they were publicly stated on the floor of this House and admitted by the Government; and I have looked in vain during all that time for so much as a single ripple of discontent on the placid bosom of the Senate. I should have thought that the ordinary instincts of self-respect and of self-preservation would have induced that honourable body to compel the Government to take some action—to explain their position, to redeem their promises and fill the vacancies; and all I can say is that if there be one thing more than another which goes to show that the Senate of Canada has unhappily become a purely partisan body, it is the fact that such an insult as this letter could have been made public and that body have taken no notice of it up to the present moment. Now, I have said that unfortunately, our constitution has no provision, or none except a very trifling and inadequate provision, for bringing the Senate into line with the popular will. The people may return an overwhelming majority of a certain party to this House; but nevertheless the Senate of Canada may remain, during the lifetime of its present members, absolutely and hopelessly a partisan club, and nothing else. That was not by any means the intention of the framers of the constitution; and it is a very grave reflection on the mode in which the patronage of the Senate has been administered, that at this present time not only does the Senate in no respect fairly represent the various parties in Canada, but that there is absolutely no provision whatever made for insuring any representation at all. Were the hon. gentlemen to remain in office two or three years longer, were the mortality among the Reform Senators to be as great in the succeeding three years, as it has been in the past, there would not be such a thing as a live Reform Senator in the Dominion. Now, that is a blot, and a very bad blot, upon our constitution—one that ought to be removed. It shows clearly and distinctly with what little care, I am sorry to have to say it, with how little forethought and consideration, that branch of the legislature was constituted at the time of confederation. More than that, it is wholly and absolutely opposed to all sound principle in theory and practice; it is at variance with the constitu-

tion of the second chamber in the mother country and in France, and, I believe, in the United States, or any of those countries where a second chamber has been assigned any really valuable function in government at all. Under such circumstances, I say—and I say it with considerable regret—that it is utterly impossible for the Senate of Canada either to command respect or to do any substantial service to the country. The Senate, in fact, in existing circumstances, is neither useful nor ornamental; it is practically nothing but an expensive encumbrance which ought to be removed, unless it can be improved and turned to a much more valuable purpose than it is at present. All I can say with respect to this matter is this, that I think that, peradventure, out of this evil some good may ultimately arrive. Sir, I think that the facts which I here disclose are in themselves sufficient to demand at the proper time the complete reconstruction or the abolition of the Senate. In its present shape, I do not hesitate to say that it is purely and absolute mischievous, and that it will continue to be a costly nuisance until such time as its whole constitution is revised. I admit that the present Premier, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, without in the least meaning it, may possibly be useful to the state. As for the letter itself, it may be described as a delightfully immoral letter. I do not think that the hon. gentleman in the least understood, when he wrote this letter, what an atrocious blow he was aiming at the Senate—or more correctly speaking—how atrociously he was misrepresenting his duty as the constitutional guardian of the institutions of this country, or how dangerous an example he was setting, proving how a man's conscience—of course I speak of his political conscience—may become seared by a long course of gerrymander acts, and franchise Acts and substitution of mock charges for real ones. He sees nothing wrong in this letter. I do believe he has become morally colour-blind—an affliction which is very apt to overcome men who have been for a long time in the habit of regarding themselves as the state and not merely as the guardians and trustees appointed by the state to perform certain duties. But at any rate, whatever else he has done, Sir Mackenzie Bowell has removed all doubt from the minds of all impartial persons as to the position the Senate now occupies. No man reading his letter, no man reading the answer to my question, can fail to see exactly what the Senate has become. No impartial man can fail to see that a complete case has been made out for a radical change in the constitution of that body. Sir, I say the Premier has established that fact, and probably that will be the only political achievement which will mark his presidency of the present Government. There remains therefore but one question to be considered, and that is whether in dealing with the Senate we should end it or mend it; and I think that it is a matter to which the attention of both sides of the House had better direct itself with as little delay as possible. As it now stands, the Senate is simply a menace and a danger to good government. It will be far better that we should have no second chamber than have one which is neither more nor less than a political partisan club, and which the Government of the country do not condescend to treat with common respect. Whether we can or cannot improve it, whether it is possible for a body which has allowed itself to fall so low, to regain its position, may well be doubted. But in the present case it will be very interesting for all students of constitutional history to see on what grounds hon. gentlemen opposite will defend the action of the Premier. This letter, I say, is an insult to the Senate. I say it is a disgrace to the Government of Canada. I would like to know on what possible grounds the Government can justify holding over no less than ten appointments out of 78 or 82—I forget the exact number—holding over no less than one-eighth of the whole appointments to the Senate; and I would like to know on what moral ground the Government can defend the dangling of appointments to that body for three or four or five years before the eyes of expectants with the view, not to promote the efficiency of the Senate by their appointments, but, as far as they possible can,—I will not say coerce,—but induce their followers to support them, rightly or wrongly, with the comfortable conviction that if they should fail to secure the confidence of their constituents, they will be provided for life with a tolerable annuity in another place. And as it is desirable that the people of Canada should understand clearly and distinctly what the issue is between us and what the conduct of the Government has been in this amendment, I desire to move:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"it appears from statements made in this House that the Premier, on or about the 2nd day of April, 1895, addressed the following letter to Mr. A. McNeill, a member of this House:—

Privy Council Office,
Ottawa, 2nd April, 1895.

A. McNeill, Esq., M.P.

My dear McNeill,—I have no doubt you have seen, as I have, notices in the papers that you had been or were to be offered a senatorship. I know of no man in the Commons whom I would rather see elevated to the honourable and responsible position of a Senator than yourself; but the rumour must have been set afloat by persons having some ulterior object in view, as no such offer has been made nor has it been considered. Certainly a senatorship was never asked for by you, either directly or indirectly. Moreover, such a step is precluded for the present by the fact that there are no vacancies that have not long since been promised.

Trusting that you may be successful in the contest before you.

I remain, &c.,
Sincerely yours,
MACKENZIE BOWELL.

That it further appears that the vacancies referred to in the above letter occurred on the following dates :—Ontario, Hon. Billa Flint, died 15th June, 1894. Quebec, Hon. W. H. Chaffers, died 16th July, 1894. New Brunswick, Hon. John Glasier, died 7th July, 1894. Quebec, Hon. Joseph Tassé, died 17th January, 1895. Ontario, Hon. Elijah Leonard, died 14th May, 1891. Quebec, Hon. G. G. Stevens, died 15th April, 1892. Quebec, Hon. Sir J. J. C. Abbott, died 30th October, 1893. New Brunswick, Hon. A. E. Botsford, died 19th March, 1894. New Brunswick, Hon. John Boyd, died 4th December, 1893. Nova Scotia, Hon. T. D. Archibald, died 18th October, 1890.

That the conduct of the Government in allowing one-eighth part of the total number of senatorships provided in the British North America Act to remain unfulfilled under circumstances set forth in the said letter and in this Resolution, is in the highest degree derogatory to the dignity and usefulness of the Senate, and is calculated to bring that branch of the legislature into contempt."

House divided on amendment :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allan,	Langelier,
Bain (Wentworth),	Laurier,
Béchard,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Legris,
Borden.	Lister,
Bowers,	Lowell,
Bowman,	McGregor,
Brodeur,	McIsaac,
Bruneau,	McMullen,
Campbell,	Mignault,
Carroll,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Monet,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	O'Brien,
Davies (P.E.I.),	Perry,
Delisle,	Proulx,
Edgar,	Rider,
Featherston,	Rinfret,
Flint,	Rowand,
Forbes,	Sanborn,
Fraser,	Scriver,
Frémont,	Semple,
Gibson,	Somerville,
Godbout,	Sutherland,
Guay,	Tarte,
Harwood,	Vaillancourt, and
Innes,	Yeo.—55.
Landerkin,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Lippé,
Bain (Soulanges),	Macdonald (King's),
Baird,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Baker,	Maclean (York),
Belley,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Bennett,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bergeron,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bergin,	McGreevy,
Blanchard,	McInerney,
Boyd,	McKay,
Burnham,	McLennan,
Cameron,	McLeod,
Cargill,	McNeill,
Carpenter,	Madill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mara,
Carscallen,	Masson,
Chesley,	Metcalfe,
Cleveland,	Miller,
Coatsworth,	Montague,
Cochrane,	Northrup,
Cockburn,	Ouimet,
Corbould,	Patterson (Colchester),
Craig,	Pelletier,
Curran,	Pridham,
Daly,	Prior,
Dyer,	Putnam,
Fairbairn,	Reid,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),	Robillard,
Foster,	Roome,
Fréchette,	Rosamond,
Gillies,	Ross (Dundas),
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Ross (Lisgar),
Grandbois,	Ryckman,
Grant (Sir James),	Simard,
Guillet,	Smith (Ontario),
Haggart,	Stairs,
Haslam,	Stevenson,
Henderson,	Taylor,
Hutchins,	Temple,
Jeannotte,	Tisdale,
Joncas,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Kaulbach,	Turcotte,
Kenny,	Wallace,
Lachapelle,	Weldon,
Langevin (Sir Hector),	White (Shelburne),
LaRivière,	Wilmot,
Leclair,	Wilson, and
	Wood (Brockville).—95.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Davin,	Gillmor,
White (Cardwell),	Charlton,
Bryson,	McMillan,
Moncrieff,	Brown,
Mills (Annapolis),	Welsh,
Sproule,	Casey,
Earle,	Edwards,
Patterson (Huron),	Paterson (Brant),
Davis (Alberta),	Préfontaine,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),	Beausoleil,
Corby,	Livingston,
Dupont,	Bourassa,
Dugas,	Macdonald (Huron),
Costigan,	Devlin,
Dickey,	Dawson,
Smith (Sir Donald),	Grieve,
Barnard,	Leduc,
McAlister,	Colter,
Ives,	Fauvel,
Lépine,	Beith,
Hodgins,	Geoffrion,
Ingram,	Martin,
Ferguson (Renfrew).	Boston.

Amendment negatived.

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

After Recess.

BEHRING SEA—SEIZURE OF SEALING VESSELS BY RUSSIAN CRUISERS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to call the attention of the House for a few minutes to the circumstances under which two British ships were seized in Behring Sea by cruisers of the Russian Government in the year 1892. It is alleged by those who have placed the information in my hands, that

these ships were seized on the high seas in a very high-handed manner, and were taken to a Russian port and confiscated, with their tackle, apparel, and appurtenances, and their crews landed on the Russian coast in a destitute condition, and left there to take care of themselves as best they could. The two ships, the circumstances regarding which have been specially called to my attention, and whose cases I have been asked to bring before the House are the "Carmolite" and "Willie McGowan." The facts, as detailed to me in a letter received from one of the owners, are these: Previous to 1892 these ships were accustomed to fish for seal in the Behring Sea on the western coast of America. But, after the modus vivendi had been agreed to between Great Britain and the United States they were driven to fish on the other side of the Behring Sea. The letter which I hold in my hand is dated the 15th May, 1895. It declares that there is no doubt that the seizure of the two schooners was wholly unjustifiable. The letter says:

There is no doubt but that the seizure of the two schooners above was wholly unjustifiable, and it is a great surprise to us here that the question of compensation is still unsettled. Both of the schooners were in charge of experienced, certified masters, who understood their business thoroughly, the master of the "Carmolite" being for years in charge of one of the Government cutters. Their affidavits and that of their crews are conclusive that no law was violated, and so strong did this appear in the case of the "Willie McGowan," which was over 40 miles from land when seized, that the Russian commander, after the confiscation and sale of the schooner, acknowledged his error, and such fact was communicated to the Imperial Government, but still nothing has ever been done to compensate the owners, some of whom were almost ruined. In the case of the "Carmolite," the injustice was still more glaring. This schooner was commanded by Captain Hughes, whose reputation as a competent and reliable man is well known to the Dominion Government. This schooner was never near the land for the purpose of catching seals, and for weeks before she was seized land had not ever been seen. At the time of the seizure she was going south from 60 miles to the north of Copper Islands, at a distance far outside of 3 miles. Further, she was only in that locality at all for the purpose of rating her chronometer, and she was all the time under full sail, never lowered a boat or caught a seal. This statement is verified by the affidavits of the master and crew, and, if further proof is wanted, it will be found in the log-book, which is now in the possession of the Russians. The evidence of an outrage was apparently so clear and convincing, that the collector of customs for Victoria, and other competent authorities at that port who were acquainted with facts, thought it had only to be sent forward and compensation would immediately be made. I presume all the papers are on file with the Minister of Marine at Ottawa. The loss of these two schooners and their catch of seals involved nearly $50,000, and I can assure you the experience was a very hard one for many of the people engaged in the enterprise. Here were two British schooners, manned by British crews, seized upon the high seas for violation of no law whatever. You may think it peculiar that a case resting upon such strong ground never was the subject of investigation. But beyond certain Government correspondence, such is the fact.

Now, Sir, I may say that this has nothing to do with the disputes which have existed between the British Government and the American Government with reference to the seizures made by the ships of the United States. I desire to confine my remarks to the seizures made by the Russian ships. I have had the opportunity of examining very thoroughly the correspondence on this subject, and I do not find—and I say it frankly—that there has been any negligence on the part of the Dominion Government when the matter was brought to their attention, in forwarding the claims to the proper authorities in Great Britain. And I think it is right to say that the Rosebery Government took immediate steps to place the facts before the Russian Government in a way that would commend itself to the confidence and approval of any gentleman who should take the trouble to read the correspondence. In fact, no fault can be found with the action of the British Government, at least up to the end of the time covered by the correspondence I have seen. My main object in bringing the matter forward is to find out from the proper authority what has been done after the time covered by the correspondence, when a certain stage in the negotiations had been reached to which I will refer in a moment. I am glad to say that in the correspondence it clearly appears that the Russian Government put forward no claim to exercise jurisdiction beyond the marine limits of three miles from the shore. It is abundantly clear, from the evidence, though the modus vivendi was agreed to by the British Government and the Russian Government with reference to the seal fishery in 1893, the Russian Government do not pretend or ask that the modus vivendi should have a retroactive effect. They were satisfied that the discussion should be conducted and the determination concluded by the maritime laws generally, without reference to the new arrangements made with respect to the year 1893. Now, I do not want to weary the House by going through that correspondence. No good would come of it; if any hon. gentleman wishes to satisfy himself with regard to it he may do so. I am satisfied to state my conclusion: So far as the Dominion Government and the Imperial Government are concerned, I can find no fault with the way they pressed that claim upon the Russian Government. But, Sir, I find that in the month of June, 1893, Sir Robert Morier, the British ambassador at St. Petersburgh, writes to Lord Rosebery a despatch with reference to this matter, communicating the conclusion the Russian Government arrived at. That conclusion refers to two things: First, to the inhuman manner, as was alleged, in which the British crews had been treated

by the Russian officers after the ship had been captured; and, secondly, the grounds upon which the ships had been seized. Now, I think I have a right to observe that although very strong allegations have been made by the officers of these ships, corroborated by the declarations of the crews of the ships with reference to the inhuman way in which they were alleged to be treated, there appear to be two sides to the question, and it is contended by the Russian Government that not only were they not treated with inhumanity, but they were treated with every kindness and consideration. Of course, it is impossible for me to pass any judgment upon these conflicting statements. We would naturally be disposed to place the greater confidence in the statements of such officers and men as manned our ships, for the reason that the captains, at least, are known to be men of repute, men of standing, and men of character, and prima facie, their statement, I take it, will be accepted by the Canadian people, at least until very strong evidence is brought forward to show that they have been guilty of exaggeration. But I wish to call attention of the House to the fact that in the despatch to which I have referred, Sir Robert Morier states with reference to that:

I think it right to observe that I have ascertained that Captain de Livron is a straightforward sailor and an honourable gentleman, quite incapable of the brutalities imputed to him by the captains of the "Willie McGowan" and "Ariel." It is also worth remarking, that the evidence of some of the other captains, especially that of the master of the "Vancouver Belle," stand in the strongest contrast with that of the above-named masters.

I merely mention that to show that the impression made upon the British ambassador in Washington was that there were two sides to the question, and that Captain de Livron, of the "Zabiaka," that seized our ships, was, in his opinion, at least, a straightforward and honourable gentleman. Now, with respect to the other and more important branch of the case, the condemnation of these ships. There was a demand for compensation by the Imperial Government, and a long correspondence ensued, and a long delay, necessitated by the fact that the Russian Government had to send the remonstrance all the way to that part of Russia adjoining the Behring Sea, for corroboration or denial, and a long time necessarily elapsed. But of that I do not think we ought to complain. It is most unfortunate, but even the owners of the ships must see that, no matter in how strong language a demand made by them may be couched, or how strong the case may be from an ex parte standpoint, I think we have reason to acknowledge that the Russian Government have a perfect right to take every step to ascertain whether the statements are correct or not. In the month of December, 1892, I find the matter was referred by the Russian Government to a commission for examination and report, and that commission, as I gather from the papers, was an ex parte commission. But such as it was, they reported to the Russian Government that of the ships which they had captured, the seizures were legal in all cases excepting two, and that in those two cases the Russian Government were not indisposed to make compensation. Now, I would call the attention of the House for a moment to the despatch from the Russian Minister, addressed to the British ambassador, on 29th May, 1893. He incloses, in that despatch, the report of the commission, to which I have referred, and commenting upon the report of that commission, he says:

The second of the accompanying reports contains a detailed examination of the circumstances which accompanied the seizure of the schooners and their boats. In considering the legality of the captures effected by the commanders of the Russian cruisers, and by the district governor of the Commander Islands, the commission was guided by a principle the justice and equity of which cannot be disputed. It recognized as lawful seizures all vessels whose boats were seen or captured in our territorial waters. It cannot indeed be denied that the boats constitute juridically an appendage of the schooner to which they belong. Consequently, their seizure in territorial waters renders the capture of the vessels, of which they in some respects form part, perfectly legal. If it were otherwise, a schooner could with impunity pursue seals on the coasts by sending her boats there, and thus infringe the inviolability of territorial waters, herself remaining outside the said waters. Taking this view of the matter, the commission recognized the legality of the seizure of the schooners "Marie," "Rosie Olsen, "Carmolite" and "Vancouver Belle," but was unable to do so in the case of the seizure of the schooners "Willie McGowan" and "Ariel." There can, however, be no question as to the serious nature of the indications which induced the commanders of our cruisers to institute a search on board these last-named vessels. The "Willie McGowan" took flight as soon as she had sighted the Russian cruiser, and she refused to heave to at the summons of the "Zabiaka."

Then he goes on to report certain evidence as to the number of seals found on board the ships when they were captured, indicating to him an important factor in the right of the captors to condemn the vessels, and adds:

The importance of this evidence was fully recognized by the commission. It was not considered, however, as amounting to positive proof such as would justify the seizure of these schooners, owing to the absence of an essential condition: their boats had not been sighted in actual pursuit of seal in Russian waters.

Now, I quote that to show to the House, and I am glad to be able to do it, that there has been no proposition advanced by the Russian Government of a right on their part to seize ships outside the three-mile limit. All they contend for—and it is a contention which, I think, will be acceded to by the lawyers on both sides of the

House—is that a vessel, fishing illegally within the three-mile limit, or having its boats fishing within the three-mile limit, and captured in hot pursuit, is legally captured, and properly condemned.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. By a modus vivendi, or an arrangement made in 1893, a zone of thirty miles was given to them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was given with an express stipulation that it should have no retroactive effect, and it was given for a corresponding concession made by the Russian Government to our people with reference to the number of seals they should kill per year, and so on. I need not go into the details of that. It is sufficient to say that the British Government agreed to that as a modus vivendi for that year, with the express provision that it should have no operation as against the seizures of the previous year. In concluding the statement of the facts, I wish to call the attention of the House to the finding of the Russian commission with reference to the ships as to which I ask for information. The finding of the commission with respect to the "Carmolite" is as follows:—

The schooner "Carmolite" was captured on the 17th (29th) August, 1892, by the cruiser "Vitiaz," commanded by Captain Zarine, and flying the flag of the officer commanding the Pacific squadron. It appears from the documents examined by the commission, that this schooner was sighted by the cruiser on the other side of the isthmus, which is at the southern point of Copper Island. The "Carmolite" was then about 3 miles from a seal rookery. She sighted the cruiser, and, taking advantage of the fact that the latter, in order to reach her, was obliged to pass around a long reef situated at the south-eastern extremity of the island, she set sail and gained the open sea. But, after an hour and a half, the cruiser came up with her at a distance of 8 miles from shore, in latitude 54° 29' north, and longitude 168° 2' east. The ship's papers showed that the schooner had been since the 29th July in the waters of the Commander Islands. The captain declared that the 608 seals, the skins of which were found on board his vessel, had been taken near Behring and Copper islands. This is in contradiction to his declaration annexed to the British Ambassador's note of the 9th (21st) December, 1892, according to which the capture of the seals had only taken place at a distance of 60 miles from the islands. The declaration of the captain of the "Carmolite," as to the distance from shore where the seizure took place, which is given as 25 miles, as well as his statement that she had not entered Russian territorial waters, are alike refuted by precise information. In order to show their inaccuracy, it is sufficient to make a calculation based upon the cruiser's rate of speed and on the extent of horizon visible at the moment when the schooner was sighted for the first time by the "Vitiaz."

The "Carmolite's" log-book had not been posted for two days. Two protocols of seizure were drawn up, one in Russian, the other in English. In consequence of this evidence the commission recognized that the seizure of the "Carmolite" was altogether then in conformity with the principles of international law.

I must say, with every desire to deal fairly in the matter, that I cannot come to the same conclusion on the facts stated here as that at which the Russian commission arrived. It does not appear to me that even taking the ex parte statement received by the commission, there is anything to justify its finding. There is no allegation that either the vessel or any of her boats were captured within Russian waters. The whole matter is entirely one of suspicion, and I think the circumstances do not present even very strong ground for suspicion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And everything is taken against the vessel.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes. Nevertheless, I thought it fair to read over the whole of the commission's report with respect to the condemnation of that ship. I am strongly disposed to think that the case of the claim of the "Carmolite" for the seizure of that vessel is a good claim, and the report of the Russian commission does not in any sense or way invalidate it. With respect to the "Willie McGowan," I find the report is as follows:—

The schooner "Willie McGowan" was sighted by the cruiser "Zabiaka" on 6th June, 1892, 15 miles from Copper Island. The schooner was under easy sail, but as soon as she caught sight of the cruiser, she made for the open sea under full canvas. The cruiser came up with her in 54° 21' north latitude, and 167° 43' east longitude, 21 miles from the coast. It was only after the cruiser had fired two shots that the schooner was brought to. A search brought to light equipment for sealing on the coast, and 76 skins, of which 69 were those of females. No entries had been made in the log-book for twenty-four hours. On the whole, the log-book contains very meagre data in regard to the vessel's course. All the entries are vague, e.g., "jogging around sealing ground," or simply "jogging." According to one entry the schooner was in sight of Copper Island on the 1st, (13th July) and the weather was hazy; on the 3rd, (15th) she sighted the "Zabiaka." The weather was again hazy, and there was a slight fog. On that day the cruiser "Zabiaka" was close to the shore, just off the rookery, as appears from her log-book. Traces of dots and calculations made in pencil on the chart and partly rubbed out, show that the schooner took her bearing by the compass when she was one and a-half hours' drifting from the rookery. One is justified in concluding from all these data that the seals found on board the schooner had been killed in Russian territorial waters. Nevertheless the commission did not feel justified in declaring that the seizure of the schooner "Willie McGowan" was altogether regular.

That does not surprise any Englishman after reading the evidence, for there is not a scintilla of evidence against the schooner. Both as regards the "Willie McGowan," which was acquitted by the Russian commission, and the "Carmolite," whose seizure was approved by the Russian commission, there is nothing in the world but the vaguest suspicion. The fact of the matter is this. There is no doubt whatever, from a close examination of all these papers

brought down, that there has been some poaching by some vessels, whether American or British, or otherwise, I would not venture to say, these vessels being in the habit of sending boats within the Russian territorial waters and killing seals and then escaping back to the vessels lying outside. Because schooners did this, the Russian authorities felt themselves justified in seizing every schooner coming within fifty or sixty miles of the shore. Those schooners in question had a perfect right to be where they were, on the high seas, they were flying the British flag, they had British papers, and were commanded by British seamen. They were illegally seized, and so far as regards the "McGowan" and the "Ariel," whose case I am not so much concerned about, they were both acquitted and declared by the commission not to have been liable to seizure at all. They, therefore, agreed that those vessels were illegally seized, and the Russian Minister declared to Lord Rosebery that the Russian Government were willing and prepared to make proper compensation for those illegal seizures. Up to that stage that is all the official papers show. That brings us down to June, 1893. I now desire to ascertain from the Dominion Government whether, having obtained this assurance from the Russian Government, that they acknowledged the vessels to have been illegally seized, and knowing the circumstances to have been as cruel and harsh in connection with the men as was possible, the Government have taken prompt steps, have adopted effective measures to enforce that claim against Russia, a claim which Russia acknowledges to be a good claim. It is intolerable that British subjects, pursuing their calling on the high seas and not infringing any international law, should be seized by the warships of any nation, however powerful it may be, taken into port and their crews discharged, and if the statements made by the commanders are half true, these men cannot be compensated sufficiently for the sufferings they endured. Of course, compensation can be obtained for the loss of those ships, and I understand the loss of the two ships is placed at $50,-0000; and as I have said, the men cannot be compensated for the sufferings they were called upon to endure. I have no complaint to make of the conduct of the Government in the initial stages, and I shall be glad to know if they followed up the acknowledgement of the Russian Government with equal vigour afterwards.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The events to which the hon. gentleman has referred relates to a period when I was in charge of the Marine Department, and the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries has suggested to me that, perhaps, I would like to speak upon the subject. And, first of all, it gives me very great pleasure to acknowledge as I do, not only on my behalf but on behalf of the Government of which I am a member, the very generous and very useful admissions made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) in respect to the conduct of the Canadian Government in this regard. If there are any subjects that members on both sides of the House would like to keep out of the ordinary political field, I am sure they are those questions which arise between Canada as a whole and any other country. We must have some common ground, and it is a delightful thing to find that this is a common ground; and the only point on which Her Majesty's Government in Canada can be held to account, and rigidly held to account, is as to whether they have done all that they can do in respect to the representation of those interests. If they fail to do that they are greatly blameable, and if they do not press them to the utmost they would deservedly merit the condemnation of the House and the country. And in that spirit the hon. gentleman has spoken on this question. He is satisfied up to a certain date, and he properly asks what explanation the Government has to give as to the delay and as to the negotiations since 1893 particularly. I may say that whether the Government has been inclined to sleep over those questions or not, the activity of members representing British Columbia and members representing even eastern provinces—as much of the capital that was invested in those western seas was drawn from both shores, the Atlantic and the Pacific—it would have been impossible for the Government to have remained quiescent. The activity of the representatives of the people on both coasts has been such as to make it impossible for the Government to be otherwise than active in using all means at their command, first, to put Her Majesty's Government in possession of all the facts, and, second, to press day in and day out, as decently and properly as could be done, consideration and action on those statements and upon those facts. I need not argue that all we in this House, in such a matter, involving the relations of Russia and Great Britain, can possibly do is limited. The Government can put the case fully, we can see that it is kept before Her Majesty's Government, we can see that no important or material point to the consideration of the case is omitted; and there, I think, our power ends. I regret I do not think there is any hon. member who regrets it more, that in reply to the important statement of the hon. gentleman who has spoken from the Opposition benches, I have to say that it is not within the power of the Canadian Government, under the present arrangement of affairs, to lay on the Table every document that has passed between this Government and Her Majesty's Government. I—perhaps not having the experience others have had—fretted under the arrangement

by which we are held accountable in Canada for all that lies upon us to do, and yet are forbidden to put fully and frankly before this House a statement of everything we have done. I cannot say that I am satisfied with that arrangement even at the present day. There may be higher reasons, and probably there are, that compel us to agree to this arrangement of affairs under which our Government and Her Majesty's Government are conducting relations between the colonies and the mother country. We cannot lay upon the Table papers which relate to these affairs concerning Imperial policy and which are connected with correspondence of a confidential and secret nature, without the consent of that body in the Empire which after all has to bear the whole responsibility. Those of us who are inclined to be generous in regard to the affairs of the Empire can assume a great deal. For instance, I have watched the discussions in the Imperial Parliament in regard to this matter, and I have noted the guarded utterance of those who are responsible for the Government of the Empire. I have observed how they have withheld important communications upon this very question; although these papers have been asked for. If I have in a way implied that the situation was not altogether as I desired, it is but fair to Her Majesty's Government to say that they have asked from the Imperial Parliament a certain amount of faith and a certain amount of confidence, when they withheld important despatches relating to interference with the rights of British subjects, whether these despatches happen to relate immediately to Canada or to any other part of the Empire. In order to show the hon. gentleman that I am speaking seriously in this matter, I will mention to the House that on the following dates despatches went by the Canadian Government to Her Majesty's Government relating to this very subject. The hon. gentleman referred to the month of June, 1893, and stated that up to that date he was satisfied with what the records stated. Now, after that, on the 22nd of August, on the 3rd of October, on the 13th of October, on the 21st October, on the 28th of October, and on the 16th December in the year 1893, despatches relating to this very question were forwarded to the British Government. And in the year 1894, on the 9th March, on the 15th of May, on the 28th of May, on the 30th June, on the 25th August, and on the 9th December despatches went forward on this question, and I need not say that in every one of them the main idea was pressed. We forwarded the data of these claims, the particulars of these claims, every bit of information sought, and we continually pressed for their adjustment and settlement. During the present year, two despatches were sent on the 14th January and again on the 21st of January, the 23rd of March and the 13th May, other despatches. Recently on the 27th May, and the 28th June, during my successor's time in office, other despatches on the same subject have been forwarded to the British Government. I agree with every word the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has said. I agree with his statement of the facts. I made a slight mistake with regard to the "Carmolite" the other day. It was the "Ariel," the sister ship of the "Willie McGowan" in the case of which the claims happened to be admitted practically by the Russian Government. Although a demand of the kind the hon. gentleman has referred to was made years ago, yet notwithstanding all the pressure we could bring upon Her Majesty's Government in this matter, the Canadian Government is not able now to say any more as to the position of those claims, other than this. When the late Imperial Government proposed, as they did just before going out of office, to press forward a measure to give them power to renew the modus vivendi under which there would be this agreement with Russia practically extending their jurisdiction for thirty miles around the Commodore Islands, in return for concessions with regard to killing and catching on the island; Her Majesty's Government in answer to the Canadian Government gave an assurance that the negotiations in regard to the adjustment of these claims which had been admitted, and the mode for inquiry into other claims which had been disputed, had not been lost sight of and were being pressed. Encouragement was held out to the Canadian Government to believe that a satisfactory adjustment would ensue. We must not forget this with regard to Russia. I have, so far as I think is wise, referred to difficulties that might surround Her Majesty's Government in dealing with various foreign powers, and upon which subject we cannot have full information. Making all due allowance for that, there is this that weighs a good deal in my mind: that Russia, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has said, never took the extravagant position with us or with Great Britain in regard to international law, which was taken by the United States. Notwithstanding that there has been an arbitration, and notwithstanding that there has been an award, it is an additional sad fact in regard to the United States seizures which took place in 1886, that we have not yet reached a method of adjusting these claims. The claims against Russia occurred in 1892, and it is not altogether to be wondered at, that there has been this delay in these diplomatic matters. I am not attempting to find an excuse. I frankly and fully state to the House that I am utterly at my wits' ends, so far as my knowledge or understanding goes, to appreciate any ground for the delay in either of these cases. I do not know what powers we have at our command that would promote greater expedition. That great question is not the one which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) has raised here

to-night. All he wants, and all he very properly wants to know is: whether the Government of Canada has been active and energetic, and has put Her Majesty's Government in possession of every fact that would be material in regard to the pressing of both of these matters; that is to say, the assessment of the claims of the two vessels, and a speedy inquiry into the facts that led to the seizure of the other vessels. Without any reservation, and handicapped though I am by not being able to corroborate my statement by the despatches, I say: anything that I have heard suggested in this House or elsewhere, has been forwarded to the ears of Her Majesty's Government. More than once have we endeavoured to impress upon them the serious danger that might possibly exist in regard to Imperial interests, if there happened to be reasonable ground in this part of the British Empire to suppose that Her Majesty's Government was in the slightest degree indifferent to these important interests, or, that they held in less regard the interference with the liberties of the Canadian subjects of Her Majesty, than they held interference with liberties of Her Majesty's subjects who reside in the British Isles. Again, I say I am very glad the hon. gentleman has brought this subject up. The discussion of the question, and the manner in which he has treated it cannot fail to have its influence and effect; and I only hope that in the proper quarters it may tend, if anything we can do will tend, to promote a satisfactory and speedy adjustment of these very distressing claims.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Justice what was the nature of the concessions which he says were made to the Canadian sealers, or to the Canadian people generally, in exchange for the delimitation of the two zones referred to in some of these despatches.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The limitation of the catch in the Russian islands to the number of 30,000 seals a year, and the right of the British agent to visit those islands and inspect the method in which the killing was conducted. The reason for that, as the hon. gentleman will understand, was the fact that, in connection with all this protection of the seal herds, a fear existed in regard to the restrictions at sea unless there were proper restrictions on land; and the results of the inspection on the Russian islands and of the first modus vivendi were such as to satisfy the British Government that far more care had been exercised by those in control of the Russian islands, and formed a remarkable contrast to the manner in which the killing had been conducted on the Pribyloff Islands. Her Majesty's Government agreed to the thirty-mile zone for protective purposes, and that they proposed to renew.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was another matter, also, referred to in the despatches of Sir Robert Morier, to which I would like to call the attention of the Minister. I observe that Sir Robert suggested in one of his despatches, in reply to some difficulties which had been raised by the Russian Government, that it would be expedient that an English cruiser should be stationed in the neighbourhood of these seal islands, and he further suggested, as I understood, that to this cruiser, the British vessels accused of violating international rights, could be handed over; at least, that is what appeared to be the object of the suggestion. Has that been carried out, or have any steps been taken with reference thereto?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No. I do not think any special cruiser was told off to any British station, though each year cruisers have been ordered to go and cruise on the Pribyloff side and on the Commander side. But the vessels on the North Pacific, under command of Her Majesty's Government, apparently have not been sufficient, and I am not surprised at that, to enable them to tell a vessel off to any particular location, though they cruise in those waters each season, and make their reports.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statement of the hon. Minister on this subject is, of course, satisfactory so far as it goes. It might have been satisfactory to the House if the hon. Minister could have seen his way to have gone further and to have informed the House as to the precise position which the Canadian Government took on this subject, and I think that could have been done without any violation of that secrecy which is recognized in international communications. Now, the hon. Minister has not informed us whether he has recognized the right of the Russian Government to go illegally upon a British or Canadian vessel on the high seas, and from the vessel itself seek to obtain information, with the view of justifying the seizure.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. By the right of visitation and search.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Practically, it is asserting the right of visitation and search in time of peace that was settled many years ago. The English Government, under Lord Palmerston, as Foreign Secretary, undertook to assert the right of visitation and search under the treaties in reference to the slave trade, made with the United States. That interpretation of international law was resisted by the United States. It was subsequently made a subject of discussion in the House of Lords, and Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Brougham, and others, the most distinguished law lords of the time, took the ground that the position taken by the American Government was quite correct, that there is no justification in time of peace for a

foreign country to assert the right of visitation and search. That being so, I do not see upon what ground, even though there had been conclusive evidence on board that these vessels had been engaged in fishing for seals, either the Russian commission, or any other body of officials appointed by the Government of Russia could assign that as a reason for the seizure. Then, there is the further question to which my hon. friend referred, that is, the question of hot pursuit of the boats that were engaged in fishing within the limits, while the vessel itself remained outside. Now, a vessel upon the high seas in time of peace is under the protection of the law of nations. The municipal law of Russia does not extend there; and unless it be upon the principle laid down in the English Hovering Act, which has been adopted in some other countries with the view of protecting their revenue, that this pursuit and seizure would take place, I do not see, upon the authority even of that Act, that these seizures could be defended. Now, when a vessel of Sardinia, the "Cagliari," was seized outside of the marine league on the high seas, Sir Travers Twiss was consulted by the Italian Government as to whether the seizure, for the violation of revenue laws, I think, of France, could be properly made, and he regarded it not as a matter of international law, but of municipal policy, which had been adopted by a great many states, and took the position that where the subjects of a state were in the wrong, and had undertaken the violation of the laws of another country, the Government of their own country would not, necessarily, come to their rescue; and he advised the Italian Government not to make a claim against the conduct of the country by which the "Cagliari" was seized. There is no doubt the boats themselves would be liable to seizure, but whether the vessel outside the marine limit would be liable to seizure under the English principle of international law, I think, is more than doubtful. If they could be seized at all, it would be only under a regulation of municipal law, like the English Hovering Act, under which the English Government might refuse to come to the rescue of the owners of the captured ship on the ground that the vessel had been a delinquent. On these questions, I think the hon. Minister might have gone further without violating the secrecy necessary to be maintained in transactions of this kind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I quite understood the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) in regard to the question of hot pursuit, to admit, impliedly, that while we could not quarrel with that doctrine at this date, its sanction was obtained from the tacit consent of the nations whose vessels offend by boats operating in the three-mile limit. If a vessel, standing outside of the three miles makes an effort to violate the laws of a friendly country, then the nation of the flag of that vessel may not promote a claim.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the only ground.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And I took it that that was the hon. gentleman's position, and that certainly has been the position of Her Majesty's Government because we had, in connection with the Russian case before 1892, the case of a British registered vessel; and in that case the British Government, having satisfied themselves that this vessel, though outside the three-mile limit, was violating the law by pushing her canoes into the territorial waters, took the ground that they would not press further for damages in a case of that kind where a Russian cruiser came out and took the ship herself outside the three-mile limit. There is no trouble about that, but there is great divergence of opinion as regards visit and search. I have no hesitation, and I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought the matter up, in stating the ground we have taken. Neither under the award at Paris nor under any arrangement made or that could be made, ought Russian or the United States vessels or the vessels of any other foreign country be permitted to overhaul a vessel flying the British flag outside territorial waters. If those vessels offend against the laws of the country, let them be taken in the offence. Let the aggrieved country exercise this doctrine of hot pursuit, if they like, and that is going to the extreme. But we have protested as strongly as we could against any espionage or surveillance covering millions of square miles in the Pacific waters. The answer of Her Majesty's Government, both as regards the Russian case and the United States case, is simply as follows: You in Canada need not be particularly concerned; we are carrying out, as we believe it our duty to do so, in the best of faith, the award in the one case and the agreement in the other. We do not give them special rights over Canadian vessels, that is vessels registered in Canada, but we do give them this right of visit and search over vessels flying the British flag, registered in any part of the British Empire, sailing in those waters; and that is not such an indignity or such a sacrifice of rights as you think, because we get the right in return to visit and search vessels flying the flags of those countries.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In their interests, however.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Our reply has been that that does not, in any sense, meet the case, that in all probability the only British vessels which will plough those waters will be vessels registered in our ports, which are colonial vessels pure and simple, and which the other nations regard as tantamount to pirates. These nations discourage in every possible way their own

vessels from going into the business. They denounce the business, they legislate against it, and the business has fallen into comparatively very few hands. On our side, with the award behind us, with the law of nations before us, it is a legitimate business, and this is the only way in which we can engage in that lucrative and legitimate business. This is also one of the ways in which we can push our flag and extend our prestige and influence in the Pacific waters. We have pressed, as strongly as we can, on the British Government, our opinion that the arrangement is unfair to us and that the people of the British Islands would not tolerate one week such a system with Germany, France or any other European power, in the waters between the British Isles and the continent of Europe. Her Majesty's Government regretfully observe that they cannot go with us that far because they believe that the utmost good faith in carrying out the arrangement makes it necessary, in order to secure the observance of those regulations, that this right —we call it an odious right, where the flag does not protect the ship, and I believe that in that we are in every sense warranted by history and tradition—must be conceded, and that our national honour and dignity is concerned by having the same concession from the power floating the other flag and a party to the agreement. There we are at daggers drawn, so to speak. We have exhausted all the arguments we can think of and have protested as strongly as possible. As regards Russia, the measure was passed through the British House of Commons, the other day, rather hastily. There were some friends of Canada present, and they mentioned some of these points. They mentioned this one in particular, but Her Majesty's Government, in promoting the Bill, did not in terms take that power, though they took the power to the Queen in Council to make such regulations as will meet that state of things. We hope yet our arguments will prevail. I have used the strongest language we could to bring that about. Now that I am on my feet, I think it is only fair to say that while Her Majesty's late Government has not been able to meet us in every direction where we have pressed our views in these intricate and delicate matters, I can testify, and I know my colleagues will bear me out in this, to the kindly manner in which the late Colonial Secretary, Lord Ripon, acted in all these matters as a friend to Canada. I do not believe, whether a Liberal or a Conservative Government obtain in England, that we will ever have a better friend than Lord Ripon. We may have a stronger friend, one who may accomplish more, but we will never have, in my opinion, any one who could desire more generous treatment to the colonies, or who pays greater regard to her material interests.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Mr. PRIOR. As the matter now under discussion is one of great moment to every person in British Columbia, concerned, as that province is, in the sealing industry, in which a large number of men are employed and a large amount of capital is invested, I may be allowed to say a few words on the subject before us. First of all, I wish to say that I am very glad indeed my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) has seen fit to bring this matter up. I am glad not only speaking for myself but also on behalf of the other members from British Columbia, that this matter has been brought up by a gentleman holding the high position that he does in Her Majesty's Opposition, and who has manifested on this occasion such great fairness towards the Government and also to the members from the Pacific coast. Some people might ask perhaps: how is it a British Columbia member did not bring this matter before the House? All I can say is that we did not do it for one very good reason; and that was we did not see what good it would do, since we were in constant touch with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and on all occasions were told how matters were going. We were allowed to know as much as he could possibly tell us and we felt that the interests of the sealers were being looked after as well as they possibly could be. With regard to the seizures themselves, as the hon. member for Queen's has said, anybody who takes the trouble to read all the correspondence in the blue-book will see that they were perfectly unjustifiable in the cases of these two schooners. The Russian commission sets that forth with no uncertain sound. That makes it very difficult for the owners and the sealers themselves to understand why it is no determination has been come to with the Imperial Government and why it is compensation has not been paid. Of course, from the explanation made by the Minister of Justice, it is easy to see that these things cannot be done in a day, or a month, or perhaps a year, where two great powers are contesting over a matter of this sort. The Dominion Government, I firmly believe, has done all it could, and it is most satisfactory to hear that stated by an hon. member of the Opposition. The British Columbia members, who are supporters of this Government, might well make that statement, but it comes with much greater force from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. In regard to the treatment of the crews, I think all must agree that it was most inhospitable, and I think we may say it was cruel. There may be a difference of opinion, considering that the evidence of the two captains was not exactly the same, but one who knows anything of Russian treatment of prisoners or anybody else, can see that perhaps the treatment they meted out to these captains and crews was not what a Britisher would think was quite

kind treatment. This matter of compensation being withheld is a very serious one to these men, and I am sure that the whole House must wish to see a final settlement arrived at as speedily as possible. I trust the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and also the Minister of Justice, will continue to press upon the Government, as we see they have done hitherto, the necessity of a speedy settlement, not only of these claims, but of any other claims that are still unsettled. I think it is a pity, to say the least of it, that the Imperial Government, in their wisdom, have seen fit to refuse permission to this Government to publish the evidence and the correspondence that has taken place. It is very hard, indeed, to make men who are interested in a case like this, it is very hard to make sealers believe that as much as possible is being done for them unless they can see some documentary proof of the fact. Now that there is a new Government in England, I hope the matter will not be shelved by them for what they may consider more important matters. The Minister has just stated that Lord Rosebery's Government were most fair about it and did all they possibly could, and I only trust the present Imperial Government will take the matter up, and that before another meeting of this House these sealers who have lost so much and have been put to so much inconvenience, will be recompensed for the trouble and anxiety they have suffered.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A question was asked by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as to the precise terms of the agreement between the Russian and British Governments with respect to the extended zone allowed to Russia as her preserve beyond the three-mile ordinary limit. With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I will read the terms of the agreement, as it will be interesting to members of the House as well as to many outside. I quote from the despatch of the Russian Minister to the British Ambassador under date May 10th :

1. During the year ending the 31st December, 1893, the English Government will prohibit their subjects from hunting seals within a zone of 10 marine miles on all the Russian coasts of Behring Sea and the North Pacific Ocean ; as well as within a zone of 30 marine miles round the Komandorsky Islands and Tulenew (Robben Island).

2. English vessels engaged in hunting seals within the aforesaid zones beyond Russian territorial waters, may be seized by the Russian cruisers, to be handed over to English cruisers or to the nearest British authorities. In case of impediment or difficulty, the commander of the Russian cruiser may confine himself to seizing the papers of the aforementioned vessels, in order to deliver them to a British cruiser, or to transmit them to the nearest English authorities, on the first opportunity.

3. Her Majesty's Government engage to bring to trial before the ordinary tribunals, offering all necessary guarantees, the English vessels which may be seized as having been engaged in sealing within the prohibited zones beyond Russian territorial waters.

4. The Imperial Government will limit to 30,000 the number of seals which may be killed during the year 1893, on the coasts of the islands of Komandorsky and Tulenew (Robben Island).

5. An agent of the British Government may visit the aforementioned islands (Komandorsky and Tulenew) in order to obtain from the local authorities all necessary information on the working and results of agreement arrived at, but care should be taken to give previous information to these authorities of the place and time of his visit, which should not be prolonged beyond a few weeks.

6. The present arrangement has no retroactive force as regards the British vessels captured previously by the cruisers of the Imperial marine.

This is the entire agreement, and I quote it because I wish to draw special attention to the fact that in consideration of the British Government agreeing to the extension of the zone to thirty miles, it is specially agreed that when the Russians seize a British vessel, they shall not take her to a Russian port for the trial of the case in a Russian court, but shall hand it over to the nearest British authority for trial in a British court.

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

(In the Committee.)

Indians—British Columbia—	
Salaries	$18,660
Relief of distress	5,000
Seed grain, implements and tools	1,200
Medical attendance and medicines	12,000
Day schools	6,500
Industrial and boarding-schools	47,460
Travelling expenses	5,000
Office and miscellaneous	4,320
Steamer "Vigilant"	2,000
Surveys	1,672
Reserve Commission	3,500
	$107,312

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that everything in connection with Indians is to be open for discussion on this item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I thought I would call the attention of the leader of the House again to the vote for the North-west Mounted Police. It may not be strictly in order, but it affects the Indians, and therefore may be allowed. When the hon. Minister announced the other day that he had decided to reduce the force, I pointed out that he might be making a mistake. And to-day I see in the Toronto "Globe" a long account of trouble brewing and existing in the North-west among the Blackfeet Indians. Now, in view of that, I would just ask the Minister whether he was aware of the unsettled condition of affairs among the Indians when he decided upon a reduction. If not, perhaps he may deem it wise to strengthen the force instead of reducing it.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot make answer to that, not being the Minister of the department, but I have no doubt that my friend the Minister of the Interior will answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DALY. I presume the hon. gentleman has reference to what appears in the Toronto "Globe" of to-day. I think three or four columns are filled with a sensational account of recent occurrences on the Blackfoot reserve. I regret it very much, because the publication of what appears in the "Globe" will probably precipitate the trouble.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DALY. Yes, that it will be read to every Indian upon the reserve. I want hon. gentlemen to understand that these Indians can read. That will be sent to them and they will read it. It is exaggerated out of all due proportion. If they will allow the officers of the department to deal with the Indians, as they have been doing to the avoidance of all disturbance of every kind, no doubt any difficulties arising will be overcome. To satisfy the minds of those who think there is trouble there, I may say that the department received a telegram this morning from Mr. Forget, the assistant commissioner, who has recently been on the Blackfeet reserve, stating that there is perfect quietness there, that there is no disturbance and no trouble. Now, referring to the "Globe's" account of the interview with the young lady, or the statement of the reporter, or whoever wrote the account, it is stated that the Rev. Mr. Tims, a Church of England clergyman, has had to leave the reserve. The fact is that in the month of May, a young girl was taken ill in the Indian Home. A doctor was sent for, and upon arriving, said that the symptoms were those of diphtheria, and that he could not tell until a few hours later whether it was diphtheria or not. The parents of the child were informed of the fact of the child's illness, and they arrived and desired to take the child away; but the doctor and the Rev. Mr. Tims, who was in charge of the school, said that they did not think, in view of the fact that diphtheria was a contagious disease, that the child should be removed. The father was pacified, and quite satisfied, and he left with the understanding that the child should remain for two days. The doctor remained there all that day. He arrived there at three o'clock in the morning, and remained, I think, until one o'clock on the following morning. He visited the child several times during the day, but he did not see any signs of improvement, because the child was far gone with inflammation of the lungs in addition to the fact of having diphtheria. After the doctor left, the child was attended by the nurse in charge, and every proper nourishment was given to it. The report shows that the assistant teacher sat up until nearly one o'clock in the morning, and at three o'clock on the morning of the 2nd May, before the expiration of the two days within which the father was to call, the child died very suddenly. Immediately, Mr. Baker, the instructor, was sent for, as he speaks the Blackfoot language, and, anticipating that there might be some trouble, White Pup, one of the chiefs, was sent for, and other chiefs were brought to the boarding-house, and were there when the parents arrived. Naturally, they were very much excited. It is impossible to deal with them as you would with white people, but, so far as the chiefs and the others were concerned, they expressed their satisfaction with the treatment the child had got, and said that no person was to blame. But the foster father of the child, a man named Wood, and the father of the child, whose name I have forgotten, swore vengeance upon Mr. Tims. They were quite satisfied with what the matron had done; they were quite satisfied with all the assistant teacher had done, but, for some unaccountable reason, they expressed themselves as bound to have vengeance upon Mr. Tims, and, in their ignorant superstitious way, blamed him for the death of this child. Those are all the facts as they are detailed in the report to the department by Inspector McGibbon. But, in consequence of the feeling that arose, not on the part of the good Indians on the reserve, but upon the part of the parents of this child, it was thought better that the school should be closed, and that Mr. Tims should take a holiday for a short time, which he has done, and he has removed from the reserve. Those are the whole facts in connection with the case. I have no doubt the young lady who has returned from there, and whose experience with the Indians, I think, covers six months, may have been very much frightened and very much exercised by what took place. But I can say that until the unfortunate death of Skinner, the ration issuer, some two months ago, in our whole experience with the Indians on that reserve, there has not been a white man killed, either by mistake, or injury, or any other way, and he, poor fellow, met his death at the hands of a man who was crazed by the death of his child, and who was actually irresponsible at the time he committed the deed. But, so far as the Indians on the reserve are concerned, they are quite orderly, and they are working on the reserve, making an irrigation ditch, quite satisfied with the treatment they have received. It is owing to the unfortunate feeling of the parents of this deceased child towards Mr. Tims, that all this trouble has arisen.

Mr. MULOCK. The article in question says that the Indians get drunk. It says they can go out, and seem to have great facility for getting whisky.

Mr. DALY. That is not so, it is entirely exaggerated. What did occur, I believe, was that an old Indian got too much; to use a common expression, he got full on some Florida water that he obtained from some Indians that had been in Calgary; but the old gentleman, thinking himself a friend of the offended father, the man whose child had died, started off to have his vengeance upon Mr. Tims. But he was hauled off by his wife, and the terrible gun he had in his hand fell to pieces when the old lady hauled him off. That is the whole story, and the report is untrue.

Mr. MULOCK. The "Globe" gives that description.

Mr. DALY. That is the unfortunate part of it. It is not only the injury the report will do amongst the Indians themselves, but I have no doubt the whole fact has been cabled home to the old country, and the result will be that it will be a long time before we can satisfy the public that things are right up there.

Mr. MULOCK. The only reason I had for bringing this matter to the attention of the Government was to ascertain the facts, and to impress upon the Government the absolute necessity of maintaining the force at whatever strength is necessary for the purpose of maintaining peace and order, and confidence in the security of life and property there.

Mr. DALY. I am fully in accord with that. The hon. gentleman heard my statement the other night.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see why the Minister should attach so much importance to the sensational statement of the "Globe," and so little importance to the statement that he himself made the other evening in discussing some of these Estimates. The hon. gentleman told us of the great danger there was of an Indian rising. Why, the hon. gentleman said that if the police force were reduced, they would not be responsible for what might happen in those Territories, and that the people who were out in the sparsely settled districts, were without any fear of injury from the Indians at the present time. Now, the hon. member thinks that no injury can arise from a statement of that sort, because it is made in the interest of the department, and in the interest of the appropriation that he has asked for. But because a newspaper publishes an article containing the same views which the hon. gentleman officially expressed here, very great injury may happen. Now, if the hon. gentleman would see his own statements in just the same light that he sees the statements in the newspaper, he would not undertake to use exaggerated statements such as those he employed in discussing these Estimates a few nights ago. Now, there is an item in the Indian Estimates upon which I wish to say a few words. I wish to call the attention of the House, and especially the attention of the Minister of Finance, to two statements here: The one is that the cost of the industrial schools in the North-west Territories is $227,000, and in British Columbia, nearly $48,000, or nearly $300,000 in all.

Mr. FOSTER. We have heard that before.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I dare say the hon. gentleman has, but he did not attach much importance to an expenditure of this sort. Now, I wish to call attention to this fact, that before this country was committed to that large expenditure, amounting to nearly $300,000, as a permanent charge upon the public, and for the maintenance of a certain class of Indian schools, the House ought to have had a declaration on the part of the Government that they intended to adopt as the permanent policy of this country, the establishment of such schools. The Government ought to have brought down some statement with respect to the probable cost, for we have never had such a statement submitted. They have asked appropriations of a few hundred dollars for school-houses during the last days of the session, or a few thousand dollars for establishing industrial schools, and that is the only way this House has had the matter brought before it. I do not wish to call attention specially to this estimate, but rather to the practice by which immense sums have been granted and made a permanent charge on the public revenue, and I call attention to the fact that in England no such charge is ever made upon the simple appropriation contained in the estimates, but there is a full and careful statement of the whole cost of every work furnished when the appropriation is asked. It is a serious matter that a charge of this kind should be made a permanent charge on the revenue without the subject having been at any time discussed with any attention or care by the House itself. Then I wish to call the attention of the House to one other matter, and that is regarding the surveys in British Columbia. The hon. Minister has asked $1,672 for surveys, the least amount asked for 15 years, and $3,500 for the reserve commission, which is in itself far below any estimate in the same period of time. There are 26,000 or 27,000 Indians in British Columbia, and 4,000 or 5,000 of them are upon Vancouver Island. I desire to know how far the surveys are completed on the mainland, and how many thousands of the Indians, if there be any, have yet their reserves to be laid out. This work has been carried on for 16 or 18 years and the total cost of the surveys has been nearly $300,000. It was estimated at the time the system was initiated that five or six years would be sufficient time to complete the surveys, and perhaps the Minister would state whether the surveys had

been completed and whether this reserve commission may for the future be dispensed with.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The hon. member for Bothwell has referred to industrial schools, which, I suppose, comprise industrial schools in the North-west, and he has also spoken of the great expense. I believe that the establishment of those schools has been the very greatest boon to the Indian population. I understand thoroughly how hon. gentlemen who have not from personal observation seen the working of those schools and estimated the probable expense imagine that these expenses are very high, but to one who has lived in the North-west for a long time, who has taken an interest in this question and who has observed the working of these schools, the results appear to be very satisfactory. I know that in the district I represent there are schools under the control, not only of the Roman Catholic Church, but also of certain Protestant denominations, which have done most remarkably good work among the Indian population, and if that work is continued and the moneys not too much stinted, it will be the means of civilizing the new generation of Indians, and the best, most rapid and satisfactory means of so civilizing them. I also know that one of my difficulties in my anxiety to see those schools well carried out has been the fact that sums have been refused very often for their proper development. A new school was established about a year ago at Duck Lake in Saskatchewan. There were about 20 pupils; that school could be filled very easily with 100. The work done is most admirable, and the cost per head is really very trifling; but it is necessary to put up a building, and it costs a little money to do that and establish the school. After that is done, the cost per capita is trifling compared with the great results to be attained. There is also a demand for an industrial school at Prince Albert to serve certain reserves there, and I am sorry to say that without effect I have broached the subject to the Minister of the Interior with a view to obtain a grant to establish such school and carry it on. Therefore, on account of what I have said the hon. gentleman will understand that while I do not sympathize with him in condemning the Government for extravagance in expenditure, while I say that I think more money might have been wisely expended, I do not intend to lay myself open to the charge of advising the Government to spend money unwisely or unwell. I believe it would be well spent and wisely spent in establishing additional schools, that a small expense per capita would maintain those schools after they have been erected, and that this would be the true and best means of bringing our Indian population under civilization and making them one with ourselves.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to say one or two words on this subject. Referring to what has been said by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), I was very glad to hear the statement from a leading member of the Opposition that he had been impressed with the necessity of keeping our North-west mounted police up to an efficient standing. The article in the "Globe" has done at least one thing, although I am sorry it appeared, if it has enlisted on the side of those who hold that it is absolutely necessary that the North-west police should be kept up to a certain standard, the hon. member for North York. With regard to what has fallen from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I cannot agree with his criticism of the statement made by the Minister the other evening to the effect that it was necessary that the North-west mounted police should be kept up to a certain standard, because the Indian population was scattered here and there throughout the Territories, and settlement being sparse it was important that immigrants coming in should feel they would be secure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman went further than that.

Mr. DALY. I beg your pardon, I did not.

Mr. DAVIN. I take the statement as made by the Minister, and I cannot place it on the same plane as an article like that which appeared in the "Globe." I cannot say what the habits of the successor of Crow Foot are, but I know that Crow Foot had the newspapers read to him, and I learned with surprise, on visiting the agencies in the North-west, that the chiefs are accustomed to get newspapers read to them so that they may know what is going on. I was surprised to see such an article as that to which I have referred about this matter in the "Globe," an article four columns in length, because I must say this, that it would be hard to find any paper in Canada that for some years back has been conducted better than the "Globe"; it is a credit to Canada and to Canadian journalism, both in its management, in its fairness and in the temperate way it has been conducted ever since a gentleman whom we all know has had the management of it. This article if read in Indian camps is calculated to do harm. Let me point out what is attributed to a young lady who comes from that place. She is asked this question:

"Do you yourself think the rations sufficient for them," the reporter asked Miss Turner.

"I truly do not think they are," and she went on to say that she had seen the rations issued for three people for four days. It consisted of a quantity of flour which she thought might possibly make two loaves of bread, though she was doubtful on this point, and a chunk of beef which seemed nearly all bone.

Well, Sir, from what I have been able to learn of the way our Indian reserves are managed, that is not the way the Indians are treated. It is not desirable that the Indians should be stall-fed. It has been the policy of the department, and I think a wise policy, to try to get the Indians to implement what the Government supplies them with. As my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Macdowall) knows, the Indians have been implementing what the Government supplied, and I know that on Pie-pots reserve, and on the Crooked Lake Reserve, the Indians have become industrious. They are farming, they are selling hay and other things, and they own their own cattle, and their own binders, and they take pride in their little farms, and they are gradually developing and becoming civilized. It is undersirable that an article like this should be read to Indians, and I think that portion of it alone that I have referred to is calculated to excite them into a discontented spirit. We know that anything that causes notoriety or publicity, such as the report of murders, is calculated to do harm on even civilized or excitable natures, and how much more is an article such as this, calculated to do harm when read as these articles are read to the Indians on the reserve. Now, with reference to what my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said with reference to industrial schools. He charged that the Government when they started out to give industrial schools to the North-west—they had already given industrial schools elsewhere—should have looked forward to the possible expense, and should have indicated to the country what the ultimate cost would be. He says that in England, when entering on a policy of this kind, a careful statement is made of what the aggregate cost is likely to be. I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) could have remembered the speeches of Mr. Gladstone when discussing questions of this kind in the English House of Commons, because I recollect that Mr. Gladstone has pointed out, how subtly expenditures steal into the estimates. He has pointed out that a certain line of policy is entered on and originally the expense is small, but from year to year, the department first and then the country, think well to pursue that policy, and finding it successful in the end aimed at, it naturally extends its operations and the expense increases with the extension of these operations. That is exactly what has taken place in regard to these industrial schools. No one knows better than my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) that before we ever adopted the policy of having industrial schools in the North-west Territories, there were industrial schools costing many thousands a year in the United States. We have always prided ourselves on being more just and more generous to our Indians than have the people of the United States, and we believe that we have reaped a happy consequence in the way of saving expenditure. But, Sir, my hon. friend will find that there are industrial schools on Indian agency after Indian agency below the line, and that these industrial schools are managed almost precisely on the same lines as our industrial schools are managed. What did the Conservative Government do when it came into power in 1878? One of the first things that Sir John Macdonald, then Minister of the Interior did, was to send to the United States to inquire what was the system pursued to educate the Indians industrially. A report was made to the right hon. gentleman and on that report he acted, and ever since that the policy of educating the Indians industrially has gone on, and with, as my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Macdowall) points out, the very happiest results. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has, I think, visited the North-west at least once. I would that he had from Qu'Appelle Station gone north to Fort Qu'Appelle and visited the industrial school. He would have seen there a number of children, taught not merely to read and write and cast accounts, but some taught one trade and some another; the girls taught to be useful as domestic servants. To my knowledge the very best domestic servants have gone from that school into private families in Regina and elsewhere, and have acquitted themselves in a manner to show the possibility of Indian education, and to fully justify the policy of the department in regard to these industrial schools. And the lads reared in these schools, they, too, have shown that they were capable of being civilized and taught these trades, and that they have no need to go back to live partly on the Government in a state of pupilage, and that the system of educating them has weaned them to civilization, from the nomadic hunting habits of the older men. The amount voted for day, boarding, and industrial schools, $233,400, is not a large sum considering the work that is done. Would the hon. gentleman for one moment adopt a policy in Canada, side by side with that which has been adopted by the United States. Would he make Canada a by-word for want of foresight in feeding the Indians and caring for the Indians on the reserve, and not educating the young Indians coming up, but let them be trained in the wigwam to grow up fire-eating bucks and become a menace to the peace of the North-west Territories. Would he do that, instead of training up the Indians under the wise management of the Government and educating them to become a portion of the civilized community in those Territories. But, Sir, the bare fact that we are caring for the Indians at all implies that we shall care for their education, and if we care for their education we must care for their industrial training too. That would follow as a natural consequence. But with the example of the United States before us, with

their successful experience for many years of having industrial schools for the Indians, it would be a piece of wanton folly on the part of the Government of Canada, if it did not adopt this policy of educating the Indian children. Once this policy was adopted by the Government, you could not have an industrial school at Fort Qu'Appelle, an industrial school at Regina, an industrial school in the west, an industrial school in the north, and industrial schools wherever they are needed, without expense. And if the number of these schools is taken into account, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) must come to the conclusion that $233,400 is not a large sum. I assure him of this: That there is no way of spending money that will be so emphatically endorsed by the people of Canada as spending it for the education of the Indian, and contemporaneously with the education of his intellect, giving him this industrial education to fit him for earning his living in civilized life.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I shall read a paragraph from the hon. gentleman's speech which the hon. member for West Assiniboia will see is not so trifling a matter as he has represented:

> Amongst the Blackfeet and the Piegans, the most unruly and difficult Indians we have to deal with. If the mounted police were not there, the friends of the hon. gentleman, of whom he speaks, would not stay there twenty-four hours.

That is the representation made by the hon. gentleman—not simply that the people would be alarmed by a fear without cause, but by a fear for which there was very sufficient cause. The hon. gentlemen from the North-west Territories have talked rather beside the question, because, on this occasion I have not discussed the propriety of these schools, or the manner in which these very large charges were, so to speak, surreptitiously fastened on the country. The hon. member for West Assiniboia referred to what Mr. Gladstone said, as to how stealthily the expenses of the United Kingdom had grown up, and he argued that in the same way these expenses have grown up in Canada. That is not so. The fact is precisely what I have stated. There is no new thing introduced. There is no important charge made upon the public treasury of which there is not a careful estimate, and which, apart from the Estimates, is not brought before Parliament for deliberate consideration; and I venture to say that no English Parliament, whatever might be its political complexion, would, for a moment, entertain a proposition submitted in the way many of these charges are submitted to us, by a mere fragment of a vote in the Estimates, without a proper estimate at all. These hon. gentlemen seem to think that $223,000 a year for industrial schools for an entire population of 23,000 men, women and children, is not a very important charge. Let me tell the hon. gentlemen that we have 2,000,000 people in the province of Ontario, and this vote is equal to one-half of the entire sum appropriated from the provincial treasury for the maintenance of education. Those 2,000,000 people have an appropriation of less than $500,000, while $233,000 is taken from the treasury of Canada for the education of the children of 23,000 people, a mere fragment of whom are in the schools. I do not propose to discuss that subject further. If it were an earlier period of the session, I would be disposed to discuss this whole question of industrial education amongst the Indians. I believe that a physical and industrial training of the Indian children, properly looked after, is of infinitely more consequence to people in their stage of industrial progress than the mere book learning that may be obtained in a public school.

Mr. DALY. Then what does the hon. gentleman complain of?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will tell the hon. gentleman. My predecessors in office, every one of them, Conservative and Reform pursued the same policy; and I myself, when in office, was waited upon by gentlemen connected with various missionary societies, and I informed them that any appropriation made to them for educational purposes was a temporary appropriation, and that the Government had no intention of putting the subject of education out of its own control and jurisdiction.

Mr. DALY. And this Government has not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to know if every industrial school in the North-west Territories and British Columbia is not under some denominational jurisdiction?

Mr. DALY. Under the control of the department, and inspected by the department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is under the control of the department so far as the appropriation is concerned, and no further.

Mr. DALY. Not at all; so far as inspection and returns are concerned.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not say that the system might not have been best, but I say it was adopted without due consideration. In my time, we felt that the control of education should be handed over as soon as possible to the local authorities, and controlled by them, as the work could be more successfully and efficiently conducted in that way than in any other, because it would be under the supervision of the people settled in the country, who had the most to gain or lose by the actual progress of the Indian population. I am not going to discuss that question; but what I complain of is that the Government have taken an irremediable leap, and taken it

without adequate consideration. They have taken a position from which they cannot resile, and I am not convinced that the course they have taken is the best in the interest of the Indians themselves, or in the interest of the people of this country. I am not going to say any more in regard to these expenses. They are very large, and some of them, in my opinion, are unnecessary, especially those relating to the reserves, of which the hon. gentleman has not yet given us any information.

Mr. McNEILL. I have no doubt the hon. member for Bothwell does not desire to be unfair; but one listening to him would suppose that he had been intentionally unfair to the Minister of the Interior in two respects. He spoke as if the Minister had made an alarming statement when he said that if the mounted police were withdrawn from the North-west, the people there would become very much alarmed and speedily leave the country. I think that is not a very alarming statement. If the police and all the military force of this city were removed, I think the people would feel a little uncomfortable even here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that the sense in which the hon. gentleman made the statement?

Mr. McNEILL. Is it not a fact? And is there anything alarming in the statement that if the mounted police were withdrawn from the Territories, and there was no military force there to control the roving bands of Indians who are there, and who are not thoroughly civilized, but who, I am glad to learn, are becoming rapidly civilized, the men and women who are settled there would become alarmed? I think the hon. gentleman has to go a long way to find an argument to support the article which was unhappily published in the "Globe." Now, the other point in which I think my hon. friend was unintentionally unfair, because I assume his unfairness was unintentional in both instances, was this. He spoke of the expense of education among the Indians. He said there was over $200,000 appropriated for the education of the Indians, while some half a million dollars was appropriated for educational purposes in Ontario. Surely my hon. friend knows there can be no comparison between the two cases. He knows the people of Ontario contribute themselves towards their education and that the Indians do not.

Mr. LAURIER. It is like comparing the North-west mounted police with the police in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not at all comparing the numbers of the police in the North-west with the numbers in Ottawa, but it does not matter whether there are five or five thousand mounted police in the North-west, the argument is the same. The numbers have nothing to do with it. The Minister says a certain number of police are necessary in the North-west, and if you unduly reduce that number you will cause panic there. A certain number are necessary for the city of Ottawa, and if you reduce that number to a great extent, you will cause panic in Ottawa. I do not know what the number is, and I do not think it matters so far as the argument is concerned, nor does it matter so far as the special figures are concerned which my hon. friend has given with reference to education. No fair comparison can be drawn between the cost of educating the Indians in the North-west Territories and the appropriation by the local government in Ontario for the same purpose.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) has made the matter much clearer. He has made it clear certainly that it will cost a little more per head to educate Indians there than it does to educate white children in Ontario, where the parents contribute to the fund. But the difference between 2,000,000 people is so vastly greater than the difference between $230,000 and $2,000,000 that the hon. gentleman has not improved the position of the Government very much.

I rose more particularly to refer to the statement contained in to-day's "Globe" regarding the troubles among the Indians. It would appear that in spite of the large expenditure for mounted police, and in spite of the large appropriation for civilizing the Indians, the fact is that at present the missionaries are not allowed to move amongst the Blackfeet tribe on the reserve. We see great excitement maifested in the papers on the announcement that a missionary has been expelled from some place in the backwoods of China, or that missionaries have been warned to leave Chung Chow, or some such place, under threats of murder. That is made the subject of diplomatic representations, and of great ado, but we are told it is a very small matter when missionaries are compelled to leave a settled tribe of Indians on the reserves in the North-west.

I differ in toto from that contention. I can have no sympathy with attacks levelled at newspapers for calling attention to this state of things, revealed by the missionaries themselves, fully credible persons, who are in a position to know the facts, and which is a state of things disgraceful to the management of our Indians and the department which controls them. With a force of mounted police sufficient to maintain order throughout all the reserves, and which costs us so much money, it is simply disgraceful that such a state of things should be tolerated for a moment. It appears that a state of things which the Minister of the Interior said might happen if the mounted police were reduced in numbers, has happened, although they are maintained at their full strength, and, as we are led to suppose, in

their full efficiency. I believe that a newspaper, in making known these facts, in making known the statements of the missionaries who were on the spot, is only fulfilling its duty to the public.

The cry that these things should not be reported, because they will create false impressions, is absurd. If those things are facts, they are quite sufficient to deserve the closest attention of the country and the House, but the Government and its supporters, my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) amongst them, seem to believe in the old principle: "Do not say anything about the Indian troubles or Indian grievances; hold your tongue about them and it will be all right in the long run." We had enough of that before the rebellion of 1885. I was in the North-west three years before the rebellion. I was at Qu'Appelle, at a pow-pow held by Chief Piapot and Mr. Dewdney, who was Lieutenant-Governor, and the question turned then as now largely on the subject of rations. There was an angry dispute the whole afternoon on the subject of rations.

Mr. DALY. Where is the dispute now about rations?

Mr. CASEY. I will answer that question in good time when I come to it.

Mr. DALY. Be fair.

Mr. CASEY. At that time there was a dispute about rations the whole afternoon, and the Indians left in such anger that they would not accept the Governor's invitation to stop and have a steer roasted for them. There was very nearly an outbreak of hostilities on the spot at the time. But everybody pooh-poohed these things, said the Indian grievances were all rubbish, and the result was seen when the half-breed outbreak took place, the Indians sympathized with the half-breeds.

Mr. DALY. To what extent did they sympathize with the half-breeds?

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman a little while ago wanted to know where the question of rations came in. It was introduced into this debate by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who read the statement of Miss Turner that she did not think the rations served out to the Blackfeet were sufficient, and he disputed her estimate of what was sufficient for the rations of these people. I have the honour of knowing Miss Turner, and believe her to be a very calm, unexcitable lady, quite capable of giving a clear and a housewifely estimate of what would be sufficient rations for three people for four days. I believe she could estimate how much flour would make two loaves of bread, and could tell just as well as the hon. member for Assiniboia whether the meat served out was mostly bone or not. Before Chief Piapot and Chief Dewdney the very same question came up, that the rations were not sufficient or as good as required by the treaty. It may be maintained that the Government kept the Indians on lower rations for the purpose of inducing them to work and raise food for themselves. That might be a very good plan if it had been deliberately entered upon in the first place, after agreement with the Indians. But the question for the House and the Indians is, whether the Indians get the rations to which they are entitled by treaty?

Mr. DALY. We do not contract to give them anything by treaty. What we are doing is voluntary. There is no treaty made with any Indians which compels us to give them an ounce of food.

Mr. CASEY. That was not the interpretation maintained by Piapot and Mr. Dewdney.

Mr. DALY. That is the plain reading of the treaty.

Mr. CASEY. I did not read the terms of the treaty. Well, that was not the interpretation put upon the treaties by——

Mr. DALY. That is the interpretation and the plain language of the treaty.

Mr. CASEY—either the Indians or Mr. Dewdney. The hon. gentleman expects me to accept his statement.

Mr. DALY. I expect you to be fair.

Mr. CASEY. I am not versed in the intricacies of these treaties. I am not inclined to take all the Minister's statements without reservation until we have looked into them. We will have to let it go for the moment.

At all events, they have undertaken to supply rations to these Indians. Whether by treaty or not, a certain allowance has been arranged for. If they are attempting to withdraw that allowance contrary to use and custom, it will only create dissatisfaction among the Indians. What the country complains of in dealing with the Indians is not that sufficient money is not voted, but that the money voted for the benefit of the Indians does not get to the Indians but goes to whites, to those who distribute the rations. I am afraid, that that complaint is only too well based. It is that, Sir, that exasperates the Indians more than anything else—not the loss of a little flour or a little meat, but the feeling that they are being cheated.

There is one point concerning which I wish to ask information from the Minister very particularly. It is stated in this report from the North-west that the sun dance has taken place already on the Q'Appelle reserve, and was soon to take place at the time this report was sent amongst the Blackfeet Indians. We know very well what these sun dances mean. This ceremony of making braves means the stirring up of what you may call the

patriotism of the tribes to induce them to revert to their own heathenish practices in other respects. We know that these sun dances are dangerous occasions. I wish to ask the Minister if it is the fact that sun dances have been forbidden; if they have not been forbidden, amongst what tribe are they still permitted, and what is the intention of the Government in regard to preventing these ceremonies in the future? Also I would ask if any preparations have been made in this case, seeing the tribes were in a distrubed state, to have a sufficient number of police in the neighbourhood to prevent any disturbance?

Mr. MACDOWALL. I wish to add a few words to my former remarks with regard to what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said concerning the schools. I think that nobody can do otherwise than agree that it is necessary to have a certain amount of physical teaching as well as intellectual teaching. But the Indians who are to be taught have lived the lives of hunters on the plains. Almost their whole exercise has been physical exercise, and the object of the school must be to give the intellectual faculties the exercise that they have lacked. If the hon. gentleman were to go to one of these industrial schools he would find that the iron bedsteads, the utensils in the halls, the tables in the dining-room, &c., are all made by Indian pupils themselves. This is proof that they receive not only intellectual training but also the physical exercise which teaches them a trade. At the same time, when we consider that the whole sum expended in these schools is only $237,000, and that the total number of schools of all classes—day schools, boarding-schools and industrial schools—is about a hundred, we cannot but see that the average spent on each school is a very small sum indeed. I think the department would do wisely to increase this expenditure, to build more industrial establishments and to change the vote of $2,000,000 for feeding the Indians and paying agents and make a considerably larger educational vote. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) about the necessity of maintaining the mounted police, as one of the members from the North-west, I think I have a right to express an opinion upon this question which should be regarded as carrying some weight not only by members of the Government but also by members of the Opposition. I hold it would be a vital mistake to reduce this force too much. No hon. member who does not know the North-west and the circumstances of the settlement of that country, the circumstances under which law and order were maintained, can form any idea of what an inestimable benefit the North-west mounted police have been to Canada and how small has been the expense compared with this benefit. I think no once who has lived in the North-west and knows the work of the force feels that he cannot pay too high a tribute to this body of men for the work they have done. I have not only seen our own North-west Territories, but I have been through the territories of the United States, and I know that the moment you cross the boundary line a difference can be observed. In our own territories life is as safe—yes, safer—than it is in some of your large cities. This is owing to the prestige that the law of Canada holds, and that prestige is due to the presence of the North-west mounted police. Cross the boundary line and you do not meet a man who does not carry his revolver in his hand and his rifle at the pommel of his saddle ready to shoot on sight. Throughout the towns in Montana disorderly conduct frequently occurs, and life is not safe except for those who are able and ready to defend it. In our towns in the North-west life is safe. This is owing to the presence of the North-west mounted police. In the western states you hardly hear of a single railway running its trains across the continent whose trains have not some times been held up by desperadoes or outlaws. But our transcontinental line has never had such an experience in the whole course of its existence. This is owing to the presence of the North-west mounted police. I regret to say that, owing, I believe to the representations of hon. gentlemen opposite—certainly not owing to representations of any member for the North-west—that force is being cut down. I for one enter my protest against any further reduction, and would urge this House to lay party politics to one side and consider whether it would not be advisable to increase the mounted police force again, in order to make certain of maintaining our reputation as possessing a western country that is second to none in other respects and is in advance of any other in the possession of a self-respecting people who can maintain and enforce law and order. Therefore I deprecate any remarks against the maintenance of the North-west mounted police force. With regard to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from West Elgin about the article in the "Globe" I would agree with him in this respect—that there is no fear at all of danger to the well-being of the country through the publication of any statements that are truthful in regard to the North-west or the conduct of the Indians. The only fear is, when mangled and untruthful statements are published, that they may create a sentiment which may breed discord. In regard to the rebellion, the hon. gentleman spoke with some authority. He seemed to think that it was caused by insufficient rations, and he quoted his visit to Piapot's reserve. Let him disabuse his mind of that opinion altogether. I believe that the North-west rebellion proceeded from one of the simplest causes that ever existed, that not only existed in our own

country, but has existed as late as 1850 in Great Britain. We know that in 1850 the anarchists were active in Great Britain, and we know there were bread riots. And so in 1885 we had a bread riot in the North-west, for it was nothing else. There was no ill-feeling amongst the people. Those who took arms on one side and those who took up arms on the other, are as good friends to-day as ever they were before. But a bread riot occurred, and this was brought about because these people in the north who had a large market for their supplies, and who had incurred debts to the large agricultural implement firms and others, and who were oppressed with these debts, suddenly found out that the market for their supplies was cut off by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the south of them, the line having been deflected. The Canadian Pacific Railway, when it was built, afforded access to the large mills which were immediately established in Manitoba, and the large factories in Ontario and other places, carrying the supplies which were formerly produced in the Prince Albert district, to the markets north and west of them, and carrying them at a cheap rate. It was this policy of buying in large quantities, at the cheapest rate, from large contractors, principally in Ontario and Quebec, instead of buying the produce that was raised in the country, that starved these poor people and created a bread riot. But I do not believe we shall ever have such an occurrence again.

Mr. MULOCK. Who were the people that caused the bread riots ?

Mr. MACDOWALL. I have told you.

Mr. MULOCK. I want to know who are the people who lost their trade, or the markets for their products ?

Mr. MACDOWALL. The farming element, and indeed every other class.

Mr. MULOCK. Were those the people that caused the rebellion ?

Mr. MACDOWALL. They were not the people who caused the rebellion, you were the people who caused the rebellion. I was not a member of the House then, and, therefore, I had no legislative responsibility with respect to that rebellion. But I believe Parliament did have some responsibility for it.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) thinks that the statement of the Minister the other night, and which he read, was as calculated to excite the Indians, as the article in the "Globe." What the Minister stated was that the presence of a police force was calculated and intended to keep the Indians from rising. That statement does not lead the Indian to rise. The hon. gentleman knows that the police force in the North-west is a terror to evil-doers, especially to the Indian evil-doer. The aim of the department is to keep him quiet, whereas a four column article in the "Globe," giving great prominence to the facts there alleged, is likely to create an opposite effect on the part of a savage people. But the hon. gentleman has only to take up a newspaper any day, and he will find in Quebec—you see it in the Demers case—he will find in Ontario, an excitable nature fancying itself aggrieved and provoked to commit a crime, either in a moment of insanity or a moment of wild excitement, and that is exactly what occurred here. Now, with reference to what my hon. friend said about the schools, the Government of Canada, in 1886 and 1887, entered vigorously on a policy of establishing industrial schools. They had in their hands, in 1879, a report on the schools in the United States, and in 1880 and 1881 they took some steps in the same direction, and the first school, I think, was established at Battleford ; but the rebellion put a stop to that policy. In 1886-87, as may be seen from the records of that period, the Government of Canada entered vigorously on its policy of industrial schools. Now, I have been looking through "Hansard," and I cannot find that my hon. friend from Bothwell, although he, as an ex-Minister of the Interior, was the proper person to criticise what was being done, sounded a single note of warning. If we will look at the Supply Act of 1886-87 he will find there several items for industrial schools. For instance, in 1887, under North-west Territories, you have a sum of $5,000 to provide for two Indian industrial schools, and then you have the sum of $8,000 for the education and maintenance of 80 pupils at each, in all 160, at $50 each. To enable the department to veneer a couple of industrial schools with brick, $4,000. To aid in the maintenance of a school at Assiniboia under the care of the Rev. Hugh McKay, at the rate of $50 each for 30 pupils, $1,500. To aid in the establishment of a school building and mill in the Peace River district, the whole estimated to cost $4,500, of which $2,500 will be collected by Rev. Mr. Brick, and so on. My hon. friend from Bothwell criticises that. Now, I find that in 1886, when a discussion took place on North-west affairs, a gentleman who is known on both sides of the House to be a man of great candour, who is known to speak exactly what he thinks, to be a man of fearless independence, and who often receives applause from both sides of the House, spoke as follows, on the 7th May, 1886 :—

I wish to say a word or two with regard to one item which is not included in the Estimates, that is the industrial school at Qu'Appelle for the training of Indian boys. Having had an opportunity of visiting that school at several times, I must say that if there is anything on which we can congratulate ourselves, it is the attempt being made in the North-west to educate the

youth of the Indian tribes. It is quite evident we cannot do anything with the old men or the young men who have attained the age of maturity. Our only chance is to endeavour to educate the young boys and girls who are growing up in the different reserves; with them we may possibly do something. I admit that experience is not altogether favourable, for I found there, and we know, in fact, from our own experience, in the province of Ontario, that the Indian boys and girls who are trained with the greatest possible care at our various industrial schools, after they have obtained a good deal of instruction, turn out to be after all mere savages; but at the same time the only hope we have, the only prospect we have, the only inducement we have to spend money upon the Indians, is based upon the fact that upon the young, caught young in fact, we may possibly hope to obtain some influence which may be of benefit in future years. I took several opportunities of visiting that school at Qu'Appelle, and I was very much pleased with what was going on there. The expenditure in establishing that school has been very great. The buildings have cost a great deal of money, but I think they are worth all what they have cost, and I desire to express my sense on the very great service the fathers in charge of that institution are giving to the people of the country. I am sure they are doing a great work. Among others there, I saw a grandson of Sitting Bull, a little boy, a bright little fellow, of just the class from which the people of this country may hope something in the future. I hope the Indian Department will endeavour to encourage and develop these institutions.

He had already said that this one entailed great expense. It was in 1886, when the policy was being entered upon.

I think the country will not begrudge any reasonable expenditure in developing them. I think they are the only hope we have of obtaining in the future anything like a grasp and a hold upon the Indian population. If we can give them some notions of our ideas of civilization, some idea of cleanliness, of good clothing, of everything that we believe makes the benefits and comforts of civilization, the country should not begrudge the expenditure; and, in regard to this particular institution——

This is one of the pioneer institutions. It is the one I know best myself, and no one can visit it without coming away an enthusiast as this member of Parliament did in regard to the industrial training of our Indians.

—I beg to express my extreme sense of what this country owes to the clergy who are in charge of that institution, and the excellent work they are doing in the management of it.

The note, if a note of warning it was, was struck on that occasion by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) whose words I have been reading. But the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) must have been wanting in foresight, because, although the ship of industrial education was about to be launched, and the necessary expenditure involved thereby to be incurred, not one word on that occasion came from him. So I do not think his points are well taken on the present occasion, when he condemns this expenditure. In regard to the hon. member for Elgin, I may say that that hon. gentleman cannot know everything. That hon. member has wide information. He can go from one quarter of the globe to the most distant point, and survey mankind from China to Peru, and talk on a great variety of subjects, and talk instructively and well; but occasionally he comes on a subject on which he is not comme faite. If I may do so with perfect politeness, I will say that on the present occasion I do not think he knew the whole facts about the war, because he spoke as though a large number of Indians, the Indian population, had shown active sympathy with the rebels in the war of 1885.

Mr. CASEY. What about Cut Knife Creek?

Mr. DAVIN. We had two Indians showing sympathy. But if the Indian population in the North-west Territories had not proved themselves, as they did, the great body of them, loyal to their great mother the Queen, it would have cost not five millions but twenty or thirty millions to put down the rebellion. The mass of the Indians remained loyal to the Government of Canada. So the hon. gentleman in regard to that matter was mistaken. There is no controversy at present about rations as there was at the time of which the hon. gentleman spoke. At the time Piapot was disputing about rations there was a cry from the Indian reserves, which was echoed here in Parliament, and Mr. Blake took up the matter, and if he had got his information at first hand instead of second hand, he might have made something out of it.

Mr. LAURIER. All his statements were denied at the time.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know. If Mr. Blake had got the statement as to rotten flour and rotten bacon, he might have made something out of them, but he did not get his information at first hand. At that time there was a cry on the reserve, a discontent in certain parts among the Indians, but to-day none of the Indians on the reserves are kicking about rations, so far as I am informed. Speaking as a man who knows something about newspapers, I say if this article, published in the "Globe" had been correspondence sent from Gleichen, Calgary, or Regina, or any part of the North-west where a man could speak with local knowledge, it would be a different matter; but this is an article made up in Toronto, as any one acquainted with the subject knows, by some member of the staff of the "Globe." The Minister of the Interior did not mean, I apprehend, to deprecate the publication of facts in regard to Indian affairs, but what he did say was, and it was only a passing remark, that it was exceedingly to be regretted that four columns should have been made out of this

matter, which could have been given in the ordinary way as a piece of news, and that it looked like, and as I have said contrary to what I have seen in the "Globe" for years back, a desire to make some sensation in regard to this matter.

Mr. DALY. I have so many questions to answer, and some of them were asked so long ago, that the committee must forgive me if I do not follow them in sequence. Coming back to the "Globe," what I complain of, as the hon. gentleman has said, is not with regard to any truthful reports, because so far as the Department of Indian Affairs is concerned, the conduct of our affairs in the North-west are open to day light, and full investigation, but I take exception to an article appearing on the front page of one of the leading papers of Canada with such a heading as "Indians in paint, excitement on the Blackfoot reserve. Murder of Mr. Skynner." There is no evidence that the Indians have put on their paint. This statement means much to white people. Of course, you can go on an Indian reserve, or even in Brandon or Regina, every day, and see Indians with paint on their cheeks; but people not acquainted with the Indians would at once imagine that this means that they have put on their war paint, and there is going to be trouble. What sense is there in referring to the murder of Mr. Skynner. That occurred on 3rd April, three months ago; an investigation was made and an inquiry held, and, in order to show to what state of civilization the Indians have reached, I may say that on the coroner's jury there were three of the Indian chiefs, and they agreed with the rest of the jury in acquitting the policeman. I think it is right to publish news respecting Indian affairs, but it should be done fairly, and by persons acquainted with the facts, because such publications as that create excitement not only in Canada but also elsewhere. No doubt this article will be seen in England, and will be dwelt upon as the matters are dwelt upon by enterprising journalistic correspondents, and we do not know what the effect may be. With respect to the criticism by the hon. member for Bothwell of the remarks made by me about the mounted police, what I said I am prepared to repeat. I was replying to the hon. member for Wellington, and if the hon. gentleman had been fair, he would have read what that hon. gentleman said, as follows:—

In some sections, such as those referred to by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), they should have a few of those police around for the purpose of protection, but I insist that in the south-western portion of the North-west there is not that necessity. The people there do not think there is. I have friends and relatives living there for the last twelve years, and they declare that the North-west mounted police, while an efficient, is an enormously expensive corps, and largely made up of the class of people I have stated—young Englishmen, brought out and paid large salaries, and well provided for, and some Canadians who cannot very well be mastered at home, and are sent out there for the purpose of being drilled into good behaviour. It is not right that the country should be saddled with an enormous expenditure to keep up this corps, which could, in a great measure, be dispensed with.

Mr. DALY. I am sorry there is a difference of opinion between hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you sure there is none on your side.

Mr. DALY. I do not think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No difference of opinion on any subject?

Mr. DALY. Possibly, but not as to the keeping up of this corps. The hon. member for North Wellington says he has communications from the south-western portions of the North-west Territories, which lead him to believe there is no necessity for the mounted police there. I may tell the hon. gentleman, if there is one place in the whole of the territories where it is absolutely necessary to have the mounted police, it is in the south-western portion.

Mr. McMULLEN. Close to the border?

Mr. DALY. Yes; in treaty 7, amongst the Blackfeet and the Piegans, the most unruly and difficult Indians we have to deal with. If the mounted police were not there, the friends of the hon. gentleman of whom he speaks, would not stay there twenty-four hours.

I was perfectly justified in saying that, and for these reasons. I presume that in the families he speaks of there are women and children, and if these women and children did not know the fear and trembling the Indians have for the North-west mounted police, they would not consider themselves so safe, and the women would probably not remain in the country at all. If instead of the Indians being kept on reserves they were allowed to wander around the country, and probably without any wrong intention on their part they entered the house of a settler, those women and children would be frightened. Any one who has a knowledge of the subject will know this to be the case. A statement of that kind, however, is entirely different from a sensational statement contained in the heading of a newspaper article. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) spoke of the sun dances, and asked what steps were taken to prevent them. The Indians are given to understand that we do not permit these dances under any circumstances, but the dances are looked upon as a religious rite, and we have to exercise a great deal of discretion as to how far we can go in preventing them. We use moral suasion, and give the Indians perhaps a little more tea and tobacco and increase their rations so as to persuade the leading men amongst them not to take part. Notwithstanding the persuasive appeals of the agents and others, and the resort to these methods I have spoken of, some of the older men will insist upon the sun dance. Old Piapot has been

a very unruly Indian, and although peaceful during the last few years, strange to say he got the idea this year that he must have a sun dance. He held one, and no harm came of it. The police were on hand and everything passed off peaceably. At the Touchwood Hills, and on other reserves they also prepared for a sun dance. On the Blackfoot reserve the sun dance was about to be held at the time the trouble spoken of occurred, and in order to pacify the Indians the schools were closed and the children allowed to go to their parents. Probably one reason why we have been unable to persuade the Indians not to hold sun dances this year, is, that some of the old chiefs who were peaceably inclined are dying off. The younger men are coming up and their desire is to be made braves the same as their forefathers, and it is hard to restrain them. If we were to dare to send the mounted police and prevent these men from taking part in the sun dance, then the trouble would commence and there might arise a great deal of ill-feeling that it would take months to overcome. We have therefore to exercise discretion in the matter. While these three sun dances have taken place this year we had no other sun dances throughout the North-west. Now, with reference to the rations. There may have been complaints some years ago about the rations, but I can assure hon. gentlemen there is no complaint now. I have myself seen the rations distributed to those very Blackfeet who were spoken of to-night. They get the very best beef grown in any part of America. It runs from a pound and a twelfth to a pound and a quarter, and from half to three-quarters of a pound of flour. There are greedy Indians who will grumble, but we must give them the bone with the flesh, and no matter how much meat or flour you give them they would continue to grumble. You can never satisfy an Indian in that respect. I am glad to see there are no complaints as to the quality of the rations distributed. If the hon. gentleman, for instance, were to have a pow-wow with the Indians on one of these reserves, the very first thing they would commence to do would be to complain of their rations. From the pow-wows I have had with the Indians, I can say that the expression of opinion amongst them from one end of the North-west to the other, was that the Government had met its treaty obligations in every particular. I want to emphasize the fact that in none of the treaties, from the time we made the first treaty at Lower Stone Fort Garry, until we made the last treaty, did we undertake to supply them with rations. There is one exception in the treaty in which Governor Morris undertook to provide them with a thousand dollars worth of food for the first three years, and that we carried out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think Governor Morris also went further than that, and also provided that the Government would not see them want.

Mr. DALY. In all the treaties a reservation is made that in the event of famine we would look after them, but in order to keep them on the reserves we feed them. Year by year the rationing is becoming less on account of their raising wheat, grinding their own flour and raising their own beef. Now, in relation to the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) about the schools. If I understood him aright, he says that the Government before going into this class of industrial schools should have laid before the House its full policy in reference to that question. Presumably he means that they should have stated that they were going to erect industrial schools at certain points throughout the territories where they were to be erected and what their total cost was. If that is what the hon. gentleman means, I do not see why the Government should be called upon to pursue a different course in relation to the establishment of industrial schools, than they do in relation to the erection of public buildings or the carrying on of public works.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They should do exactly that in both cases.

Mr. DALY. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that from the year 1883 when the first industrial school was established at Battleford, down to the establishment of the Brandon school in 1894, the hon. gentleman or some of his friends asked for and received full information as to the total cost of the school, the number of pupils it was to accommodate, the number of teachers, and an estimate of all the expenses that would be incurred. If the hon. gentleman turns up "Hansard" he will find that. I gave the other night the cost of buildings, the cost of carrying on the industrial schools, the per capita allowance, and I made a comparison which showed that the cost of carrying on our Indian industrial schools was less per capita than for the Ontario industrial schools at Mimico and Alexandria. If the hon. gentleman wants that information for future criticism he will find it in my statement contained in "Hansard." The hon. gentleman admits that the principle is correct, that we should instruct the Indian children in the art of farming, and knowledge of trades and so on. Let me call his attention to the following facts:— The total amount expended on our schools for the year ended 30th June, 1894, was $301,169.31. There were 295 schools in operation with 8,136 pupils enrolled, of which number 21 were industrial, 24 boarding, and 250 day. The expenditure on Indian schools in the United States as taken from the latest report, 1893-94, of the commissioner of Indian affairs, speaks for itself. There were 304 schools in operation with a total enrollment of 21,619 pupils divided as follows:—

141 day, 143 boarding, 20 training. Of these 187 are under the sole control of the Government, 78 are conducted under contract, 4 are mission boarding-schools and receive no Government aid, and 25 of the day schools are white schools where a per capita grant is paid for the tuition of Indian pupils in attendance. The amount paid by the United States government for Indian schools was, $2,084,275.47 ; contributed from other sources, $198,797.49 ; total expended on Indian education, $2,283,172.96. In the United States there is expended for this purpose 7·58 times as much as is spent in Canada, while they have slightly more than two and a half times the number of pupils enrolled, which would make the cost per pupil there over three times as much as we pay. I am not going to detain the House with any further figures. I think I have answered the queries the hon. gentleman put to me.

Mr. MARA. As we are allowed to discuss the mounted police under this item, I wish to refer to an application made by the British Columbia Government a short time ago to this Government to send a small detachment of the mounted police to the South Kootenay River. On that river there is a small band of nomadic Indians who cross and recross the line, and are constantly breaking into settlers' houses, thieving and committing other depredations. A few months ago they camped and built a small shack on the dyke of the Alberta reclamation works ; and it was only through the influence of Mr. G. E. Keefer, the engineer, who was on the ground at the time, and by his stopping the works, that bloodshed was averted. Again, the Colville Indians frequently come up the Columbia River and give the same trouble to settlers there as the other Indians do on the Kootenay River. I am well aware that the cost of the administration of justice as well as the cost of the preservation of the peace falls on the provincial government ; but it was not intended, nor is it fair, that they should be expected to keep up a force to protect the frontier from marauding Indians. The Dominion Government can, at a very slight expense during the summer months, send a squad of police by the Crow's Nest Pass. There would be no cost for transportation, as they could drive their animals through ; the cost of feeding the men would be very little more than in the North-west ; and their presence, even for a short time would have a beneficial effect. If the Indians saw a few redcoats, if only for a few weeks, I am sure the settlers would not any longer suffer as they have suffered in the past from their depredations.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). While this item is under discussion I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a statement which I see in this morning's paper. On the item for Indians in the maritime provinces last night, it says that the hon. member for North Victoria asked the following question :—

> Major Hughes asked if these schools were under the control of any religious bodies. Hon. Mr. Daly replied that they were controlled by the Roman Catholic Church.

Now, as one having some knowledge of the way in which these schools are conducted, particularly in the province of Nova Scotia, I have to differ with the hon. Minister in that statement. These schools are not under the control of the Roman Catholic Church. The Indian agent in the district has the authority, by an understanding or agreement with the trustees, who are Indians, to employ a teacher, who has a teacher's license under the school system of the province. He is paid by the Dominion Government so much a month and gets a provincial grant. He is obliged to make his returns the same as the teachers of the common schools. His school is inspected by the provincial inspectors. The books used by the pupils are the same as those used in the common schools of the province. There is no religious teaching in the schools, but the Indians and the children get their religious teachings in the places of worship built by themselves. So that the schools are conducted entirely under the regulations of this House and under the regulations of the province the same as any other school.

Mr. DALY. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has referred to this matter. I do not know whether or not I was wrongly reported in the "Citizen," but my reply to the hon. member for North Victoria was occasioned by the fact that in my key "Roman Catholic" was put opposite to the schools of the maritime provinces. It appears from information that I have since got from the department that the reason the schools were so designated was that all the Indians in the maritime provinces are Roman Catholics, and it did not mean that they were under the control of the Roman Catholic Church. On the contrary, the schools there are carried on in the same way as the Indian schools in Ontario and the other provinces. The teachers in the schools all possess provincial certificates, the programme of studies will be found in the report of the department, and in every way the schools are conducted as non-denominational schools. They are under the control of the department ; and in no sense are they Roman Catholic schools. It is simply the children who are Roman Catholics, but the schools are non-denominational.

Mr. McMULLEN. After giving the subject of the expenditure for Indians a good deal of attention, both last year and this year, I think a very large saving could be effected, both for the training schools and for the general care of the Indians. We have in the whole of Manitoba and the

North-west only 4,888 male Indians altogether, and we expended in connection with them last year $846,000; in addition to that we spent on the mounted police to keep them quiet $622,000; a total of $1,468,000, or a little over $300 per man to feed them and keep them quiet. We have altogether in Manitoba and the North-west 21,446 Indians. Last year, we paid in salaries and travelling of officials in connection with those Indians $196,000, out of a total of $613,234, excluding the salaries at Ottawa, which amounts to over 34 cents in every dollar paid for salaries and travelling alone. Any person would easily come to the conclusion that, with the facilities we have there, and considering the very limited number of Indians, this is an enormous sum to spend for salaries and travel for the purpose of feeding and clothing them. On this, as on every other occasion when any question of expenditure in the North-west comes up, my esteemed friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and others, are ready to defend the expenditure and call out for an increase instead of a reduction. So long as the money is spent out there, they will support the expenditure, regardless whether it is in the interests of the country or not. The hon. Minister of the Interior says it costs on the American side something over two million dollars——

Mr. DALY. For schools alone.

Mr. McMULLEN. You did not give us the other figures.

Mr. DALY. You will find the whole thing in the speech I made the other night.

Mr. McMULLEN. There are 65,000,000 people in the United States, so that the expenditure on Indian schools cost about three cents per head of the population, but in Canada it costs over 25 cents per head of our population.

Mr. DALY. What has that to do with it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has a great deal to do with the question whether we are wise in spending so large an amount of money for the benefit of so small a portion of the population.

Mr. McMULLEN. If proper economy were practiced in connection with the interests of the Indians of the North-west, an enormous amount would be saved. What regulation have you with regard to doctors visiting the different reserves? I had a conversation with a gentleman who a short time ago was in charge of an Indian reserve, and he left owing to the ill-health of his wife. He told me that where a doctor was sent for to go some fifty miles, he had a dollar per mile.

Mr. DALY. That is what all doctors charge in the North-west.

Mr. McMULLEN. When a doctor leaves Regina on his buckboard and drives fifty miles to a reserve he gets $50. A great many would like to drive fifty miles in a day and get $50.

Mr. DALY. My deputy informs me that they only get 50 cents a mile.

Mr. McMULLEN. There must have been a reduction lately, because this man was paid a dollar a mile.

Mr. DALY. You do not know that.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, except from the man who was in charge. Now, these facts go to show that there has been enormous extravagance in connection with the management of the whole North-west mounted police, both in Manitoba and the North-west. I have on several occasions gone over the accounts very carefully, and as I showed the year before last, 46 cents out of every dollar go into the pockets of the officials, and only 54 cents reaches the Indians. I have had the opinion of men who have visited the North-west with regard to training schools. Those schools are very expensive items. There are very expensive officials connected with them, men hired at large salaries. There are seven or nine training schools.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. We give these schools a per capita allowance, they pay their own salaries, and they complain that the federal allowance is not sufficient to carry on the schools to advantage. They pay their salaries out of what we give them.

Mr. McMULLEN. Any one who has carefully investigated the whole question must see that there is great room for economy in these institutions.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to say a word with regard to the purchase of seed grains. I am informed that the policy of the department is to purchase garden seeds for the Indians in eastern Canada and send them to be distributed in British Columbia. The seedsmen of British Columbia think that is eminently unfair. They think that as they have to pay taxes and live in the country, they should be allowed to provide these seeds, as they can grow as good seeds and put them up in as nice packages as the seedsmen in the east. I can see no reason, except on the ground of economy, for this practice. Our seedsmen may charge a little higher price, because wages are higher, and they cannot raise the seeds as cheaply, but I do not think the hon. Minister should take that into consideration. It is only fair that these men in that business should have a little of the Government patronage, and be allowed to provide these seeds to the Indians. And not only seeds, but, in other matters, the same old story holds true. In stationery, for instance, store-keepers think that it is not right that every pen and pencil and bit of India-rubber used in the

department in British Columbia should be sent as it is now, from the east. They think they have a just right, being store-keepers in that country, to supply the departments themselves, if not with everything, with a good deal that is used—and I must say that I fully coincide with that opinion. I would like to hear from the Minister on this subject.

Mr. DALY. Our seeds for the Indians, like everything else, are furnished by tender, and the contract goes to the lowest tender in every case. The consequence is that we get the seeds for the Indians in British Columbia and the North-west at a much less cost than we otherwise could. The hon. gentleman admits that. That is the reason for not purchasing them by retail in British Columbia. I would like to say further in answer to the hon. member from Yale (Mr. Mara)——

Mr. MULOCK. How about the stationery?

Mr. DALY. The stationery comes from the Queen's Printer, for all the departments. I have nothing to do with that. In answer to the hon. member for Yale as to the mounted police being sent to British Columbia, I may say a word. The hon. gentleman referred to a case last fall, close to the border on the Kootenay River, when the British Columbia Government asked to send the mounted police. Our reply was that we would be glad to send them under the provision of the statute. I have not it here, but it provides that the mounted police can be sent out of the North-west Territories into other provinces only under certain arrangements. Some years ago, the Government sent some mounted police into British Columbia to quell a disturbance which was reported as very serious. But, on making inquiry, it was found that the affair was not of such a character as to justify the expense of moving the mounted police being undertaken. Had the people used a little discretion with the Indians there would have been no trouble. The cost of sending the mounted police in such a case is very serious, but they can be sent if the province requiring them will bear the cost.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that amongst others employed in connection with the reserves is Dr. Orton. Will the hon. gentleman please say what is Dr. Orton's salary, and what are his duties?

Mr. DALY. His salary is $800——

Mr. McMULLEN. And travelling expenses?

Mr. DALY. Yes. He takes the whole of the Indians east of Manitoba. He has to travel by team and dog sleigh in the winter and by canoe in the summer. I think he earns all that he gets.

Mr. CORBOULD. In the valley of the lower Fraser River there are a number of reserves, and on these reserves are many Indians who make good farmers. Last spring, the Fraser River was overflowed, and the consequence was that the Indians lost all their spring crops. The provincial government undertook to supply grain to the white settlers in the valley. I would like to ask the Minister whether the item for grain and seed covered the item of seed supplied to the Indians, or whether the Indian Department intend to pay for the seed the Indians required owing to the loss?

Mr. DALY. Last year, after the disaster to which the hon. gentleman refers, the department, through its agents, furnished the Indians with the seed they required then. The Indians will be supplied with the seed they require this year, in addition to what they have already received.

Mr. MARA. I want to say a word or two with regard to the industrial school at Kamloops. The Roman Catholic priest at Kamloops entered into an arrangement with the Dominion Government to supply so many pupils. I understand that the number was fifty. But only twenty-five were supplied, and they felt rather aggrieved that provision had not been made for a larger number. The school is well managed, and the pupils have made rapid progress. The teacher, Father Carillon, as well as the sisters, deserve great credit for the advancement made by their pupils.

Mr. DALY. We have provided this year for twenty-five extra pupils at the Kamloops industrial school. The vote is included in the general vote for industrial and boarding-schools.

Mr. DAVIN. Before this is finally carried, I wish to say that if the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) had given what was paid for medical attendance at each reserve, it would have struck the committee as very little. In some cases, it amounts to $500 or $600, but sometimes it is down to $50, and in some cases there is no charge for medical attendance at all. The hon. gentleman ought to have analysed the figures. The fact is, the hon. gentleman looks at all expenditures in the North-west through a magnifying glass, and turns alarmed away from the exaggerated figures that he sees only in his own fancy.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) never gives us any facts or figures; he always deals in platitudes. He is willing to favour any expenditure in Manitoba and the North-west. He never offers a criticism of the amounts paid, of the amounts charged, or anything else. He says that I did not go sufficiently into details in the statement I made regarding medical attendance for Indians. I

have spent considerable time in looking over the accounts, and I know the statement I have given is correct. If the hon. gentleman is disposed to challenge my statement, I am willing to go over the accounts with him.

Government of the North-west Territories—	
Expenditure connected with the Lieut.-Governor's Office	$ 9,930
Schools in unorganized districts	5,000
Incidental Justice, &c	6,040
Addition to salary of Clerk of Legislative Assembly	400
Legal adviser	600
Registrars	18,160
Insane patients, Manitoba	30,000
Schools, clerical assistance, printing, &c.	242,879
	$313,009

Mr. McMULLEN. I see the first item is the expenditure in connection with the Lieutenant-Governor's office at Regina. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman what is the entire cost of the Lieutenant-Governor's residence that has been recently completed.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that that residence has been occupied for three years.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know that, but we do not know what it has cost yet.

Mr. DALY. You will have to ask the Minister of Public Works. You can find it all in the Auditor General's Report, I think, for last year.

Miscellaneous Printing	$25,000

Mr. PRIOR. I do not know whether this has anything to do with the printing of the voters' lists, but perhaps the committee will allow me to say a word or two in regard to that. I believe the Government, in having the voters' lists printed for the different constituencies, have stated that in British Columbia they were willing to pay the same price for printing these lists as was paid in the east. Now, I went to the trouble of finding out what was the difference in wages paid to printers, and I was told that in British Columbia, where they have a printers' union, they get $21 per week for 50 hours work, whereas I am told that in the east they only get from $9 to $12 per week. It is easy to see that no paper, or no publisher, in British Columbia could possibly do that printing for the same sum of money that it is possible to get it done for in the east. Of course, they naturally think it is very unfair. They are willing that those lists should be tendered for amongst the printers in British Columbia, but they do not think it is fair, in view of the rate of wages prevailing there, that they should be asked to compete with eastern Canada. I hope the Secretary of State will look into that matter, and that if there is more printing to be done, he will see fit to let the British Columbia printers have a chance to make something.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think there is some grievance in this relation. The printing is paid for under a certain regulation which establishes a price, and it is hardly fair to ask the publishers in British Columbia to do the printing at the same rate which is paid in the east. At the same time my hon. friend will understand that by discriminating at all, it opens up the door for what might prove to be abuses. However, I have discussed the matter with the Queen's Printer, and he is endeavouring to see what can be done.

Commutation in lieu of remission of Duties on articles imported for the use of the Army and Navy	$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to inquire of the Minister of Finance exactly how this money is distributed. Is it paid over to the officers' mess?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know whether it has come to the attention of the Minister, but there has been a considerable number of complaints made in the English newspapers as to the way in which our duties press in the case of private soldiers, and in the case, I suppose, to some extent, of private sailors. Although I suppose that only applies to the troops in Halifax, and possibly in Esquimalt, I am bound to say that I should imagine that if any considerable importation took place for the troops at Halifax of articles of ordinary use, that $2,000 would not go very far. I think the number of troops there is about 2,500.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It used to be. I think it is 1,500 now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Still, that is a matter in which, I think, we could afford to deal with reasonable liberality with the soldiers on service. We don't want to make any particular portion of our revenue out of the necessities of the private soldier, who is poorly enough paid as the matter stands. This amount of $2,000, I should judge, barely compensates the officers messes for importation.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all it is used for.

To meet expenditure in connection with the Canada Temperance Act	$1,500

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have made careful inquiries into that item, and I think $500 will amply cover all that may be necessary and I would ask that the item be reduced to $500.

To provide for the payment of Mr. Fabre's salary, and contingencies of his office...	$3,500

Mr. McMULLEN. I positively object to that, and I move that it be struck out.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us how many immigrants he sent to Canada last year?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He did his best.

Maintenance, construction, of roads, bridges, and other necessary works in connection with the Hot Spring's reservation, near Banff Station, N.W.T..... $6,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the revenue from this land?

Mr. DALY. The revenue for the year 1893-94 was $2,500, and for the year up to 31st March, 1895, $1,903.97.

Mr. McMULLEN. We must have spent over $150,000 on that park.

Mr. DALY. I do not think so. Whatever money has been spent there, has been well spent.

Mr. McMULLEN. Could the hon. gentleman say what are the terms upon which sites are rented, or sold?

Mr. DALY. They are leased, and it depends upon the location of the lots. The best lots near the river were leasing for $30 per annum. I think these were about 33 by 120 feet.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is in charge?

Mr. FOSTER. G. A. Stuart is the superintendent.

Academy of Arts..... $2,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I visited the building the other day, and I judged that the Government had not purchased any painting last year. This is a vote in which I most cordially concur. I think it is desirable to expend a reasonable amount every year in purchasing a work or works of art, and I hope the Minister will see that the national gallery of art is extended from time to time. I hope also that a proper room will be obtained for the display of the paintings. We should invest a reasonable sum in acquiring works of art painted by Canadian artists or others, especially by Canadian artists, just as we purchase books for the library.

Plant for Printing Bureau..... $5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. For what purpose is this amount required?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is an annual vote to replace plant worn out, or to introduce new or improved plant. It may be used, or it may not be used.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman I hope will take care to see that there are no campaign discounts. We have already had strange experience in connection with the Printing Bureau.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The instruction to the Queen's Printer is to run the Bureau simply as a business enterprise.

To provide for survey of bed of Straits of Northumberland $6,300

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far is the survey completed, and when is the tunnel to be constructed?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not like to give a possible promise in regard to the second part of the question. The surveys have proceeded quite a distance; they are at work on them now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then we may expect an election shortly.

Mr. FOSTER. No, they are not in that connection. The sum was voted last year and a contract was given out. Hon. gentlemen will, however, remember that I have explained the matter already.

Towards the expenses of determining the boundary line between Canada and the United States of America between the southernmost point of Prince of Wales Island and the 141st meridian of west longitude, and in Passamaquoddy Bay.. $18,000

Mr. DALY. The survey has been going on since 1893 for the purpose of determining the boundary between Alaska and Canada from Prince of Wales Island northward. We have parties out this year and we expect to complete the survey, and obtain data to lay before the commissioners when they meet to fix the boundary. The total expenditure to date is $135,000. This vote will complete the survey.

Mr. PRIOR. Has the hon. Minister obtained any information in regard to the contention with respect to the Portland Canal. This question is of great moment to British Columbia. If the American contention is upheld, the Americans will obtain a very fine harbour and terminus, and these will be lost to British Columbia and to Canada. The contention, I believe, is that Portland Canal, which is mentioned in the treaty, is the Portland Canal called by that name now, whereas the contention of a large number of British Columbians, at all events, is that when that treaty was made there was no such place known as Portland Canal. I should like the Minister to look into this matter thoroughly. There is a gentleman now in Ottawa who has made a study of it, and he considers he could bring proof to bear out the contention of the British Columbians. I should like to ask the Minister whether the matter has been thoroughly looked into, and whether he knows if there is anything in the contention or not.

Mr. DALY. The matter has been looked into and the department has all the information necessary, but I am not at liberty to disclose what that information is, because any information we have is for the purpose of presenting it before the arbitrators when they are called on to settle the matter.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman's deputy seems strongly in favour of the American contention.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 5th July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Mr. TISDALE. There is a matter I wish to bring to the attention of the House in connection with the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. I am satisfied, as chairman, from the progress that has been made in the last three sittings of the committee, that it will be impossible for us to get through with the business now standing before the committee unless we have leave to sit during the session of this House. I beg therefore to move:

That leave be granted to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines to sit during the time the House is in session.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, if that motion is in order? I do not think that, according to the standing orders of the House, that or any committee can sit during the sessions of the House, and we can hardly change the standing orders in this way.

Mr. TISDALE. The House can give leave to the committee to sit.

Mr. EDGAR. I take objection that the orders of the House cannot be amended without notice of motion. I, for one, positively object.

Mr. TISDALE. This is in line of the motion that was passed the other day, but the case now is stronger than that was. I see no way, under the rules of the House by which progress can be made unless the committee that are charged with certain orders by the House have permission, without notice, to sit during the sessions of the House. The chairman makes the statement—I, as chairman, make the statement —that that is necessary in order to enable legislation to be gone on with.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The committee have not asked for this.

Mr. TISDALE. But I, as chairman, take the responsibility for making the statement that the legislation entrusted to us cannot be put through unless this permission is given, and if notice must be given, it would not be reached this session. Now, for the same reason that the motion was passed the other day to enable one of the committees to reduce its quorum, I hold that it is necessary to grant this permission to the Committee on Railways. Otherwise the orders entrusted to us cannot be dealt with.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a very extraordinary proposition that the chairman of a committee, without the sanction of the committee and without any request from the committee, can bring a motion of this sort before the House. As a matter of necessity, the chairman might come here to make a request. But when he comes here with a motion of this sort, he should come as the organ of the committee and not as the member for South Norfolk. This seems to me a monstrous proposition. What is the reason the hon. gentleman gives for making it? He says the business before the committee cannot be disposed of otherwise. Why, Sir, look at the Order paper of this House. Is there no business before this House that will not be disposed of, are there not many Bills before the House that will not be dealt with? And yet does any hon. gentleman disregard the rules of the House and make propositions such as the hon. gentleman has submitted in order to prevent a certain amount of business perishing with the session. Every session there are questions that come before the committees that are not finally disposed of by those committees. The proposition of the hon. gentleman, it seems to me, goes to show that he wholly misapprehends his position as chairman of the committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must be wrong in his argument. If the hon. gentleman's contention is right, an important committee of this House might, by obstruction, be prevented from doing any business at all, even passing a motion in favour of such permission as this being granted; and it would not be in the power of the House to deal with the matter. Surely this House has control of these committees so as to prevent their work being made abortive for the whole session. I do not think the hon. gentleman would go that far, though his argument logically carried out would lead him in that direction. It seems an extraordinary thing that it should not be the right of the chairman of the committee or any other member of this House to bring his case here on the floor of Parliament and show that the business of

the session will not be carried out as the House desires unless a certain committee has instructions other than those we first gave to it. In this case we know how many Bills are before the committee and we know that they have been before the committee for an exceedingly long time. And, as the end of the session is approaching, it seems to me too clear to need demonstration that the House can give instructions to the committee at any time to sit from day to day, or on any particular day, or during the sittings of the House. That was the course pursued in connection with the Public Accounts Committee——

Mr. MULOCK. By unanimous consent.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Consent was not asked. It is true there was no opposition, as the reasons commended themselves to the House. It would be an extraordinary proposition to lay down that this House cannot send instructions of any kind to any select committee appointed by the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it would be a more extraordinary proposition to lay down that the standing orders of this House are to be disregarded, absolutely without notice. The only reason for which we make standing orders is to prevent surprises, and see that reasonable formalities are observed in the conduct of public business; and now the Minister of Justice, who ought to be in this House the special guardian of the rules of this House, proposes that our standing orders may be set aside, without one word of notice, without one word of consideration, at the whim of any particular member who happens to have a Bill that he thinks requires particular attention. There is an immense number of Bills quite as important as these little local Bills, four-fifths of which might stand over with great advantage to the community, for not one week, or one month, but for several years, I fancy. There are a number of important Bills that we have no chance of touching. The Government do not propose to suspend the rules of the House and let them have a chance, but in favour of this Bill they propose to suspend all the rules of this House, because, by accepting this motion, you practically decree that our standing orders are of no consequence whatever, that every standing order of this House may be abrogated without notice, a proposition that seems to me to be a monstrous one.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a question of order, and I submit that this motion is not in order. I maintain that the chairman of the committee has no right to move as the representative of the committee without the authority of the committee, and in consequence of a report of the committee. In this case the chairman not only was not authorized by the committee to make any motion of this kind; he even refused to tell the committee what he proposed to do in the House, refused to tell what he proposed to move, though he indicated that he intended to propose something that would gag the committee in some way. In the second place, the Minister of Justice has gone beyond all rules in professing to know that obstruction existed in that committee—if I may use the word as a quotation from the hon. Minister. The chairman of the committee did not commit himself to that statement; he knew very well that it would be irregular for him to state that obstruction existed in the committee, without the authority of the committee to that effect. But the Minister of Justice breaks the rules by saying that obstruction existed there, and in giving that as a reason for adopting this motion. In reference to the precedent sought to be drawn from the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee in 1891, it will be remembered by yourself, as by us, that the committee on that occasion, by report, requested power to sit at unusual times and continuously, and authority was given to them by unanimous consent of this House, without objection from anybody. That certainly is no precedent for an unauthorized proposition of the chairman of the committee to ask the House to give powers to that committee which the committee itself has not asked for, and which are objected to strongly on the part of a large section of the committee and of this House. I ask your ruling on the point of order, before discussing the merits of the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. With regard to the motion which has been proposed by the hon. member for South Norfolk, I would say that I do not regard it as exactly in the same light in which I regarded the motion which was made the other day to reduce the quorum of the same committee. Then it was urged that the committee could not meet for want of a quorum, but in the present case the chairman has moved, without any report being made by the committee, that the committee have leave to sit during the sessions of this House. Now, it is quite competent for the House, in a case of urgency, it seems to me, to grant to that committee power to sit during the sittings of the House, but I think before coming to that conclusion, we ought to have some definite statement from the committee itself, such as a report, that it is necessary, to enable the committee to get through with their work, that they should be allowed to sit during the sittings of the House. I do not, however, agree with those hon. members who say that this motion could not be put without notice, if a report had been made by the committee that it was necessary for the prosecution of its business that the committee should have leave to sit during the session. For these reasons, I consider that the motion should not be put to the House on the present occasion.

Mr. EDGAR. That will be the adoption of the report.

Mr. TISDALE. If I may be allowed a word of explanation of my motion, it is simply to advise the House of the needs of the committee, and to relieve myself, so far as possible, from any responsibility as chairman. The reason why I took the responsibility, and I quite acknowledge it was a grave responsibility, was that in view of what has occurred in the committee, without any reflections upon the members of the committee, I thought it was impossible to get any report.

Mr. CASEY. Order.

Mr. TISDALE. I am merely speaking, I am not reflecting upon anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to say, however, to my hon. friend, that the House would all the more readily absolve him from any responsibility if the House were led to believe that he had no responsibility at all. With regard to the point of order which has been discussed, there is another point which will come up later upon the report of the committee.

DELAYED RETURN.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Secretary of State what explanation he offers to-day for not bringing down the returns. The old ones are all worn out.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior tells me, what I had forgotten, that I left it on the Table in the Council. I will bring it over Monday morning.

BOARD OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. WALLACE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 140) further to amend chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes and the Acts in amendment thereof. He said: The object of the Bill is to provide for the Board of Customs to hold legal sittings without an assistant commissioner being present. The original Act provides that there shall be an assistant commissioner present at each sitting of the board. We have no assistant commissioner; therefore, this amendment is necessary. Then, provision is made for three members of the board to constitute a quorum. It also enlarges the class of men who can be appointed members of the Board of Customs. As the board is now constituted, only those officials mentioned in section 4 of the present Act, and the Dominion appraisers of customs, and assistant Dominion appraisers of customs can be appointed to the board, and it is proposed to take power to appoint any competent man from the service.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it the intention to abolish the office of assistant commissioner?

Mr. WALLACE. We have no assistant commissioner. Parliament has not provided a salary for such an officer.

Mr. LAURIER. But the office still exists by statute.

Mr. WALLACE. We have no assistant commissioner.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the object of the Bill is to create a board, instead of having an assistant commissioner. I want to know if it is the intention of the hon. gentleman to fill that office or not, or to abolish it?

Mr. WALLACE. There is no salary provided this year for such an officer.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose no one will fulfil the duties unless he receives a salary. But there will be other years. Does the hon. gentleman propose now, or later, to create a board of experts, as petitioned for by the Board of Trade of Montreal and other cities?

Mr. WALLACE. No. This Bill provides for enlarging the sphere within which those appointed to the Board of Customs will be eligible. It will be an advisory board.

Mr. CASEY. Will all those eligible under the Act be already in the Customs Department?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Then it does not provide for the appointment of a board outside the department.

Mr. WALLACE. It is the Customs Department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has made what is a very extraordinary statement, and we should have further explanation on the subject. He has admitted that there is an office of high rank in existence, created by statute, and for which the Government has failed to provide any salary. That is a most improper proceeding, it is illegal and unconstitutional, because the Government are bound to obey the law just as anybody else, so long as it is the law. If there be such an office, and the hon. gentleman thinks it should not be continued, he is bound either to submit to the House a vote for the legal salary of that office, or submit a Bill for its abolition.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken, for I made no such statement. I said Parliament has provided no salary for an assistant commissioner. That was the statement I made.

Mr. LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman provide a salary for the collector of customs at Montreal ?

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved that, on Monday next, the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide, that instead of the deduction provided for by section six of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, a deduction shall be made from the salary of every person to whom the said Act applies, at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum on such salary if it is $600 or upwards, and of 3 per cent per annum thereon if it is less than $600.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—INDEMNITY OF MEMBERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that, on Monday next, the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that for the present session of Parliament the deduction of eight dollars per day mentioned in section 26 of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, shall not be made for twelve days in the case of a member who has been absent from a sitting of the House of which he is a member, or of some committee thereof, during such number of days, but that this provision shall not operate to extend the maximum amount mentioned in section 25 of the said Act, and that in the case of a member elected since the commencement of the present session it shall not apply to days prior to his election.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. LAURIER. I remind the leader of the House that he promised to make the statement to-day which we have been expecting for some time past.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not make a definite promise that I would make a statement to-day ; I said I might probably make a statement. I have, however, to say to the hon. gentleman and to the House that the deliberations of Council in the matter we have under discussion have so far advanced that on Monday, when the House assembles, I will make a definite and positive statement in regard to the matter.

Mr. LAURIER. That is the last ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is positively the last.

ELECTORAL BALLOT PAPERS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Two months ago I introduced a short Bill of very great importance, because it may affect the election of every member of the House. It is quite apparent that there is no possible chance of carrying that Bill in the hands of a private member during the present session. The Bill was submitted in consequence of a decision rendered by Judge Andrews, of Quebec, regarding the ballot papers. The Bill is of sufficient importance, in my opinion, for the Government to take it in charge. Its object is to provide that the ballot papers we have adopted shall be marked in one place, where it was intended, and in no other place, as Judge Andrews has given a construction to the existing statute different from what the House intended. The Bill would soon pass the House if the Government would take charge of it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know the Bill to which the hon. gentleman refers. I am only able to say at present that I will see that the Government consider the proposition.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved third reading of Bill (No. 127) further to amend the Act respecting judges of provincial courts.

Mr. MULOCK moved, in amendment :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend the same by striking out the clause increasing the salary of the local judge for British Columbia.

He said : Mr. Speaker, the Government are proposing to inaugurate a most unsound practice by appointing a gentleman to office and then increasing his salary above the statutory allowance which existed at the time he accepted office. No argument whatever has been advanced for the carrying of the proposition of the Government. The statute fixes the salary of the chief justice and of the judge of the maritime court in question. He has only been appointed within a few months, and now it is proposed to select him out of the army of 200 judges in Canada and to extend to him this special favour. The proposition has not been sustained by any argument that justifies it. It is an exercise of the arbitrary will of the Government. No valid reason has been given for it, and the only possible explanation I can see is, that there must have been some understanding between the Government and the judge at the time of his appointment. I shall not take up much further time discussing this question, but I would submit to the Government and to the House whether the present is an opportune time to inaugurate a programme of increasing salaries. We have six or seven thousand office-holders in Canada, and if you select one for special favour, it is an invitation to all the others to apply to the represen-

tatives of the people here for increases. Our pay to the civil servants of the country is amply large enough for the pecuniary capacities of the people, and this House has higher duties to perform than to be exhausting the treasury in order to carry out promises which have not been made in the public interest. For these reasons, and others which could be well advanced but which I will not press upon the House now, I trust the House will see the propriety of vetoing this Bill, and so mark its displeasure at the extravagance of the Government. Trifling as this increase is in itself, the extravagance of the Government generally and what it must lead to, should be condemned. I trust the House will emphasize its disapproval of this course by refusing to increase the salary of this judge at the request of the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. I endorse the remarks of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). It is nothing short of an outrage that in the present condition of the treasury we should be asked to increase the salary of a man who has only been installed a couple of months in office. When a judicial position becomes vacant in any part of the Dominon, we find there are any number of men urging their claims for it. The great object first is to get the appointment, and after they get it they come here seeking for an increase of salary if they can discover any trifling little increase in their duties. This man has hardly had time to warm his seat in office than he immediately asks that $600 be added to his salary in order that he may have a round sum of $6,000 a year. The Minister of Finance announced a short time ago, that he could not grant to the Auditor General, an official who is discharging important and onerous duties, an official who sits in judgment upon the expenditure of this country: he could not give that official an increase of $500 or $600 to enable him to efficiently discharge his duties. But now, without the slightest hesitation, he consents to giving this judge in British Columbia $600 a year extra. In view of the enormous deficits announced by the Finance Minister, the House should not consent to this unnecessary expenditure. I respect our judiciary. They are a decent lot of men, but in my opinion they will not continue to hold a dignified position in the eyes of the people if they are everlastingly boring this House for increases to their salaries. There are any number of able men prepared to creditably and efficiently discharge the duties of judges when a vacancy takes place. We should make the judges understand that if they are called upon to perform some trifling routine service in addition to what their predecessor did, they must not expect additional pay for it. This proposition is preposterous and should be voted down by the House.

Mr. LANGELIER. I am very much surprised to see that the chief justice of British Columbia is singled out for an increase of salary when nothing of the kind is proposed for the chief justices of the other provinces. After the death of Sir A. A. Dorion some years ago, the chief justiceship of the province of Quebec was offered to Sir Alexander Lacoste. I heard from several of his friends that for some time he declined to accept the position because he did not think he could live upon the salary of $5,000 a year. His friends told me further that he was promised an increase of $1,000 a year, and that he accepted the position on the distinct understanding that such an addition would be made to his salary. For two sessions afterwards the late Premier Sir John Thompson, introduced resolutions proposing to increase the salaries not only of the chief justices, but several other judges in the different provinces. These resolutions never came to anything. Most probably the Government considered that public opinion was not in favour of increasing the salaries of judges. Now, this year, without any explanation having been given, it is proposed to increase the salary of one of the chief justices who has been appointed only a few months ago. Why is that proposed in his favour and not in the favour of the other chief justices? As no satisfactory explanation has been given to the House, I shall certainly vote for the motion of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock).

Mr. CAMPBELL. This is a bad precedent to establish. I do not think there is any class of men in the Dominion who are better paid than the judges, but here you are singling out a man who gets $5,600 a year for a further increase. In the present state of the finances of the country this is an outrage on the people and one that the House ought not to permit. It is entering the thin end of the wedge and probably next session we will have not only the county court judges but the superior court judges again asking for increases. Having established a precedent of this kind you cannot very well stop it. The House ought therefore to reject the proposition without hesitation. The proposal is very unpopular in the country, because the people believe that the salaries of the judges throughout Canada are quite sufficient at the present time. When we compare their salaries with those of the judiciary of any other colony in the Empire it will be found that in the Dominion of Canada we are paying our judges more than is being paid to the judges of any other portion of the Empire except Britain itself. This man accepted the position knowing what the salary was, and he was quite willing to accept it at that salary; and now, after he has occupied the position only three months, I think it is bad taste for the Government to come down and ask Parliament to increase his salary. I think the House will be doing wrong in granting this increase, and I will certainly vote for the amendment.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Mulock):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Harwood,
Bain (Wentworth),	Landerkin,
Beausoleil,	Langelier,
Beith,	Laurier,
Bernier,	Leduc,
Berden,	Lister,
Boston,	Livingston,
Bowers,	Lowell,
Bowman,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brodeur,	McGregor,
Bruneau,	McIsaac,
Campbell,	McMullen,
Carroll,	Martin,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Mignault,
Charlton,	Mills (Bothwell),
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Perry,
Davies,	Proulx,
Edgar,	Rider,
Edwards,	Rinfret,
Flint,	Rowand,
Forbes,	Semple,
Fraser,	Somerville,
Frémont,	Sutherland,
Gibson,	Tarte,
Gillmor,	Vaillancourt,
Godbout,	Wilson, and
Grieve,	Yeo.—57.
Guay,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bain (Soulanges),	LaRivière,
Baird,	Lépine,
Belley,	Macdonald (King's),
Bennett,	Macdowall,
Bergeron,	Maclean (York),
Bergin,	McAlister,
Blanchard,	McDonald (Victoria),
Boyd,	McDougald (Pictou),
Cameron,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cargill,	McGreevy,
Carpenter,	McKay,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McLean (King's),
Chesley,	McLennan,
Coatsworth,	McLeod,
Cochrane,	McNeill,
Corbould,	Mara,
Costigan,	Masson,
Curran,	Metcalfe,
Daly,	Miller,
Davis,	Mills (Annapolis),
Dickey,	Montague,
Dupont,	Ouimet,
Earle,	Patterson (Colchester),
Fairbairn,	Pope,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),	Pridham,
	Putnam,
Foster,	Roome,
Fréchette,	Rosamond,
Gillies,	Ross (Lisgar),
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Smith (Ontario),
	Stairs,
Grandbois,	Taylor,
Grant (Sir James),	Temple,
Guillet,	Tisdale,
Haggart,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Haslam,	
Hazen,	Turcotte,
Henderson,	Tyrwhitt,
Hodgins,	Wallace,
Hughes,	Weldon,
Hutchins,	White (Cardwell),
Ingram,	White (Shelburne),
Jones,	Wilmot,
Kaulbach,	Wood (Brockville), and
Kenny,	Wood (Westm'd).—90.
Lachapelle,	

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. member for North Norfolk has not voted.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was paired with the hon. member for Cardwell during my absence. As he has voted, I would vote for the amendment.

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

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 130) further to amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Montague.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the voters' lists of 1895.—(Mr. Montague.)

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 116) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act (Mr. Daly), read the first time.

Mr. DALY moved second reading of the amendments.

Mr. LAURIER. What are they?

Mr. DALY. The first amendment is to permit the sale of two school sections—section 11 and section 29 in township 3—to the Cochrane Ranch Co. The sale has been made to that company of 10 per cent of its leasehold, and within the territory sold are these two school sections, which are so surrounded by the property of the Cochrane Company as to be perfectly useless to anybody else. The other amendment provides that certain transfers of assignments of homestead rights made by homesteaders prior to the issue of their patents shall not ipso facto be void. The explanation of the legislation is this: In the North-west Territories some people who purchased agricultural implements have made an agreement with implement owners, in which they declared that they had made a homestead entry, and gave them a lien on the same; and the implement owners put an affidavit of execution on the back of this agreement, and registered it in the registry office. By the Dominion Lands Act any transfer of assignment made prior to the issue of the patent is void, and does not permit a man to get his patent; and it is to remove this difficulty that this amendment is made. The occasion for it arises from an Act passed by the local legislature of Manitoba, in 1893, providing that none of these agreements should in future be received by the registrar. After this the same difficulty cannot arise, as these liens cannot be registered.

Mr. LAURIER. The last amendment is unobjectionable, so far as I can see. The first one may lead to difficulty, but it is impossible to take exception to it with the scanty information we have, and therefore the Government must take the responsibility of it.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved second reading of Bill (No. 68) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: As the House knows, by the general Act the elections in all the constituencies are held simultaneously, that is, on the same day, with certain exceptions, which are made on account of the geographical situation, the sparseness of population, the want of travelling and printing facilities, and other peculiarities, of the constituencies excepted. Among these exceptions is the old district of Cariboo in the province of British Columbia. By the Redistribution Act of 1892, the district of Cariboo is attached to the district of Yale, and the two become the electoral district of Yale and Cariboo. The Government were, therefore, under the necessity either of including the old constituency of Yale in the exceptions or removing Cariboo from the list. After having made careful inquiry those who know what the facilities for travelling, for the posting of proclamations, and for the printing necessary for the holding of a poll in the new district, the Government have come to the conclusion that it would serve the purposes of the people of that district thoroughly to remove Cariboo from the list of exceptions, and bring the new district of Yale and Cariboo under the general provisions of the Act; and all the clauses of the Bill have that effect.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to add a new clause to meet a contingency which is not likely to arise, but against which it is well to provide. The Redistrbution Act does not come into force until proclaimed, and though not at all probable, there might possibly be a by-election in these particular constituencies before the general election. I therefore propose:

That the provisions of this Act should come into force only upon the day to be named by the proclamation of the Governor General, and not before.

Mr. LAURIER. It would be much simpler to say that this Act would come into force at the next general election.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I simply use the words used in the Redistribution Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to call the attention of the Secretary of State to an amendment which I suggested some time ago. In the year 1894 we passed an amendment to the Dominion Elections Act, and adopted a ballot of four discs, and our idea was that the voter should mark his cross in the disc opposite the name of the candidate for whom he wished to vote. The Act reads as follows:—

The elector, on receiving his ballot paper, shall forthwith proceed into one of the compartments of the polling station, and there mark his ballot paper, making a cross with a pencil on the white portion of the ballot paper opposite to or within the division containing the name of the candidate for whom he intends to vote.

The words "opposite to, or within" were interpreted by Judge Andrews to mean below, or in any part of the white paper surrounding the name, and not in the disc. The intention of this House was that the voter should mark his name within the disc and nowhere else. After Judge Andrews decided that was not the meaning of the clause, I introduced a Bill in order to make it perfectly plain that the voter should mark his cross inside this disc, and nowhere else. I would move, therefore, that the following section be added to this Bill:—

1. The section substituted by section four of chapter thirteen of the Statutes of 1894 for section forty-six of The Dominion Elections Act, chapter eight of the Revised Statutes, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"46. The elector, on receiving the ballot paper, shall forthwith proceed into one of the compartments of the polling station and there mark his ballot paper, making a cross or crosses with a pencil on the white circular space or spaces opposite to the name or names of the candidate or candidates for whom he intends to vote, and shall then fold up such ballot paper so that the initials on the back can be seen without opening it, and hand it to the deputy returning officer, who shall, without unfolding it, ascertain by examining his initials and the number upon the counterfoil that it is the same which he furnished to the elector, and shall first detach and destroy the counterfoil, and shall then immediately, and in the presence of the elector, place the ballot paper in the ballot box."

The old Act says "making a cross with a pencil on the white portion of the ballot paper opposite to, or within, the division." If the voter is to make his cross within the white disc, there would be no question as to what that means, because there is only one disc; but if he is to make his mark on the white portion of the ballot paper, he will be within the technical wording of the section if he makes his cross underneath the name, and not in the disc at all. This would encourage bribery, because the briber might say to the elector, I will give you $5 if you will make your cross underneath the letter "J" in my name, and not in the disc at all. In this way might be defeated our object in adopting this ballot paper, which was to ensure that the ballots should be

marked on the white disc, and nowhere else, so that the voter should not indicate by his mark to an outsider, in any sense or way, if he wishes to do so, how he was voting.

Mr. FOSTER. How can he do that in one case more than in the other?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If he marks in the white disc, no third party can tell who made that mark; but if he made an agreement with me beforehand that he would mark, say under the letter "a" in "Davies," within the division for the name, I should know that he voted straight. The whole object of adopting this paper was that the marks should be put upon the disc, and nowhere else. Otherwise, we might as well have the old paper. In that case, what was the sense of adopting this ballot, and paying $2,500 for it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman's suggestion is probably a very good one. But I hope he will be satisfied with this. We are all in accord as to what we mean by this provision of the Act. Some hon. gentlemen think it already clear and unmistakable, and that the hon. gentleman's amendment does not much improve it. Others, and on this side, too, think that the hon. gentleman's amendment is clearer, and I have just asked my colleague who has charge of the Bill to allow it to stand for its third reading, and we will consider that matter carefully. We may come to the conclusion that it is better to adopt the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of course, everything will depend upon whether these words are directory or mandatory. If they are directory, they will still remain directory under the amendment of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). Now, there are two views taken of this matter. If these words are directory, that circular white disc with the black ground was intended to aid the party in the marking of his ballot properly. It was not for the purpose of compelling him to put his cross in a particular place, but for the purpose of aiding him in marking it opposite the name of the party for whom he intended to vote, and not elsewhere. That is as I understand it. I confess I do not exactly take the view of my hon. friend. Of course, I think we ought to construe every law in the interests of the voter, and with the view of upholding the vote. If the voter wishes to have an understanding with the party, he can mark under a particular letter, as my hon. friend says, and indicate in that way that he has voted according to the compact, but he may show that also inside the disc by making his cross in a particular form agreed upon. The question of form is just as important as the question of place. I do not think there is any difference in that respect, and the question, to my mind, is this: Are you, by this arrangement, going to deprive an illiterate man, a man who is not in the habit of marking his ballot, or doing anything else of a literary character, of the vote which he wishes to record. In my opinion, his right to vote is of more consequence than anything else, and, that being the case, I would not want to put any other construction than the directory construction which the judges have put upon this in the interpretation of this provision.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a great deal of force in the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Clearly, if the intention of the voter is to vote for a certain candidate, and he indicates this by marking within the square set apart for the name, he ought not to be deprived of having his vote counted. The argument of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) might apply in various ways. Under any circumstances, the candidate might arrange with the elector that he should mark his cross, say, at the lower side of the disc, or at the upper side, or in some other way make an identifying mark in such a way that the ballot could not be rejected by the deputy returning officer. It seems to me, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says, that it is much more important that the vote of the elector given clearly and unmistakably for a candidate, should be counted, than that the objection that the hon. member for Queen's should be given effect to.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is perfectly evident now, after the expressions of opinion by Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for Bothwell, that the Act must be amended. I was speaking as to the legal construction of the Bill. I put one legal construction upon it; my hon. friend puts another; and, if we differ, it is perfectly clear that the returning officers throughout the Dominion will differ, and when you come to the next general election, one-tenth of the ballots will be thrown out. We must have this thing put beyond a possibility of doubt, one way or the other. I am not very much concerned if the majority take the view of the hon. member for Bothwell, so long as it is made clear. I have no strong feeling, one way or the other. The reason why I introduced the motion was that last year the House were of opinion that this ballot, making it compulsory to mark on the disc, should be adopted. But if members, legal members on the same side have different opinions about this matter, what may we expect when the law comes to be interpreted in a general election throughout the country. I am mainly anxious that it should be put in such form that there can be no doubt in the minds of returning officers. If the law is to be left in its present state of chaos, what will be the result? It will be lamentable.

On section 4,

Mr. MONTAGUE. My attention has just been called to the fact that the wording of the Registration Act is this, that the Act shall come into force on the dissolution of the present Parliament. This is shorter and more satisfactory. I therefore move, as an amendment :

This Act shall take effect only upon the dissolution of the present Parliament.

Bill, as amended, reported.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF SILVER-LEAD SMELTING.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $150,000 in five years to encourage silver-lead smelting in Canada, the payment for each ton of ore smelted not to exceed fifty cents.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. This resolution pretty well explains its object. The proposition is to encourage and extend the industry of silver-lead smelting in Canada, the principal region in which the industry bids fair to be developed being in British Columbia. The proposition is smply this, that the sum of $150,000 shall be appropriated, to extend over a period of five years ; that for the first year, for instance, not more than one-fifth of the sum shall be paid out ; that the payments shall be made upon each ton of ore which is smelted ; that the maximum paid for each ton of ore which is smelted shall be 50 cents ; that if more than sufficient is smelted at the rate of 50 cents per ton to make the $30,000, the maximum that can be paid out, then the rate per ton will be made by dividing the number of tons that are smelted into the $30,000, or the amount that can be made for the first year. If, during the first year, the $30,000 is not absorbed, any surplus which is left goes on to the second and succeeding year ; but at no time can more than 50 cents per ton be paid for the smelting of these ores. The ores are found in more or less abundance through all parts of the mountain ranges of British Columbia. In the districts along the rivers from the southern boundary north of the line of railway, these ores have been prospected to a certain extent, and have been mined to a certain extent. But, up to the present time, they have all been exported for smelting, consequently, in the first place, the increase in the development of the industry must be retarded by the distance that these ores have to be transported in order to get them to the smelting furnaces which are in the United States. But a greater disadvantage than that is, that only a certain class of ores will bear the transportation and pay the expense, that is, the higher grade ores. As the higher grade ores form a small proportion, necessarily, of all the ores available, it leaves the low grade ores practically unused, although they are of considerable value, and pay largely for smelting, if the transportation to the smelting furnaces for separating the ores does not cost too much. In the smelting of these ores, I am told that it is necessary to have two kinds ; besides the common ores, they also need, in order to make up a composition for successful smelting, the dry silicious ores. These are not found in great abundance in British Columbia at the present time, although the prospectors have an idea that they exist, and any stimulus given to the smelting industry will, of course, provoke a search for, and it is hoped, a discovery of, those silicious ores in sufficient abundance to make what is so very requisite in the composition for successful smelting. The object the Government have in view is to give an impetus to the mining and smelting industry of that country, particularly, and wherever ores of that kind are found in Canada, for a limited period. It is not proposed, and it is not thought that it will be necessary, to give aid for any lengthy period. The main idea is to get the industry started, to set the prospectors at work, especially for these dry silicious ores, and so to stimulate the search for, and, consequently, the development of, the mining of those ores. It is believed that a very great benefit will result. The labour employed, and the expenses of smelting are large. A certain amount of labour, of course, is employed in mining the ores, and taking away that high grade portion of them which stands transportation, but that is not at all to be compared with the labour which is expended, on all the adjuncts to the smelting which are necessary, and the expenditures that are made, if the ores, both high and low grade, are smelted in the country. For instance, in smelting 150 tons of ore, it is calculated that 500 tons of coal are used, that about 1,200 tons of coke are used, and about 500 tons of limestone. Now, all these industries will be stimulated by the smelting of the ore. The coke will be made, probably, at Nanaimo, and, perhaps, in the Rocky Mountains, and an industry will be developed there which does not, at the present time, exist, giving employment and making large expenditure as well. And so, with reference to the limestone and the coal. Then again, as is well known, the development of the mining industry has a particularly good effect on the consumption of agricultural products. A mining population is particularly a consuming population. It makes nothing for its own wear, and for its own food, but it calls lavishly and constantly for the products of the manufacturer, and more especially for the products

of the agriculturist. The effect has been seen in the history of this kind of mining in the western and north-western states, where lead smelting has been very greatly developed, and where the combined products of the smelting ores and of agriculture, largely for the sustenance of the miners, have run up very largely, and now amounts to a very large sum. The amount that Parliament is asked to vote will be but small, the time will be limited, and it is not thought that a period longer than five years will be necessary in order to put the industry upon that basis of development upon which it can go on and extend itself. Certain conditions will be put about it. In the first place, the subsidy begins on the passing of the Act, and extends for five years, and a provision will be put in the Act by which any smelter, to have the advantage of this bounty, must commence these operations by the 1st July, 1896. The object is to give a stimulus to the development at once, to get capital to go in and set up establishments there, and commence operations, so as to give the benefits that are derived from a large industry. All this, of course, will be under regulations of the Governor in Council, as to conditions, supervision, and the like of that. I think these are the main features of the Bill which it is proposed to found on the resolution. I may also state that the amount of 50 cents per ton, of course, is but a small percentage of the value. Probably the average value of product would be $50 or $60 per ton, and the aid would be somewhere in the region of 10 cents.

Mr. LAURIER. Everybody, I think, including the Minister himself, may have some doubts as to the wisdom of the proposition he now introduces.

Mr. FOSTER. I have none.

Mr. LAURIER. I have. But for all that, I am not disposed to criticise or oppose the motion submitted by the hon. gentleman. I take it that this is to be an experiment, and I should be glad to find that the results which the hon. gentleman anticipates materializes in the glowing figures which he has presented. I have my doubts as to that; the hon. gentleman has not. But he should have some, because he knows that at the present time silver all over the world is very much depressed, in fact, silver has ceased to become a commodity, and it is now an article to be avoided. The silver market of the United States was never so low as it is now, and I doubt if the aid which the hon. gentleman intends to give the mining and smelting industry of silver will have the results he looks for. However, for my part I would be very glad to know, whether in one year or in five years, that the market has improved, and therefore the results which the hon. gentleman predicts have been realized. If the amount asked from Parliament were a very large figure, in the present condition of the finances, I would, perhaps, be disposed to take a different view from that which I entertain at the present time; but as the amount is not large, as it is an experiment, and as mining in British Columbia is the principal industry of that province, and is one which we shall all be glad to see developed, I do not intend to offer any opposition to the proposition of the hon. gentleman. The Kootenay district, I suppose, will be that principally affected, and this industry is progressing and developing there, and from that consideration, I will allow the motion to pass without offering any opposition.

Resolution reported.

MARKLAND MORTGAGE.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 136) respecting the discharge of a mortgage to Her Majesty known as the Markland mortgage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the subject was before the House some time ago the Minister of Finance promised to produce a copy of the mortgage. It should have been laid on the Table before this.

Mr. FOSTER. The mortgage cannot be got, but here is the memorial which is registered.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Time should be allowed to examine into this document.

Mr. FOSTER. This matter has a long history. It has been before the Government for thirty or forty years. It has been before the Public Accounts Committee, and in 1888 that committee investigated the whole subject and reported to the House that these accounts should be wiped out utterly, thereby giving assent to the view that they were perfectly worthless, as so many years had elapsed. That recommendation was assented to by the House. This proposition is different from that. I believe, from what my officers tell me as a result of their investigation, that we can get 50 per cent of the price for which the property was sold if we were in a position to give a title. That is a distinct advance on the position of 1888, when the Public Accounts Committee recommended that these accounts should be wiped out completely. After inquiry, the officers of my department and my deputy very strongly recommend that this is the very best course to pursue. The properties are depreciating, the house on one lot has gone to pieces, and no rent has been received for five or ten years. If we carry out this proposition we will get a title to the property and allow it to be

utilized, and I think we are getting as good value as it is possible under the circumstances.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am by no means so sure of that. I observe that one of these properties is a water lot, and it should be a valuable property.

Mr. FOSTER. We have only part of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But half of a water lot in that particular locality in the immediate vicinity of the Tete du Point barracks is worth a considerable sum.

Mr. FOSTER. We can take the second reading now, and allow the hon. gentleman to look at the papers before the third reading.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the facts are correct, I have no desire to prevent the adoption of this proposal. The real question at issue is whether the several properties are or are not of the value of that mortgage. Has any interest been paid ?

Mr. FOSTER. No interest has been paid. The aggregate amount for which the property was sold was $7,480, subject to a mortgage of £600, and on account of which $1,245 has been received.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When was it sold ?

Mr. FOSTER. In 1862.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then there remains due about $6,000 and interest, or about $12,000 in all ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not mean we will obtain 50 per cent on the arrearages.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the proposition is to take $3,000 for these properties.

Mr. FOSTER. A property was sold in 1862 to W. M. Minguay for $4,200, subject to this mortgage ; Augustus Thibaudeau, $1,600, and Thomas Baker, $480, making $7,480. That was the sale in 1862. The sale to Mr. Minguay for $4,200 was subject to a mortgage on a portion bought by him from Mr. David Ruthbridge ; the amount of which, $2,200, should be deducted from the $4,200. The amount I have mentioned is all the Government has received from the proceeds of the sale.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will agree not to proceed with the third reading until I have a little time to investigate it, I will raise no objection now. We had better fix the third reading for Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the hon. gentleman proposed this before, I called his attention to the fact that I thought it was the university funds that were about to be secured, and on further investigation I am inclined to think that they are funds belonging to the Indian Department, and that the university section of this indebtedness was written off a few years ago by the Government on the recommendation of a committee. I suppose the Government will consider its liability to the university for the investment which was made, and for the amount of money which was written off.

Mr. FOSTER. We will not raise that question now.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the Government expect to get now ?

Mr. FOSTER. Fifty per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it be 50 per cent it is quite clear that it will amount at the outside to only $1,000 if the Minguay claim be struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not struck out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is the contention of Mr. Minguay that it should be struck out, on the two-fold ground that there was a prior mortgage for $3,400 which, of course, he did not expect to pay, and secondly, that he did not get all the property that he thought he had purchased.

Mr. FOSTER. These are some caveats that he has put in.

Bill reported.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

Mr. DALY moved second reading of Bill (No. 135) further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories. He said : The first clause of this Bill is to provide that the North-west assembly may have power to create irrigation districts, and the next clause is to amend the Act as it now stands which provides that the assembly have not power to incorporate railway companies (not including street railway companies, transportation and steamboat and canal companies). What we do is to strike out " transportation," which it has been held includes baggage transfer companies and omnibus lines doing business between hotels and railway sta-

tions. The next clause is to provide that when a member of the local legislature resigns, he shall do so in a certain manner. At present there is no provision permitting a member of the legislative assembly to resign between the close of one session and the meeting of another. It appears that there are some candidates in the field for the Dominion Parliament who are members of the legislative assembly, and they cannot resign their seats in that body, while if they continue to be members of it their candidature may be attacked on that ground. This is to relieve them from that difficulty. The final clause is to give authority to the Lieutenant-Governor to appoint commissioners to inquire into certain matters affecting the legislative assembly—matters within the jurisdiction of the legislative assembly. It appears that some trouble has arisen in reference to the expenditure of certain moneys on roads and bridges, and the question has arisen whether there is authority under the present law to appoint a commission to make an inquiry into matters of that kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the expenditure is authorized by the legislature, surely the inquiry ought to be by a committee of the legislature, and not by a commission.

Mr. DALY. What the legislature wants is power to appoint a commission to make an investigation.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. McMULLEN. If this clause giving the Lieutenant-Governor power to appoint commissions is adopted, it will unquestionably lead to the expenditure of a great deal of money. Would it not be better to utilize the judges of that district to hold investigations ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The objection to the commission is not only to the cost ; it is altogether an objectionable principle. What would be thought of our giving the Governor General power to inquire into the expenditure of moneys voted by this House? Every legislative body is responsible for the expenditure of the money voted by itself, and inquiries into that expenditure should be made by itself. Commissions relate to the administration of public affairs under the jurisdiction of the executive Government. If any of the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches think that any of their subordinate officers do not discharge their duties properly, or expend improperly any moneys entrusted to their care, they appoint a commission. That commission is for the purpose of collecting information for the Government or for the particular Minister who is responsible for the conduct of the officer in question. An expenditure by order of Parliament stands upon an entirely different footing. The Government are themselves responsible to Parliament ; they are subordinate to the authority of Parliament ; and every inquiry that takes place with regard to the expenditure of money under the direction of those whom it is immediately entrusted by the House must be by Parliament itself. There is no other body which, under our system, without doing violence to that system, has a right to inquire into that expenditure. So, in the North-west Territories, the Lieutenant-Governor has no right to cause inquiry to be made concerning any matter in the jurisdiction of the legislative assembly. If the assembly were to recommend such action on his part, he might do it, although that would be a most unusual thing. Now, in England, on one occasion, so carefully have these principles been watched and followed, when certain charges were made against the conduct of parties in the Island of Ceylon, and it was suggested that a commission might issue for the purpose of inquiring into that matter, Parliament said no, we must appoint a parliamentary committee. We will appoint parties or a commission may be appointed for the purpose of inquiry, for our information—not for the purpose of dealing with the subject at all. If the place be so distant that a committee cannot actually inquire for bring witnesses before it, then the committee may suggest or, upon its recommendation, a commission may be issued for the purpose of obtaining information, not for the use of the Government, but for the use of the parliamentary committee appointed to inquire into these matters.

Mr. DALY. It should have been " the legislative assembly" instead of " the Lieutenant-Governor." I did not notice the mistake until the hon. gentleman began his speech.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a rational proposition, but you will have to recast the whole section.

Mr. DALY. I do not understand how the thing got mixed up in this way, and I move that the clause be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved second reading of Bill (No. 109) further to amend the Civil Service Act (from the Senate). He said :

There is authority under the Civil Service Act to proceed against those who may commit any offence against the examinations, and under the wording of the Act that has to be done under the Summary Convictions Act, which is superseded by the Criminal Code, and this substitutes the Criminal Code for the Summary Convictions Act.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. We give power to subpoena, but you do not make any provision to pay the expenses of those witnesses who have come from a distance.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The rules that regulate the ordinary courts will govern in this matter.

Committee reported; Bill read the third time and passed.

THE INDIAN ACT.

Mr. DALY moved second reading of Bill (No. 109) (from the Senate) further to amend the Indian Act. He said: The first clause repeals the law, as it now stands, with reference to the power of dealing with the leasing or selling of lands on a reserve. As the law stands, no reserve or portion of reserve can be sold or alienated unless surrendered to the Crown. That portion still remains, but under the law, as at present:

> The Superintendent General may lease, for the benefit of Indians engaged in occupations which interfere with their cultivating land not on the reserve, and of sick, infirm or aged Indians, and of widows and orphans, or neglected children, lands to which they are entitled, without the same being re-leased or surrendered.

What we do now is to make the terms of the law general and to provide that the Superintendent General may lease for the benefit of any Indian the land to which he is entitled without the same being re-leased or surrendered. In a number of cases, particularly in Ontario, Indians have engaged in other occupations and are fairly well off, and left the reserve, and under the law, as it at present stands, we are not in a position to lease these lands without the consent of the band. In a number of cases, the neighbours, through spite or pique, have used sufficient influence to prevent that being done. This Bill provides that the Superintendent General may lease these lands for the benefit of these Indians. This gives us no further power to alienate, but simply provides for the leasing of them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether this is intended to extend to land that has not been subdivided, and for which location tickets have not been issued?

Mr. DALY. No; nothing of that kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Under this the Government would not undertake to deal with timber limits or anything of that sort?

Mr. DALY. No; it has no relation whatever to that. The next is an amendment to section 70. Now, section 70 provides that moneys received from the sale of Indian lands or other property held in trust for the Indians, or from any timber on Indian land or reserves, or from any other source for the benefit of the Indians (with the exception of 10 per cent) shall be invested from time to time, and the money may be disposed of by the Governor General in Council in laying it out to cover the cost incidental to the management of the reserve, lands, property and moneys under the provisions of the Act, and for the construction and repair of roads passing through such reserves or lands, and by way of contribution to schools attended by such Indians. And what we seek to do by the amendment is to authorize the expenditure of the money for the construction or repair of roads, bridges, ditches and watercourses on such reserves and for the construction of schools, as well as by way of contribution to schools attended by such Indians. The present law, it will be seen, provides only for the contribution to schools and not for the building of them, and provides only for the making of roads and not for the making of bridges, ditches and watercourses.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It would be better to make it read "school-houses," rather than "schools."

Mr. DALY. In this we followed the language of the original Act. Perhaps the hon. gentleman's suggestion is a good one. When we get into committee, I will change that. The next clause provides for the amendment of the law in relation to the selection of chiefs. As the law now stands, no band may have more than six head chiefs and twelve second chiefs, but any band composed of 30 Indians may have one chief. What we propose is that any band containing 30 or more Indians shall be entitled to elect chiefs or headmen in the proportion of one for each 30 members; but no band shall have more than 15 chiefs or headmen. In addition to that the present law provides that the Governor General in Council may depose any chief for dishonesty, intemperance, immorality or incompetency, and that any chief deposed by the Governor in Council may be declared ineligible to hold the office of chief for three years. The present

law relates only to chiefs appointed by the band. We want to take the power to depose hereditary chiefs who are guilty of the offences mentioned here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where you have made a treaty with the Indians, and in the treaty you have provided that the chiefs shall receive a certain sum that amounts to a trifle more than is given to an ordinary Indian, if you undertake to carry out this Act, you may seriously interfere with existing rights.

Mr. DALY. All these original chiefs are dead now. This applies to Ontario and Quebec. There is no trouble of this kind in the North-west. I now come to the next amendment. As the law at present stands there is no provision under which an Indian who becomes enfranchised can be paid his share of the moneys of the band, unless the band takes action to enfranchise the whole band. The Indians who desire and are found qualified to be enfranchised, it is thought, should be given their share of the capital as well as the land of the band, and thus be removed from the guardianship of the department, and the law is being amended in this particular. We propose to strike out a portion of section 93 of the Act, so that the law shall read as follows :—

1. Whenever any member of a band, who, for three years immediately succeeding the date on which he was granted letters patent, or for any longer period that the Superintendent General deems necessary, by his exemplary good conduct and management of property proves that he is qualified to receive his share of the moneys of such band, the Governor in Council may, on the report of the Superintendent General to that effect, order that the said Indian be paid his share of the capital funds at the credit of the band, or his share of the principal of the annuities of the band, estimated as yielding five per cent, out of such moneys as are provided for the purpose by Parliament :

2. If such Indian is a married man he shall also be paid his wife's and minor unmarried children's shares of such funds and principal moneys, and if such Indian is a widow, she shall also be paid her minor unmarried children's shares :

3. The unmarried children of such married Indians who become of age during the probationary period, for payment of such moneys, if qualified by the character for integrity, morality and sobriety which they bear, shall receive their own share of such moneys, when their parents are paid ; and if not so qualified, before they receive payment of such moneys, they must themselves pass through the probationary period :

4. All such Indians and their unmarried minor children, who are paid their shares of the principal moneys of their band, as aforesaid, shall thenceforth cease, in every respect, to be Indians of any class within the meaning of this Act, or Indians within the meaning of any other Act or law.

In conjunction with that we must read section 93, which reads as follows :—

If any band, at a council summoned for the purpose according to their rules, and held in the presence of the Superintendent General, or an agent duly authorized by him to attend such council, decides to allow every member of the band who chooses, and who is found qualified, to become enfranchised and to receive his or her share of the principal moneys of the band, and sets apart for such member a suitable allotment of land for the purpose, any applicant belonging to such band, after such a decision, may be dealt with as provided in the foregoing provisions respecting enfranchisement, until his or her enfranchisement is attained.

And similar provisions as in the present Bill, are made regarding married men and widows. The effect of this is that the band may deal under clause 93 with Indians who come within the meaning of the clause I have read.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As I understand the clause, as the hon. gentleman explains it, it provides in effect that the Indian shall in every case receive a lump sum. But the Indian might wish to become enfranchised and still retain his portion of the reservation. For instance, take the Moravian reservation. That is divided up, I think, into lots of about 40 acres in extent, each head of a family being in possession of one of these 40-acre lots. If he becomes enfranchised, why not permit him to retain his lands ? In many cases, I think, it would be to their advantage if they were all put upon the emancipated lists under some restrictions.

Mr. DALY. This legislation is exactly in the line of the request made by several bands throughout Ontario. They seem quite satisfied.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose you emancipate a whole band.

Mr. DALY. If we did that, we hand them over all their money and their lands. The next amendment is in reference to the prohibition of the encouragement, either directly or indirectly, of the festivals or dances that are held, particularly by the Indians on the British Columbia coast—what they call potlatch. As the law now stands, it simply provides that any Indian or person who engages in, or assists in, celebrating the festival known as the potlatch, or Indian dance, is guilty of a misdemeanour, and liable to imprisonment. Now, we go so far as to provide that any person who engages in, or assists in, celebrating or encouraging, either directly or indirectly, another person to celebrate such festival or dance, shall be guilty. We are enlarging the law so as to meet several cases that have arisen where it appears that the Indians themselves were not responsible for getting up these dances, but outsiders encouraged them to do it. The last clause is in order to give Indian agents who are magistrates, power to try Indians for vagrancy, under part 15 of the code. As the law now stands, they only have power to deal with Indians under 13

of the code. What is done here is to insert after the word 13, in numerals, the words, "and 15 of the code"; and also to extend it to non-treaty Indians. As the law now stands, we can only deal with treaty Indians, and we propose to give authority to magistrates to deal with non-treaty Indians under clauses 13 and 15 of the code.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You cannot have agents for non-treaty Indians.

Mr. DALY. No, but in the immediate neighbourhood. For instance, where Indian agents are appointed by Order in Council, we give them a magisterial jurisdiction over certain territory, which does not necessarily include the territory within their agency, but extends it beyond. The words that are inserted, and which differ from the present law, are put in after the word "Indian," down about the fourth line from the bottom of the clause: "Non-treaty Indians, or non-treaty Indians which were in any way concerned in, or affected by, the offence." As to the next clause, it appears that certain transfers have been made from one band to another in Ontario. Complaints have been made by the Indians that the band from which an Indian withdrew has gained by his withdrawal, and that the band which he entered has lost their share of the interest money. What we provide for is that—

When by a majority vote of a band, or the council of a band, an Indian of one band is admitted into membership in another band, and his admission thereinto is assented to by the Superintendent General, such Indian shall cease to have any interest in the lands or moneys of the band of which he was formerly a member, and shall be entitled to share in the lands and moneys of the band to which he is so admitted; but the Superintendent General may cause to be deducted from the capital of the band of which such Indian was formerly a member his per capita share of such capital, and place the same to the credit of the capital of the band into membership in which he had been admitted in the manner aforesaid.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is right enough.

Mr. DALY. The last and final clause of the Bill is to provide that the Governor in Council may reduce the purchase money due, or to become due, on sales of Indian lands, or reduce or remit the interest on such purchase money. The reason of that is that some years ago sales were made of Indian lands, as high as $5 or $6 an acre, that were covered with bush at the time, and probably were not inspected by the purchasers, as we find has occurred in a number of instances that we have on record through the reports of our officers. These lands were nothing but rocks, or covered with timber of no value, and the purchasers have applied for aid in the way of reducing the price that they originally contracted to pay. The department has been going on dealing with them for a number of years, and the question was raised by the Department of Justice whether we had power to do it, and we seek legislation to give us the power, when it was established to the satisfaction of the Government that a reason exists, to remit certain of the purchase money so as to reduce the price.

Mr. MULOCK. At present what steps have you to take in order to sell Indian lands?

Mr. DALY. We take the valuation of the agent, and sell by private sale, the Indian lands on the reserves. So far as timber is concerned, we advertise. But in the reserves the lands are for sale at the upset price fixed by the valuation of the agent, and are sold on certain terms of payment. We are following the same rule that has obtained ever since confederation.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How far do you obtain the sanction of the Indian himself to this proceeding?

Mr. DALY. It is only on his application we do it. We would not attempt to do it otherwise.

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

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

After Recess.

INTERNATIONAL RADIAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the National Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

Mr. MASSON. When this Bill was under discussion before, we were discussing an amendment proposed by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle) requiring the company to commence the construction of all three of the roads within two years and to finish within five years, or otherwise the powers granted by the Act and by the Railway Act would be null and void. I understand from the hon. gentleman that that was not his intention, but that if any of the lines would commence within the two years that the powers with reference to that line would still remain in force. I understand that some members of this committee argue that that is the proper construction to be put upon the resolution. I do not think it is

necessary to occupy any time in discussing what the real meaning of the amendment is, but to my mind it is clear that if we do not commence each of the three lines within the two years, no matter if we had commenced and built quite a large proportion of the other two, notwithstanding the work done on one or more of the other lines, there would be room at least to argue, that there was a forfeiture of all. To accept a Bill in that shape would be to invite litigation at a very critical stage in the existence of any road; that is within the first three years of its obtaining a charter. The constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Boyle) is reached by one of these three lines, and I quite appreciate his contention that it is not desirable to have a large tract of country tied up, and that with the construction of a line commenced within two years, it might be five years before work was commenced on the other line. I propose to make clear that there shall be no forfeiture of work actually done on any one of the lines, and with that view, I move the following sub-amendment:—

If the construction of any of the lines mentioned in paragraphs a, b, and c, of section 3 of this Act, is not commenced and an amount equivalent to 5 per cent of the amount of the capital stock is not expended on each of the said lines, within three years after the passing of this Act; then the powers granted by the Railway Act, and by this Act, shall cease and be null and void, in respect to any of said lines not commenced, or on which an amount equivalent to 5 per cent of the capital stock has not been expended within the time limited; or if any of the said lines, or any portion thereof, is not finished and put in operation in five years from the passage of this Act; then the powers granted by the Railway Act, or by this Act, shall cease and be null and void in respect to so much of said railway as then remains uncompleted.

This amendment, I think, meets the view of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyle). The only alteration from his view, as expressed to the committee, is that we take three years instead of two. Now, two years to begin and seven years to finish, is the usual time-limit in charters granted by this Parliament. On account of the divergences of these lines they are spoken of as three railways, but it is not three railways. It is one railway, radiating, as its name implies, in three different directions from a common centre. Each of these lines are part and parcel of the whole scheme. They are not separate and distinct railways but they are different lines of the same railway. In asking us to commence each one of these different branches within the limited time, I think that we are entitled to at least one year more than the usual limit, especially when it is taken into consideration when we accept two years shortening of the time limited for completion. As I stated the other evening, I was surprised at the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment, as his amendment carried in the committee, reducing the time-limit for finishing from seven to five years, was what I then accepted. I think it is only fair to meet him as regards the time for the commencement of the three lines; but I would ask for three years instead of two, and that it should be made clear that the forfeiture will not extend to any portions of the work done, if 15 per cent of the whole capital stock is expended within the three years.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not at all agree with the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment, that it does not materially vary the amendment of the hon. member for Monck. The hon. member for Monck is unexpectedly called away, and he asked me to take charge of his amendment, if I concurred in it, as I do, and to press it. I do not think my hon. friend from North Grey has quite seized the objection of the hon. member for Monck, nor that of the committee, without the explanation I am about to make. There are virtually three charters, and the provision is that when the comapny starts one of the railroads, they shall have subscribed $200,000 of its capital stock, or such larger sum as is equal to $2,500 per mile of such section, and pay 10 per cent thereof into one of the chartered banks. Before commencing the construction of a second section of twenty miles, they shall do the same thing over again; and so in regard to each twenty miles. So that if my hon. friend gets the change he wishes to-night, it will lessen instead of strengthening the evidence of the company's good faith, as was the intention of the hon. member for Monck. If we allow the amendment of the hon. member for Monck to be so changed that if the company commence any one of the sections and pay 5 per cent instead of 15 per cent, as the Railway Act provides, that would be quite sufficient. The intention of the hon. member for Monck was that they should commence each of the three sections, that they should pay in 5 per cent on each instead of 15 per cent on one; so that the projectors would not have to pay in more in the two years than they would have to pay on any one section if they confined themselves to one, but to commence the whole three; because, as he puts it, they have three charters in one. The effect of the change proposed by the hon. member for North Grey would be that if the company commenced one section, and paid 5 per cent on one, and failed in regard to the others, either in commencing or otherwise, the forfeiture would only apply to those sections which they had not commenced upon at all; so that they could commence one section and spend 5 per cent upon it, not touch the others, and get the time extended for three years; and then the forfeiture would only apply to those sections which were not commenced at all. Instead of the company subscribing the capital stock for the construction of the whole line and branches, the com-

mittee allowed them to divide it into three branches. If they subscribed the whole amount of $600,000, and paid in 10 per cent of that, then they would have to expend, in three years, 15 per cent of the whole amount; so that the amendment of my hon. friend is actually lessening, instead of extending, as was the intention of the motion of the hon. member for Monck.

Mr. MASSON. As to the intention of the hon. member for Monck, I prefer taking his own statement made to me. When I pointed out to him the effects of his amendment, that if we built twenty miles on each of two roads, or forty miles on one, and none on the third, the fact that we had not started on the third would forfeit the whole thing. The hon. member for Monck was very emphatic in stating that he did not intend anything of the kind, and he was informed by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat that that construction could not be put upon it. However, the hon. member for South Norfolk understands the object of the motion of the hon. member for Monck far better than that hon. gentleman understood it himself. He understands it as I understood it, that it means a forfeiture. Now, we want to avoid the forfeiture. It is true, the privilege has been given to build in twenty-mile sections; but that is cumulative. We start with twenty miles, and with a proportionate amount of stock subscribed. We have to have 15 per cent of the whole, or 5 per cent on each—not on the $2,500 per mile, but on the whole capital stock. On the whole capital stock, 10 per cent must be paid in and 15 per cent expended within the time-limit on the $2,500 a mile, but, in addition, it is cumulative. That would not be sufficient, if it did not amount to 5 per cent on all other branches. Therefore, we have to have 5 per cent expended on each of the branches; we have to have $2,500 per mile on each twenty-mile section we build, whether on one, two or three of the branches, and, independent of that, we have to spend 5 per cent of the whole capital stock; so that, instead of lessening the expenditure, this amendment may largely increase this necessary expenditure. While it certainly differs from the resolution of the hon. member for Monck, it is within his meaning, and it enforces the commencement of each line within three years, or otherwise the lapsing of the line not commenced. That is all the hon. member for Monck asks for, that there should be a guarantee of a bona fide commencement of each of the lines within the time-limit, and the only difference between us is the question of three years or two years.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) would show a wise discretion in accepting the suggestion of the hon. member for Monck. This is really a street railway, and such railways all over the country are limited to one year to complete the roads for which they ask a franchise. Here this company are asking five years for a scheme which runs all over, and the hon. member for Monck does not want his section of country tied up for five years. Another thing to which I would call the attention of the Minister of Railways is clause 14. We have had an example in the Railway Committee of giving power in charters to convey, and here is a street railway getting power to convey itself to a steam railway, namely, the Canada Southern or the Canadian Pacific. This House should not give power to enable steam railways to absorb the street railways.

Mr. MASSON. Hon. gentlemen cannot make this a street or electric railway by simply calling it so. It is a steam railway in every sense of the word. It has branches 65 miles long, and there is no electric railway of that length.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the hon. member for East York is quite mistaken. We struck out the objectionable part, and the only power that is left in the Bill is under section 14. The company may enter into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Canada Southern Railway Company, or the New York Central. It was clause 15 which was objectionable.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Why should the big steam railways be allowed to absorb the street railways of this country?

Mr. TISDALE. They are not compelled to be electric railways. It was clause 15 which gave the immense power objected to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would like to ask the promoters, whether they have not power to build an electric railway?

Mr. MASSON. Any steam railway, under the Railway Act, has the some power.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is a good deal of play on words as to the meaning of the different amendments. But there cannot be any doubt about the amendment of the hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), which is simply that this company shall commence work, to some little extent, within two years. I must say that the members of this committee must agree that that is a very reasonable proposition. This is not an ordinary charter. It is a charter granted to build three railways starting from Hamilton, either electric or steam. What I want to impress on this committee is the fact that there are charters already granted covering the same ground, and the people holding these charters are making financial arrangements to go on with the work. These are provincial charters. I do not know any reason why this company should come here for incorporation, but as the committee has seen

fit to grant them this legislation, they ought to take into consideration the fact that, in addition to these railways now covering this ground, there are other charters for electric railways granted by the provinical legislature. There can be no injustice or hardship to this company in imposing this amendment upon them, because there can only be one of two objects that they have in view in getting the charter. They either propose to go on and do this work bona fide, or they propose to secure this charter for the purpose of selling it or making arrangements with the other companies now covering the ground. We ought to take into consideration the fact that almost every part of the country over which this charter runs is already covered by steam railways, and also the fact that there are charters granted by the provincial legislature to other companies covering the same ground. If this company intend to go on, it is but reasonable to insist that they should commence work within two years. This will, at any rate, give them two years to do what they expect to do under this charter. It would be unfair to the people of these districts, and to the companies which have already got charters, to give this company more than two years.

Mr. TISDALE. Just read the two clauses, and the committee can decide to take which they please.

Mr. MASSON. At the suggestion of the Minister of Railways, I will make my amendment read, two years.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). That does not meet the case; I prefer the hon. member for Monck's clause.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. member for Monck asked me to see that this matter was pressed. The only change he asked was to add after the words "so much," in the last line of the amendment, the words "to each."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In order to make it clear that if they start on one, they would not forfeit on the one they started, but only on the one they did not commence.

Mr. HAGGART. The Railway Act requires 15 per cent capital to be expended within two years. The hon. gentleman, in his amendment, as first proposed, wanted time extended to three years, and only 5 per cent expended on each of the lines. The effect of that might be that he might abandon two of the lines and only expend 5 per cent capital on one of them. He ought, if he intends to keep within the meaning of the Railway Act, and if two of the lines are abandoned, to expend 15 per cent capital on the third line, but he is not bound to do that by his amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the amendment. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) has amended his amendment to the amendment by substituting two years for three years.

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The proposal of the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) makes it very clear the committee will be willing to have it apply to each branch.

Mr. HAGGART. The object of the amendment of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) is to make it obligatory upon the promoters of the Bill to build these three sections. If they choose to build one and expend the whole of their capital upon it, their charter is forfeited.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The amendment in the hands of the hon. member for Lennox, I think, makes it clear that it is only upon those branches on which they do no work that they forfeit their rights. These three sections are wholly different lines. Under the Bill as at present, the company may build to Waterloo, and then hold their charter against the others and prevent others from building the other line.

Mr. MASSON. There is no doubt that the amendment referred to by the hon. member for Lennox—adding after the words "so much" the words "to each"—would meet my objection so far as completion is concerned. But I never pressed the objection as to completion; it is as to commencing the work. If we built forty miles on one line and twenty miles on the other, and nothing on the third, notwithstanding the amendment, our charter would be forfeited for not commencing. It is not the intention of the committee to put that penalty upon us.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Put in the words that will make it clear.

Mr. MASSON. I have, and you have voted them down. If such a forfeiture is insisted upon, I will withdraw the Bill.

Mr. TISDALE. If they took three charters instead of one, they would have been compelled to commence the whole three roads. But if they see fit they have only one charter, they should take as a penalty the same responsibilities as we usually impose. If they had three charters they would have to spend not only 5 per cent but 15 per cent within three years. Under this Bill they have the privilege of building one, two or three roads.

Mr. EDGAR. It is reasonable enough, if there are practically three charters, that they should be obliged to build or forfeit their charter for those lines that they do not build. But I do not think that the amendment would have that effect. It seems to me we all mean the same thing, and the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Mas-

son) ought to be able to draft a form of words which would meet the views of the committee.

Mr. HAGGART. But the difficulty is that the views of the two gentlemen are distinctly opposite. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) insists that the forfeiture for not building shall be the whole charter, while the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) insists that the forfeiture shall be only as regards those parts of the road not built.

Mr. TISDALE. I am willing to agree to this: There are, as I contend, virtually three charters in one, so instead of subscribing $200,000 and paying up 10 per cent, let them subscribe $600,000 and pay up 10 per cent. My objection now is the same as in the Committee on Railways, though, as chairman, I said very little. The usual way is to grant a charter for so many miles, branches and main line, and to make it conditional that a capital stock shall be subscribed commensurate with the size of the undertaking, a certain percentage to be paid up. Let the same be done in this case, and my objection would be met. He could then commence within three years and build within five years. If he will insist upon having three little subscriptions, let it not be done in this unusual way, but let him take the responsibility of the three charters. If he is bona fide in earnest in desiring to build the three roads, let him commence the three. This is only a way to get over the ordinary rules of our committee, so as to allow the company to subscribe a little capital to build one small piece, and then a little more to build a little more, while holding the territory so that nobody else can build. I say this is a most objectionable thing, and a particularly objectionable precedent—for there is no precedent for it in any railway charter ever passed by this House so far as I can discover. That it is that gave me the opinion that this is a speculative charter, and that it is only a way of covering a portion of the country for railway building by a puny subscription, and a still more puny payment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has seemed to me from the very first that the promoters of this Bill should have gone to the local legislature instead of coming to this Parliament. All I can say is that if this company comes to this Parliament and asks for this concession and have had it granted to them, they ought not to object if Parliament inserts such conditions as shall ensure the bona fide carrying out of the work. It is all nonsense to give these concessions and treat them as speculative charters which they can sell, or dispose of, or alter, or operate in any way to the detriment of the general public. I suppose this Parliament grants these concessions because they are convinced that the parties are actually going to build the road. If they do not intend to build the road, why do they come here and ask for this concession? If they do intend to build the road, I take it that they have made arrangements which will ensure the carrying out of the undertaking. If they only get the charters in order that they may sell them afterwards, this Parliament ought not to be a party to the speculation. I do not think the amendment has anything objectionable in it. We have to look to the interests of the public. There is too much of a desire to look to what the promoters wish. I do not care what the hon. members intention was in promoting the Bill; I look at this resolution, and it commends itself to my mind. I think it is in the interest of the public, and it is a fair one. If these gentlemen who are promoting the road do intend to build it, then they ought not to object to the condition which is in the amendment.

Mr. EDGAR. I think it is a pity there should be a misunderstanding about this matter, as there evidently is. The committee propose to give this railway company, rightly or wrongly, a right to build this road in three sections, and it has been proposed that 5 per cent of their capital should be expended on each section within two years, or else the powers as to that section, I take it, shall be forfeited. Supposing the company had gone on and half finished two of these sections, and had not commenced the other, and chose to abandon it, that surely ought not to take away their powers as to the completion of the remainder of those sections on which they had spent perhaps half their money. I think that would be the effect, as I understand it, of the amendment of the hon. member for Monck, as it is worded. I do not think they intend that should be the effect. But I admit it is almost impossible to criticise and correctly draw amendments to a Bill in Committee of the Whole. I think if the hon. member will allow it to rest, that we may try and get a clause into proper shape so that we will know what we are doing, it would save much trouble.

Mr. MASSON. I will not say I was surprised of the result of the other motion, because I am clear that the forfeiture was only understood to apply to the one line. That was voted down, and the only distinction between these two motions now is that the forfeiture shall only be on the uncommenced portions. I know that the hon. member for Monck personally disavows such an intention, but whether such is the interpretation or not, the clause is open to that interpretation. It would be very unsafe to take a charter with such a doubt. If the hon. member will change the word "each" to "any" in the first line of his amendment, I will consent to make it 15 per cent of the amount of

the capital stock, that is, $10,500; and provided also he strikes out the word "each" in the fourth line. The amendment will then read as follows:—

If the construction of any of the lines mentioned in paragraphs a, b and c, section 3 of this Act, is not commenced, and an amount equivalent to 15 per cent of the capital stock is not expended within two years after the passing of this Act, or if each of the said railways is not finished and put in operation in five years from the passing of this Act, then the powers granted by this Act shall cease and be null and void, as respects so much of each of said railways as then remains uncompleted.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think we can make a patchwork of these intricate resolutions with any satisfaction. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to let the committee rise, and, I think, we are pretty well agreed now what we want to do, and a few of us could get together and do it.

Mr. MASSON. I think I have now arrived at what will meet the case, and it is this:

If the construction of any of the lines mentioned in paragraphs a, b and c, of section 3 of this Act is not commenced, and an amount equivalent to 15 per cent of the amount of the capital stock is not expended within two years after the passing of this Act, then the powers granted by the Railway Act, and by this Act, shall cease and be null and void, in respect to any of the said lines not commenced.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In other words, we take no guarantee that they are going bona fide to construct these lines at all.

Mr. MASSON. We are taking the whole 15 per cent. The amendment will conclude:

Or if any of the said lines, or any portion thereof, is not finished and put in operation in five years from the passing of this Act, then the powers granted by the Railway Act, or by this Act, shall cease and be null and void, in respect to so much of the said railway as then remains uncompleted.

Mr. EDGAR. Is the Minister of Railways satisfied with that?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not understand whether that means 15 per cent of the whole capital of the road, or only 15 per cent of the particular line.

Mr. MASSON. Fifteen per cent of the whole.

Mr. TISDALE. Put in "of the whole capital stock." That would make it clear.

Mr. MASSON. It will now read "15 per cent of the whole amount of the capital stock."

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 132) to revive and amend the Acts to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. Martin.)

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Metcalfe.)

Bill (No. 117) respecting "La Chambre de Commerce du district de Montréal.—(Mr. Lépine.)

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

RELIEF OF JULIA ETHEL CHUTE.

Mr. TAYLOR moved second reading of Bill (No. 139) for the relief of Julia Ethel Chute.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). In voting for the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of giving notice that if I am in the House next session, I intend to introduce a Bill giving the Dominion Court of Exchequer jurisdiction in divorce cases, on the lines, and for the same causes as obtain in the English Courts of Divorce.

Bill read the second time on a division.

SUPPLY—THE FISHERIES OF THE GREAT LAKES.

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

Mr. ALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to the fishery interests of the Great Lakes, and to say a few words respecting the fishery policy of the Government. You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that I brought this question before the House at the last session of Parliament. On that occasion my time before six o'clock was very limited, and, being unable to be present after recess, I was prevented from entering into the discussion of the subject as fully as I intended. The then Minister of Marine and Fisheries followed in a very lengthy speech, giving an elaborate review and defence of his so-called fishery policy. The hon. gentleman was evidently very proud of that great effort, for his speech was put in pamphlet form and widely distributed throughout the fishery districts. I am very glad that he did so, because his defence was simply no defence at all, and the people were enabled to see that there is practically no justification whatever for the extraordinary and ruinous fishery policy of this Government.

The hon. gentleman's speech was a very characteristic one—slightly tinged with extravagance in tone and a trifle reckless in statement. In fact, all the important statements made by the hon. gentleman

were utterly without foundation. The most important statement he made was that our fisheries had been depleted, which he ascribed to overfishing in Canadian waters. If that statement were true, it would remove, to a very great extent, the ground of complaint against this fishery policy, made not only to-day, but for years past. The charge has been that Canadians were not permitted to fish—that they were not permitted to enjoy the profits of the vast trade that has been carried on for many years in the Lake Erie fisheries. Overfishing! Why, Sir, the statement is absurd. An examination of the statistics bearing on this subject will conclusively prove that. When we look at the comparative catch on both sides of the lake, what do we find? That in twenty years the American fishermen have caught, on the American side of Lake Erie, not less than 800,000,000 pounds of fish more than have been caught on the Canadian side. Hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia can comprehend the magnitude of these figures. Why, Sir, it would take the entire catch of the 24,000 fishermen of Nova Scotia for eight years to make up this excess. The annual catch in Lake Erie on the American side has been double the entire Canadian catch of fish in the whole chain of lakes—Lake Superior, Lake St. Clair, Lake Huron, Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. The American fishermen have caught eight fish to our one, and this has been going on continuously ever since 1870, and in fact in all the past years of which we have any record. The people have protested against this policy for years. Year by year they have been pointing to the fact that, owing to the policy of the Department of Fisheries, a vast and profitable trade has been thrown almost entirely into the hands of the American people. And yet the Minister of Justice could have the assurance to get up in this House and state that our fisheries in Lake Erie have been depleted from overfishing. He declared that no member from the Lake Erie district would rise in his place in this House and state that the Lake Erie fisheries on both sides have withstood successfully the onslaught made year by year upon them. There have been no onslaughts, there has been no overfishing, on the Canadian side of Lake Erie. The very fact that the Americans have caught this great quantity in excess of the Canadian catch, and are continuing to the present day to catch yearly from 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 pounds in excess of the Canadian catch, amply proves the statement I have made. Now, Sir, if the Americans did not take a single fish out of Lake Erie, they are ahead of us one hundred years in the catch of the last twenty years; that is, it would take the Canadian fishermen 100 years to make good the excess of the fish caught on the American side in the last 20 years. And yet the Minister of Justice tells the House and the country that there has been overfishing on our side. Our fisheries are as good as theirs; they are said to be better. In the great waters that divide the two countries we have an equal interest; but if we examine the statistics bearing on the subject—and it is necessary to do so in order to obtain an intelligent view of the whole matter—the figures will show that in the production of the fisheries, Canada has had a very unequal share.

This is very apparent from an examination of the figures in relation to the different lakes. Take Lake Erie. The catch on both sides of Lake Erie in the years 1880, 1885, and 1889, which are years for which we can compare our figures with those furnished by the United States census, are as follows:—

	Canada. Lbs.	U.S. Lbs.
1880	2,008,600	29,087,300
1885	7,654,727	51,456,517
1889	9,625,754	63,557,332
Totals	19,289,081	144,101,149

The average catch in these three years was: In Canada, 6,429,694 pounds; and in the United States, 48,033,716 pounds; or nearly eight times greater than the average catch in Canada. Taking the average catch for these three years as a basis, the total catch for the ten years from 1880 to 1889, inclusive, was as follows:—

	Lbs.
Canada	64,296,940
United States	480,033,716
Excess in favour of the United States for the ten years	415,736,776

The excess in value, according to the values used by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, would be about $20,000,000. The Americans caught more fish in Lake Erie in ten years than Canada will catch in seventy years under this one-sided policy of the Government. And, Sir, in the presence of such figures as these, which are taken from the blue-books, we have the hon. Minister of Justice making this statement in the House last year:

> All this talk about the fishery statistics of United States ports on Lake Erie is nothing but talk, because I have given evidence to show that fisheries in Lake Erie, where people have been allowed to fish ab libitum, unrestricted by Government interference, are already a thing of the past; and when the hon. gentleman reads these statistics, I will tell him how they are made, and I will give him good authority. These statistics are made up of Canadian fish. These fisheries have assumed enormous importance since the passage of the McKinley Bill, and with what result? The hon. gentleman has told us in part. He has told us that our fisheries are largely in the hands of the United States fish-dealers in Buffalo and elsewhere, owing largely to circumstances over which we have had practically no control.

Now, this is a remarkable statement. The

actual figures show that the excess in ten years is over 400,000,000 pounds, and the figures I gave the House on that occasion were figures existing before the passage and operation of the McKinley Bill; and if we allowed every pound of fish to be entered, as the hon. gentleman said some tons of fish were shipped to the United States and entered, it would have very slight effect upon the figures I have given. Our catch is only 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 pounds; their catch is 60,000,000 pounds, and the hon. gentleman gets up in this House and coolly tells the Parliament and people of Canada that the statistics relating to the exports of fish are made up now by our fish entered under the McKinley Bill. Why, the extravagance of the statement of the hon. gentleman is really surprising. It is difficult to understand how a Minister of the Crown can get up and make such statements.

But there is a more serious aspect still in the statements of the blue-books of the country. Year after year we have found similar statements made with reference to our fisheries, and made, no doubt, under the authority of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In the blue-books of this country, in the face of these figures which are actual figures, an attempt is made to show that the contention that the Americans are getting an advantage in respect of the lake fisheries is simply a contention without basis. I notice in the blue-books of 1890, 1891 and 1893 these false comparisons are made. I would like to ask the hon. Minister how he can justify statements made up by comparisons such as the following. He will put down American herrings at about 1 cent a pound and herrings caught upon the Canadian side at 3 cents a pound. Canadian whitefish he enters at 8 cents a pound, and American whitefish, which is caught in the same waters and is really worth more, because it is right in the market where the fish are sold, he deliberately puts down at one-third of the value, and in this way statistics relative to our fisheries have been made up from year to year. That there may be no misrepresentation in reference to this matter, I will just read what appears in the blue-books, and I find that similar statements have appeared in the different blue-books for three or four successive years.

Catch of fish on both sides of the Great Lakes in the years 1880, 1885 and 1889.

Year.	Quantity.	Value.*
1880.	Lbs.	$
Canada	11,473,000	416,791
United States	45,600,000	984,500
1885.		
Canada	27,378,180	1,268,551
United States	76,423,728	1,813,078
1889.		
Canada	29,198,359	1,816,462
United States	91,076,624	1,827,248

* According to report of Department of Marine and Fisheries for 1891.

I wish to direct the attention of the House to the manner in which these statistics are made up. In 1880 the entire catch on the Canadian side of the lakes was 11,473,000 pounds of fish, the value of which, according to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, was $416,791. The entire catch on the American side of the lake was 45,600,000 pounds, and the value, according to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, was $984,500. In 1885, the Canadian catch was 27,378,150 pounds, valued at $1,268,551, and the United States catch was 76,423,728 pounds, valued at $1,813,078. In 1889, the Canadian catch was 29,198,359 pounds, valued at $1,816,462, and the United States catch was 91,076,624 pounds, valued at $1,827,214. Now, Sir, in 1880, 11,000,000 pounds of Canadian fish was valued at about half as much as 45,000,000 pounds of the same kind of fish caught on the other side of the lake. In 1885, 27,000,000 pounds of Canadian fish was valued at two-thirds as much as 76,000,000 pounds of American fish; and in 1889, 29,000,000 pounds of Canadian fish were valued at nearly the same figures as 91,000,000 pounds of American fish, or within $10,000 of the amount.

These are extraordinary figures. I called the attention of hon. gentlemen to them at the last session of Parliament. The hon. gentleman may make any sort of statement to the House, I suppose, but there is no way of preventing him doing that sort of thing, but here are the blue-books of Canada cooked for a special purpose, and designedly cooked, because these misrepresentations appear in one blue-book after another. I would like to know how the hon. gentleman will explain putting down herrings at 3 cents a pound, when they are valued in the United States at 1 cent a pound, and whitefish at 8 cents, when the wholesale price in the market is $4, or not more than 4½ cents; trout at 10 cents, when the wholesale price is $4. Evidently the statistics bearing upon the fisheries question are made up in this way in order to make a favourable showing, and American fish are valued at one-third less than Canadian fish.

Now, I have alluded to the Lake Erie fisheries. Fully one-half of this enormous business in the fisheries is carried on almost opposite the county of Essex. But the hon. gentleman alluded to that as a trifling matter and a mere bagatelle. He said :

In order to put the matter in its strongest light, as I have said, the hon. gentleman dwelt upon a comparatively small strip of water, where a very few men have been engaged in the fishing business. The amount is a mere bagatelle. That is their strong point, and they bring that up as an evidence of the hardship of the case. I meet them by saying, that although the subject came up earlier in the session and we are now in June, yet I have to learn the name of one solitary individual who has been ruined or injured by the enforcement of a necessary and wholesome regulation.

This is another of the hon. gentleman's very extravagant statements. He has yet to learn that one solitary person has been injured by the wholesome and necessary regulations. Well, the statement is somewhat involved. If the regulations were wholesome and necessary, perhaps no fishermen would be injured, but as a matter of fact every single regulation in connection with our fisheries has hampered and injured our fishermen. The hon. gentleman has reduced the gill-net. It will take about as many men to fish with the one pound-net as with ten pound-nets, yet his policy is only to allow one pound-net to our fishermen. The result is that they are handicapped and cannot fish to advantage. Four men can fish ten pound-nets. Here is one of the regulations by which the fishermen are injured. Then again in reference to gill-nets. The department has reduced the allowance of gill-net to one boat to 6,000 yards. The hon. Minister must know that this regulation is violated. It is violated, I suppose, in 75 per cent of cases. The fishermen do not pretend to live up to it. The allowance of gill-netting for tugs was cut down to 12,000 yards ; and, Sir, it is well known that the tugs are using two or three times that quantity. I suppose the hon. Minister knows that. Here, then, is a regulation that is being violated all over the lakes. Recently a challenge was issued to the department to deny this. I refer to an article published in the Toronto "News" on the subject of "Fishery Frauds," which I will read :

Editor "News."—Having long been a supporter of the Conservative party, and occupying a somewhat prominent position in the councils of the party, I feel it my duty to warn the Fisheries Department that the carrying out of the present scheme to secure support for that party during the coming elections will compel all lovers of liberty, of whatever political persuasion, to unite in hurling from power a Government that seems determined to eradicate from this country the last vestige of British liberty and fair-play, and reduce an important class of our people to a position of political servitude unknown in any other portion of the British Empire.

Now, Mr. Editor, I will lay before your readers as briefly as possible an outline of the scheme referred to, and challenge the Minister of Fisheries to deny its correctness. Should he deny it, my object will be accomplished, as it will tend to show that the present programme will be abandoned. According to the present law, all holders of gill-net licenses are allowed to use for sailing boats 6,000 yards of net, and for tugs 12,000 yards. This amount is admitted by all parties to be absurdly small and insufficient to pay running expenses, and yet the department has steadily refused to alter or amend the law, though repeatedly urged to do so.

And for why ? Simply because they are determined to keep the fishermen at their mercy, subject to their dictation. Now, it is a fact that cannot be denied, that there is not a fisherman on Lake Huron, or Georgian Bay, but what is using more than four times the amount of net allowed by law. Will the Fisheries Department dare deny this ? I presume not, nor dare they deny that fishery overseers and Conservative politicians have advised fishermen to ignore the law and use all the nets they please, urging them to show their gratitude in return in supporting the rule of the present Dominion Government.

And so on. But what I wanted to show is that it is a matter of notoriety that considerably more netting is used than is allowed by the regulations of the department. I have talked with many practical fishermen and they tell me that it is simply impossible to carry on their business with the amount of netting now allowed by the department ; they would simply have to quit the gill-net fishing business if they are to be compelled to fish in that way.

I have already referred to the injurious effects of the regulation respecting pound-nets. Right opposite the county of Essex, where our men are refused more than one net except in a few privileged cases, there are as many as 33 pound-nets in a string. This involves a great hardship. I brought one special case to the notice of the Minister myself, the Black case. A poor fisherman had prepared for a second pound-net upon some promise of the fishery overseer, and had gone to an expense, I think he said, of $300 or $400, which is a considerable amount for a fisherman—but afterwards was refused the additional license. I visited the department several times, and represented this matter to the hon. Minister, and it was a long time before he would grant the second pound-net even under these circumstances. It was only after affidavits had been produced to show that the promise had been made that the second pound-net was granted to this man Black, and that in the waters immediately opposite the county of Essex, there are as many as from 20 to 33 nets in a string, that the application was granted.

The lake opposite, I may say, is completely encompassed with nets. It is said there is as much as 700 miles of netting on the American side of Lake Erie, and this practically in the same waters as our own, because if a fish is not caught on one side it will be caught on the other. And yet even under these circumstances, we find the Minister hesitating and haggling with this

poor fisherman and throwing him out of nearly a summer's work before granting him a second pound-net.

Another grievance, Mr. Speaker, is in reference to the licenses. A fee of $50 is charged for a single pound-net. Thirty-two men could fish 80 pound-nets, and on the present basis, thirty-two men would be paying more license fee than is paid by the 24,000 fishermen of Nova Scotia. I would not go so far as to say that we should do away with all license fees. I would not go so far as to take the fisheries entirely out of Government control, yet the present system of patrolling the lakes, costing, as it does, over $20,000 annually, is a very expensive system.

Another favourite theory of the hon. gentlemen and his professors is that fish remain in Canadian waters, and that this policy of restriction is in the interest of Canadian fishermen and of the people of Canada. If that was so, if the fish was here for Canadians, there would be some justification for the policy. But I would ask the hon. gentleman, where this 800 million pounds of fish is to be found to equal the excess of the catch of American fishermen in the last 20 years. Why, Sir, if that theory was correct that Canadian fish remained in Canadian waters, and that the 800 million pounds of fish remained here, the Canadian waters would teem with fish, would be fairly alive with fish, there would be no depletion of our fisheries. That is a complete answer to the statement and argument of the hon. gentleman.

Now, another point is in reference to the whitefishery. The hon. gentleman said in his speech:

> What was the staple fishery of Lake Erie only a few years ago? It was the whitefish fishery. It was the whitefish that was turned over in the American market, it was the whitefish that brought gold to the fishermen on both sides of the lake. That is a superior fish, and a fish of great value. But there is no whitefish fishery on Lake Erie to-day.

That statement is confirmed by the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for this year, containing a report by the captain of the "Petrel" that there is practically no whitefish in Lake Erie to-day. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman where our whitefish have gone? It is said that they breed in our waters, that they are to be found in greater quantities on the Canadian side, and yet we are told there is no whitefish in Lake Erie to-day. The hon. gentleman was oblivious of the fact that this was an answer to his own contention that Canadian fish remained in Canadian waters. I will tell him where the whitefish have gone. I will show by figures that the American people have been catching an excess in whitefish quite as great as that in the other fish. As will be seen by the following table:—

Quantity of whitefish caught on both sides of Lake Erie in the following years:—

	Canada. Lbs.	U.S. Lbs.
1880	205,600	3,233,800
1885	186,080	3,531,855
1889	306,213	3,323,772
Totals.....	697,893	10,189,427

These figures show that the American catch on Lake Erie alone, in the single article of whitefish, is about 13 times greater than that taken by our own fishermen. In 10 years, from 1880 to 1889, taking the years mentioned as a basis of calculation, the figures would be: Canada, 2,326,310 pounds; United States, 30,631,420 pounds. Value: Canada, $189,104; United States, $2,450,530. If the Americans did not take another whitefish out of Lake Erie at the rate our fishermen have been permitted to operate, it would require 130 years' fishing on our part to catch up with the fishing on the other side of the Lake for the ten years 1880 to 1890. Now, I would like to ask where the whitefish are, if they do not cross the lake? It is quite evident from these figures that the whitefish in Lake Erie have been caught by the American fishermen, and that there has not been any overfishing on our side of the lake. The hon. gentleman, speaking of the fisheries on the other side, says:

> Ruin all round meets them and stares them in the face. I have the official evidence that their capital is moving west, that six or seven hundred thousand dollars in cold cash had been lost in the fishery up to the last season, and that those remaining in the business were endeavouring to save themselves from absolute ruin by moving on to Lake Superior, and even further west, to the Lake of the Woods.

Why, Sir, there is no doubt that American fishermen are moving on to Lake Superior and the Lake of the Woods; and if we go into the figures relating to those lakes, we will find, relatively, perhaps, not as great a difference, yet a very great difference in every one of those lakes as against the Canadian catch. Now, Sir, as against this opinion of the depletion of the Lake Erie fisheries on the other side, I will just read a short extract from the New York "Sun":

> In none of the other great lakes do the conditions for fish seem to be so favourable as in Lake Erie. This is due in a great measure, fish culturists think, to the variations in the depth which are peculiar to that lake. The western end is shallow, and thus provides vast areas for spawning grounds. The deep water at the eastern end is an almost boundless retreat for the half-grown young. The line between deep and shallow water seems to be drawn at Cleveland, for west of that city the water is not more than 60 feet deep anywhere, and the average depth will, perhaps, fall below 40.

Sir, we have only to turn up the reports bearing upon the fisheries of Lake Erie, to

find that the fisheries, even on that side of the lake where this enormous fishing has been going on, are not in the frightful state depicted by the hon. gentlemen themselves. In 1893, an American fisheries commission reported as follows on the condition of the Lake Erie fisheries :—

Although ranking fourth in area, this lake contains a fishing industry of vast extent and of much greater importance than that of all the other lakes combined, omitting Lake Michigan, which it surpasses by 36 per cent in fishing population, 49 per cent in invested capital, 60 per cent in the quantity of fish taken, and 17 per cent in the value of the catch. The fisheries of Lake Erie are thought to be more important than those of any other body of fresh water in the world, and there are few, if any, lakes which have afforded such a history of prolificness of fish life in proportion to their size. To illustrate the relative productiveness of the American waters of this lake, it may be noticed that the average value of the catch per square mile of lake surface is only $200, while in no other lake of this system is the average more than $50, and in three of them is much less.

The hon. gentleman says again :

Our American neighbours, both official and unofficial, have met to deplore the rapid depletion of this great fishery and the decadence of this great industry. They have met in both on their own side of the line and on this side to take counsel with their Canadian neighbours, having in view the great and to some extent the common interest. It is a notorious, and it is an exceedingly sad fact, that that is the condition of the Lake Erie fishery to-day. But there is more than this, Mr. Speaker, and it is to this point that I call the particular attention, and upon this I ask for the support of the House. The policy that, in spite of many difficulties, difficulties that it would be impossible for me to exaggerate, I have endeavoured to uphold, is that of insisting on a rigid observance of the regulations—which I believe to be necessary regulations—found in the Canadian Orders in Council governing Canadian waters of that lake and region. While there has been a diminution in the fishery, while the fish have fallen off on our side, we have not yet reached anything like the condition of our neighbours.

Let us now see how the American people feel on this question, and whether they are alarmed to the extent stated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ? We find a report from Lansing in the Evening "News," of 1895, as follows :—

The hopes of the state fish commission, and many others, who believe that the great lakes are being depleted of whitefish, that the present legislature would enact some protective laws, have gone glimmering. A Bill to make November a closed season was discussed for an hour and a half in committee of the whole yesterday afternoon, and then killed. The chief argument against it was, that no other state bordering on the lakes has a closed season, and until they do make one it is unfair to stop the business of Michigan fishermen at any season of the year.

That is the position they take in Michigan. They take a similar position in the state of Ohio. These are the states that are almost in proximity to our own border, and where there is not the slightest doubt that if fish are not caught on the one side they are caught on the other. I would ask the Minister, if he still holds the same view on this question, to send Professor Prince to the shore of the county of Essex, and he will find in large quantities, German carpe, a fish placed in American waters some years ago. This is a deep-water fish. They have been coming on the shores of Essex for the purpose of spawning, and so thick are they that people have come down to the lake at night, and the press of the county has called attention to the wholesale slaughter and destruction of these fish. This is positive proof that the fish go from one side to the other. Here is an additional proof, that our whitefish are caught by the Americans on the other side of the lake. The same remark applies to the depletion of our fisheries if they are in the condition the Minister alleges, because, during the last thirty years, probably not less than 100,000,000 pounds, approximately, of fish have been taken by the Americans out of Lake Erie more than have been caught by the Canadians. It would take the fishermen of Nova Scotia twelve years, that is, employing the whole 24,000 fishermen of that province, to make up a quantity equal to that to which I have alluded as having been taken by the Americans out of Lake Erie during the last 30 years in excess of the Canadian catch.

The hon. Minister mentioned that we took narrow ground, that we confine our arguments and remarks to the shore of Lake Erie. The effects of this policy can be seen almost everywhere. The American fishermen are no doubt moving west to Lake Superior and the Lake of the Woods. I venture to say that from Lake Champlain to the Lake of the Woods, in all international waters, the Americans, through the stupid policy of our Government, are securing a great advantage over the Canadian fishermen. While our people are prevented from fishing, or only allowed to fish to a very limited extent, the Americans are reaping vast profits from an enormous trade. The figures relating to Lake Superior will bear out this statement. No doubt in that great inland sea the regulations of the Fishery Department are less damaging, and probably far fewer fish cross the lake than in some of the other lakes to which I have referred, but, nevertheless, we find that the American people on that lake are doing nearly all the business and are catching the greater part of the fish. Taking the years 1880, 1885, 1889, as the basis of calculation of the catch and value of whitefish on both sides of Lake Superior for ten years, from 1880 to 1889, inclusive, I find the yearly average to be : Canada, 618,720

lbs., value, $49,497; United States, 3,575,835 lbs., value, $286,053; and for the ten years named, in whitefish alone on Lake Superior there was nearly thirty million pounds excess, and in value, about $2,300,000 excess in actual figures for the years named are as follows:—

YIELD and Value of Whitefish caught on both sides of Lake Superior—1880, 1885, 1889.

—	Canada.	United States.	Cents.	TOTAL VALUE.	
				Canada.	United States.
1880	354,000	2,257,000	8	$28,320 00	$180,560 00
1885	606,160	4,571,947	8	48,492 00	365,755 00
1889	896,000	3,898,558	8	71,680 00	311,814 00
Total for three years	1,856,160	3,578,835		$49,497 00	$286,053 00

On that basis, for ten years at the same price per pound, as used by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, actual figures are:—Canada, 6,187,200 lbs.; United States, 35,758,350 lbs. Total value: Canada, $494,970; United States, $2,860,530.

It would take fifty-seven years fishing at the rate our men have been permitted to fish to equal the catch of whitefish on Lake Superior by the Americans in the ten years from 1880 to 1889, including 1889.

TROUT caught on both sides of Lake Superior in the Years 1880–1885–1887.

—	Canada.	United States.		TOTAL VALUE.	
				Canada.	United States.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Rate.	$	$
1880	312,800	1,464,750	10 cts.	31,280	146,475
1885	911,570	3,488,177	"	91,157	348,817
1889	1,020,500	3,366,724	"	102,050	336,672
	2,244,870	8,319,651	.....	224,487	831,964
Average yearly catch of trout on Lake Superior on both sides of the lakes	748,290	2,773,217	.....	74,829	277,321
Catch of trout in Lake Superior in ten years, 1880 to 1889, inclusive	7,482,900	27,732,170	...	748,290	2,732,170

CATCH of Whitefish and Trout on both sides of Lake Superior in ten Years, 1880 to 1889, inclusive, taking as a basis of calculation the average for Years 1880, 1885 and 1889.

—	Canada.	United States.		TOTAL VALUE.	
				Canada.	United States.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Rate.	$	$
Whitefish	6,187,200	35,758,350	8 cts.	494,970	2,860,530
Trout	7,482,900	27,732,170	10 cts.	748,290	2,732,170
	13,670,100	63,490,520	.....	1,243,260	5,592,700

Loss to Canadians in ten years 50,000,000 pounds whitefish and trout and over $4,000,000.

Mr. ALLAN.

Using the figures furnished by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, there was in this one lake alone, a loss of $4,000,000 in ten years. According to that one-sided fishery arrangement, it would take 48 years fishing on the Canadian side, to equal ten years fishing on the United States side of Lake Superior. Wherever you go, if you go further west to the Lake of the Woods, the American people are permitted to fish as the Minister says ad libitum. They are catching the fish while our Canadian people there and along the shores of the county of Essex, in the fishery districts of Lake Erie, have been prevented from taking their fair share of fish.

The hon. gentleman has stated that there is no man from the Lake Erie district in this House who can rise in his place, and say that he really believes that the Lake Erie fisheries are now in as good condition as they were on account of the onslaught made on them from year to year by the fishermen on either side of the lake. I have given the figures which conclusively prove there has been no extraordinary onslaught. I would like the hon. gentleman when he makes a statement of that kind to support it by statistics. Why, Sir, if the proper figures could be got at, they would show that we should have no less than 100,000,000 pounds of fish on our side of the lake to equal the excess of American catch since 1870, and it would take the entire catch of Nova Scotia ten or twelve years to make up the excess that the American fishermen have taken out of Lake Erie in the last thirty years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. ALLAN. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but these are figures that he can get from the Canadian blue-books, and from the census returns of the United States.

We have heard a good deal about some sort of reciprocal arrangement for a great many years. The hon. gentleman told us that it was the policy of the Government in 1870, twenty-five years ago, and that it was also the policy of Mr. Mackenzie's Government. There might be some justification for a Government in power 20 or 25 years ago to try and preserve our fisheries by making certain regulations—although I believe the regulations we have in force are entirely too severe—and to keep these regulations in force expecting to make some arrangement with the American people. But every year this Government has utterly failed to do that, and the American people believe that the policy pursued by the Canadian Government is an erroneous and expensive policy. So long ago as 21st March, 1873, I find the following in the American Commissioner's Report :—

> The Canadian laws are sweeping and stringent in character. By exacting license fees from the fishermen, they control the extent of fishing in all localities, and limit the number of nets to each mile of the shore in accordance with the judgment of the fishery officers. Their system of laws and policing the whole extent of shores is an expensive and cumbersome method of protecting the fishes, and it is altogether probable that the large amount of money, $20,195 in the year 1871, used for this purpose, would increase the products of their fisheries adapted to artificial culture.

Again :

> Prohibiting fishing at certain seasons of the year has been an ordinary method of legislation in protecting the fish, and has proved to be of great advantage in streams and inland waters. The great lakes, in the particular of fishing, assume very much the character of the sea, and the same class of legislation, benefiting streams and inland waters, is not required for them.

The American people are pursuing their own policy from year to year and they refuse to enter into reciprocal regulation arrangements with Canada in reference to the lake fisheries. Every year they have been prosecuting the fisheries without limit, and in Lake Erie catching eight fish to our one. Notwithstanding what the Minister says the catch is still maintained.

The hon. gentleman talks about failures, but I have never heard of them. I knew of the failure of a large fishing firm in the section of the country of which he spoke, but it was owing to their connection with the building of a large summer hotel at Put-In-Bay Island. The examination of the United States census returns relating to the profits of the American fishermen is a complete answer to the hon. gentleman's statement. It is shown there that the American fishermen are all making money, and that it has been a prosperous business. It is no argument to say that these fishermen are over crowded in Lake Erie. They have 700 miles of netting as the New York "Sun" recently stated, on the American side of Lake Erie, while on our side in the county of Essex, our fishermen there with equal advantages and equal facilities could catch the same quantity of fish, have only about sixty pound-nets.

We catch in the neighbourhood of $100,000 worth of fish annually, according to the values given by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, while on the American side the fishermen catch the enormous amount of $2,000,000 worth. Right opposite the county of Essex, the city of Sandusky, which is the largest fresh water fish market in the world, is carrying on an enormous business. This has been going on not merely for twenty or thirty years, but has been carried on since 1855, which was about the time pound-nets were introduced. This trade was then commenced on a pretty extensive scale, and has been carried on by the Americans from year to year until they have so much fishing apparatus that it would probably be impossible for them to extend their business, while we on our side of the lake have been looking quietly on.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has been very much disturbed at times about the attacks that have been made by the fishermen and by the people of the country upon the policy of the department, and he has sent his professors to the Detroit River and to the western end of Lake Erie to make special reports upon this subject. A year ago, Professor Prince, who had arrived in this country, I believe, in April, visited the Detroit River, and when he returned to Ottawa he wrote a special report justifying the position the department had taken. Speaking of close seasons, Professor Prince says :

That the enforcement of close seasons and other protective regulations for whitefish on the Canadian side of the great lakes and border waters should have caused some discontent amongst Canadian fishermen is not surprising. When the dividing waters are so narrow as in the Detroit River, St. Clair Lake and river, such dissatisfaction is accentuated. The United States fishermen carry on their operations under no restrictions, and at all available seasons. To our own fishermen, under whose eyes the American fishermen pursue the industry, the rigid enforcement of a close season and other regulations is peculiarly irritating. But any supposed advantages enjoyed by the United States fishermen are found, on strict inquiry, to be baseless, and on the other hand, the alleged grievances on the Canadian side in these waters have no better ground. As a matter of fact, the United States policy has proved most injurious to their own fishermen's interests and is wholly and emphatically disapproved by the leading men engaged in the fishing industry in Detroit and other important centres.

Detroit, it may be mentioned, has one of the greatest fish-markets on the continent, and the view that prevails there is entirely in favour of the Canadian policy. It is not the case that the absence of restrictions on the American side has been detrimental to our fishermen, or that United States fishermen are reaping benefits of which Canadian fishermen are deprived. Careful inquiries on the spot have abundantly shown that.

Any alteration in the existing close season would indeed be an injury to the Canadian fishermen and would bring serious results, leading rapidly to the total destruction of the whitefish fishery.

This is demonstrated by the following facts :—

The Canadian side is, and always has been, the chief resort for the whitefish. The great fish-markets of Detroit and elsewhere look to the Canadian side for their main supplies of whitefish, which breed and are hatched and reared in our waters.

And yet the hon. Minister, in the face of this important statement, and after limiting the operations of Canadian fishermen in the way he has done, now tells this House and the country that the whitefisheries of Lake Erie are a thing of the past. This gentleman continues :

The November schools of whitefish, which pass up the Canadian side, are all spawners, just about to deposit their eggs. It is of the highest importance to protect them just at that time—a time which the present close season covers.

Parent fish in rivers and lacustrine waters, when ascending to the spawning grounds, always take the most direct course, and are not easily turned aside, as experienced fishermen are well aware. No more erroneous idea could be entertained than the supposition that whitefish wander aimlessly hither and thither from one side of a river or lake to the other. In these waters, as in other waters, it is certainly not the case that the schools of breeding fish deviate from their usual course, and cross from side to side so that fish caught by American fishermen during our close season would be caught by Canadians were they permitted to fish at that time.

Not only has our side been the chief resort for the spawners, but the pollutions of Detroit city and numerous factories on the American side, as well as sewage and other deleterious matters, have tended to drive the whitefish to the purer waters on the Canadian side, and thus increased the school of spawners in our own waters.

The numberless nets, traps and pounds set in American waters and extending far from shore, intercept the migrating fish, break up the spawning schools, and drive them to our side. Our close season affords them freedom from these disturbances, and encourages them to come to our side.

Here we have the statement that Canadian fish will remain in Canadian waters, while American fish will cross over to Canadian waters. Prof. Prince goes on :

Perhaps the best testimony to the wisdom and utility of the department's regulations is furnished by the attempts to establish in the state of Michigan similar close seasons. Were the present policy on the opposite shores so highly satisfactory as many Canadian fishermen at times imagine, such attempts would never be made. So beneficial to all interested has the Canadian policy proved to be, in the opinion of many leading men in the state of Michigan, that, in order to save their fisheries from destruction in these waters, earnest efforts have been, and, no doubt, will be made again to imitate our restrictions and regulations and enforce them on the United States side. Were such uniform regulations enacted and enforced, the alleged grievances of Canadian fishermen would disappear, the planting and artificial propagation of whitefish on both sides would have fair-play, and the future welfare of these fisheries in these waters would be assured.

Here is Prof. Prince, a gentleman who had only recently arrived in this country, and who perhaps had never seen a whitefish before, alleging that the whitefish naturally resort to the Canadian side ; but, in view of the confession of the hon. gentleman and the reports we have that our whitefish are absolutely gone, that Canadians have been prevented from taking their fair share, this is in my opinion a sweeping condemnation of the policy that has been pursued.

I would like to know on what ground such a policy can be justified unless for the good of Canada. If the hon. gentleman could show that his policy had developed the fisheries and that the fish were in Canadian waters for Canadians, although I believe his policy is severe in many respects, that would be almost a complete answer to the complaint that has been made against the Government policy. The hon. gentleman sent up another professor, or rather commander, who made a report in reference to the fish in the Detroit River.

"Catch of whitefish and salmon-trout on the Detroit River by Prof. Wakeham." and the beauty of this thing is that not 50 trout have been caught in the Detroit River for the past 50 years. Yet one of these professors, a man with scientific knowledge, a man who understands the movements of the fish and all about them, goes to the Detroit River under the instructions of the hon. Minister and writes a report, no doubt, with the view of supporting his peculiar views and policy, giving an essay on trout in the Detroit River when no trout can be found there:

> Whitefish and trout do not remain long on the spawning grounds; they come in slowly, but directly they have spawned they return to deeper water. It is not the case that what are called Canadian fish are taken to any great extent in United States waters. A few may straggle from the schools, but the great mass of fish that spawn in our waters never get within reach of seines or pounds fished on the other side.

Here is another certificate from another professor who professes to understand the movements of the fish and to have great knowledge of the subject. He says that the Canadian fish do not cross from side to side. Then I would like the hon. Minister to explain where the 800,000,000 pounds of fish, which is the excess caught by the Americans in the last 20 years on Lake Erie have gone. It seems to me they must have gone somewhere or other. If the fish do not cross from side to side, the Canadian fish must be on the Canadian side, and we should have an increase. In fact the fish should be so thick in Lake Erie that they would almost be in the way of the vessels. I believe, however, that the fish have gone into the American nets and market. Take the statistics supplied by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and you will find that the loss to Canada in ten years is $20,000,000 on Lake Erie alone. Yet the hon. gentleman will get up and say the statement that our fishermen are idle is an extravagant one. Why, the very fact that in the county of Essex, including Pelee Island, there are only some 60 pound-nets on one side and on the other side of the lake about 2,000 pound-nets, over one-half of which is almost immediately opposite, shows that our people are comparatively idle and have not been permitted to participate in the advantage of the vast and profitable trade which has been carried on many years by the American people.

Now, this is an important question. If hon. gentlemen would look into the figures in connection with our fisheries I am satisfied—although, of course, we cannot get back what we have lost—that this stringent and ruinous policy would not be continued. The same thing will happen in Lake Superior which has happened in Lake Erie, if this policy prevails. The Americans will go and fish out Lake Superior. I ask what argument there can be for a policy of this kind, unless it can be shown that it develops the fisheries on the Canadian side. The very statements of the hon. gentleman, in the speech which he distributed among the fishermen of the west, answer themselves. The fish are not there. He admits that; but he talks of great onslaughts on the fisheries! There have been no such onslaughts. The fish have been taken by the American fishermen because the Department of Marine and Fisheries have prevented our fishermen from using the amount of netting and the amount of pound-nets which they could use to advantage. There is just one other matter to which I wish to refer before concluding. I allude to the state of disorganization that existed in the fishery district of Essex and Kent, comprising about half of Lake Erie. I read some papers in connection with this matter last session, in a hurried manner, because it was six o'clock. The hon. Minister said he had not gone fully into the subject; he had not made an exhaustive review, but that my statements were meagre and all that sort of thing. There is nothing very profound about this subject, nothing that requires, as the hon. gentleman intimates, scientific knowledge. The fact simply is that the American people have been getting, through the connivance and sanction of the department, an immense advantage over our Canadian people. The statistics prove that; and when the hon. gentleman talks about people requiring scientific knowledge in order to discuss this policy, and the presumption of people who have not looked into the authorities and relying on a little horse sense doing so, it is enough to make the angels weep. Th hon. gentleman alluded to papers that were brought down in relation to the dismissal of Mr. Prosser, and he said in reference to that matter:

> I greatly regret, owing to the importance of the subject, and notwithstanding the time at which it has been brought to the attention of the House, that it will be necessary for me to ask the indulgence of the House for some time while I refer to the points that have been raised by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Allen), and particularly to the question upon which he only briefly touched. I know that it is contrary to the rules of the House, and very properly so, to impute motives to hon. gentlemen who ask the attention of this body to any public question; but I was considerably surprised, knowing, as I have reason to know, the very great importance of the preservation of the fisheries of the great lakes of this country, to observe this afternoon the extravagant language which that hon. gentleman indulged in, accompanied, as it was, by the most superficial statements that could possibly be made on such a question. Time and again I heard the hon. gentleman, when speaking of the policy that I am carrying out, refer to it as, "a policy of oppression and tyranny"; he spoke of "great outrages"; he stated that our Canadian fishermen on those lakes were practically idle to-day; and declared that there was no explanation or defence in reply to an attack of great moment, which, apparently, had already been made this session, and which the hon. gentleman deemed it necessary on his part to follow up with his fusi-

lade of this afternoon. These were extraordinary expressions, Mr. Speaker, and expressions which, if they had really a true support, would have excited a great deal more attention than the hon. gentleman was able to command on either side of the House, which would have attracted a great deal of attention this evening, and would have demanded the most serious consideration that we could give to them. But, instead of the hon. gentleman supporting those statements by arguments, or by an exhaustive review of what the policy of the department really was, I discovered a little later on in his remarks that his real object was to attack, not a policy, but a man; not to criticise a minister of the department or the Government of the day, but to attack, in what I consider a most unfair manner, a Mr. Prosser, who, apparently, lives in the district from which the hon. member for South Essex comes; and, although I have no knowledge of Mr. Prosser, apart from the fact that he was once an officer of my department and was dismissed, and that some years ago, yet, from what the hon. gentleman said, I have no doubt whatever that he is, whether rightly or wrongly, a strong man in that district, and a man who is politically opposed to the hon. gentleman. I can conceive of no other reason why the hon. gentleman should have spent the greater part of his time in driving home and repeating again and again the charges against this man, which were investigated as far back as 1891, and which brought about his ultimate dismissal. What does the hon. gentleman want to do with Mr. Prosser? Why does he drag him up before this House in this year of Our Lord 1894, and insist at a rather late period of the session in pounding him in the fashion he did?

It seems to me that I brought important papers before the House relating to the management of the Fisheries Department, It happened that Mr. Prosser was the fishery overseer in that district and was dismissed, and the hon. gentleman tried in this way to draw a line across the scent. He hoped by talking about Mr. Prosser to escape any other responsibility for this whole affair. Why, the return brought down was simply a disgraceful exhibition of the way the business of the Fisheries Department has been carried on in that section for years. You take these two districts from Rondeau, westward, they comprise by far, the most important fisheries on the lake. And yet, for many years, a state of lawlessness and disorganization existed, which was simply a disgrace to the Fishery Department, and to the Government of Canada. The hon. gentleman may think that he can escape on the ground that he did not know that these things existed. It seems a queer idea of ministerial responsibility to think that the hon. Minister can escape in that way. Why, Sir, although I have shown that the fisheries are practically in the hands of Americans from over-fishing on their side of the lakes, yet, on our own side of the lake, comprising half of Lake Erie, the better half of it as regards the extent of the catch, the fishing was practically in the hands of one American firm, Post & Co., of Sandusky, and our fishermen were for years mere serfs of these men, they dare not sell their fish except to Post & Co., a license could not be given except with the permission of Post & Co., of Sandusky. Though our fishermen were acting under the most rigid rules and regulations, a state of disorganization existed, which the Minister of Marine is, to a very great extent responsible. I will just read part of the report of the special officer sent to investigate the state of affairs in this district. Mr. Kerr says:

> I experienced a great many difficulties in fathoming the above irregularities.——

That is people fishing without a license, licenses being given to dead men, that kind of irregularities.——

> —All sorts of obstacles were thrown in my way, especially from such of the fishermen as were under Post & Co.'s control. This made it sometimes utterly impossible for me to get accurate, or even reliable, information in a great many cases, and I must come, therefore, to the conclusion, that either Post & Co. own and control the whole fishery from Rondeau westward, or else that overseers McMichael and Prosser are in their favour, doing their bidding in every respect, instead of taking the interests of the department, whose paid servants they are. In addition to a most serious charge of mismanagement in recommending for licenses parties who do not exist, thereby helping to place the pound-net fisheries of Lake Erie in the hands of Yankee firms, I am also credibly informed that Mr. Prosser has been in the habit of granting permits for extra nets during the fall of the year, especially to such of the fishermen who dispose of their fish to Post & Co.

And again:

> I also found many fishermen afraid to give me the necessary information that I was seeking, on accounts of threats, &c., made by Prosser and Post of taking away their licenses, &c. One old gentleman remarked, after I had taken his sworn statement, that, if Prosser knew it, it would settle his license for this year. There is no doubt this lawless sort of work has been carried on for years. If a fisherman makes a kick as to the price of his fish, &c., the next year his outside pound is taken away from him. This particularly has caused much trouble, you can readily perceive—some enjoying the privilege of fishing double-headers, while other's applications are not entertained at all by overseer Prosser, who contended to some that the thing was not allowed.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman wanted to know why I brought up these papers which relate to 1891. These papers were only brought down to the House in 1893. And the hon. gentleman was not present during that session, and I did not have the opportunity therefore of bringing the matter to his attention. I brought the subject up at the earliest possible moment, and I say it as a most singular thing that the Minister of the Crown can escape all responsibility for the disorder that existed for years in relation to one of our most important lake fisheries. What sort of system can obtain in a Department of Marine and Fisheries, I should like to know, that it is possible for one American firm to control the fish-

eries of half Lake Erie for many years, as shown by the report of the hon. gentleman's own special officer. Prosser has been dismissed, the hon. gentleman says; and he thinks that that relieves him of responsibility. Why, Sir, here is a scandal which, while, of course, not in the line of the Curran bridge, yet involves a loss to this country quite as great as that involved in the Curran bridge—our fisheries practically handed over to one American firm for years; our fishermen not allowed to sell their fish to any one but Post & Co., except in the case of one or two who positively refused. It shows that the Department of Marine and Fisheries under the hon. gentleman was not the model department that he would have the people of this country believe. It seems almost impossible that, under a well-regulated department such a state of affairs could exist, and be continued year after year.

We had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that some change for the better would take place in reference to the fisheries of the county of Essex. It was heralded by the local press, particularly by the Conservative press, of that county that there was to be an important change of policy, that our people were no longer to be deprived of the right to fish in the Detroit River, and these other narrow waters, they were not to be compelled to remain idle, while their American neighbours were gathering the fish, but that the same freedom in fishing would be allowed on our side as was allowed on the American side. Well, Sir, what change has taken place? In these narrow waters, the Detroit River and Lake St. Clair, Canadians are allowed to fish on paying $50 license fee—on the other side it is entirely free—and, in November, the only month when it is possible to catch whitefish, they are prevented from fishing, while within a stone's throw, the Americans are gathering in the fish. I was in hopes that there would be a change in the policy of the department, but the hon. gentleman seems to think that it is for the good of Canada that the old policy should remain in force. In order to show that, he must prove that the fish remain in Canadian waters, and remain there to be taken by Canadian and not American fishermen. If he cannot do that, it is quite evident that his policy has been a failure, and that there has been a very serious loss to the people of this country, a loss to Lake Erie alone, according to the figures of the hon. gentleman, in twenty years, of about $40,000,000, the excess of the American catch would be that much in value greater than the Canadian catch. That is the point, whether Canadian fish is here for the Canadians, or whether they have been caught by the Americans. There is no profound knowledge required in this matter. If the fish are not here, it is quite evident that his policy is a failure.

I think it is due to this House and to this country that the hon. gentleman should give a little better explanation than he gave in his speech last year, and more reliable, leaving out such statements that these were really very little; no difference in the catch in Lake Erie, that the figures were all talk, when the actual figures, as compiled from the blue-books of Canada, show that in the short period of twenty years, there is a difference of over 400 million pounds in that Lake alone. If we go on and extend our inquiry, we shall find a very great difference also in Lake Superior. In the Lake of the Woods the same policy is being pursued, preventing Canadians from taking their share, and throwing the trade into the hands of the American people. Now, I think it is about time that hon. members should look into this matter, and that the people who are behind the Minister should compel a change of policy. It is about time that the reign of common sense should be ushered in. The idea of handing this enormous trade over to the American people, and year by year talking about some arrangement by which the fisheries can be preserved, while the American people continue catching as many fish as they possibly can, with all the appliances of nets and boats that they bring into service. This is an important matter, it is not a fish-hook and line business. Hon. members from the maritime provinces must understand that this is no ordinary matter. If they compare the quantity of fish caught in Lake Erie alone, with the catch of New Brunswick, they will find that the catch of the Canadian and American side of Lake Erie is greater than that of New Brunswick, and it is not very much behind that of Nova Scotia. Yet the Minister and the Government have thought that it is a wise policy to stand and look calmly on and prevent our people from fishing, and see the Americans enjoy this vast trade, a trade of 63,000,000 pounds. Sandusky is the greatest fish market in the world, handling twenty million pounds of fish annually. I have not been guilty of using extravagant statements, as charged by the hon. gentleman; I have no desire to infringe upon his domain in that respect. I am sure that his statements, attributing to the McKinley Bill the results of the figures which have been presented, I have shown to be extravagant. As a matter of fact, the catch on the Canadian side is only seven or eight million pounds, and he can put that on, and it makes very little difference. Yet he will get up in this House and state that this difference is made up by the operation of the McKinley Bill, when I have shown that the figures were made up before the McKinley Bill came into operation. I think the hon. gentleman propounded a question in his speech that I have forgotten to notice. He evidently thinks it is a clincher, and is an

answer to the whole attack that has been made upon his department:

I would ask the hon. gentleman, how he will explain this to me, that, while the United States are spending millions to our thousands in fish culture, yet it was my experience to find a request from the hatchery at Detroit, on the United States side of that narrow sheet of water, for permission to come into Canadian waters, in sight of the so-called United States fishermen, to obtain the necessary quota of eggs for their hatchery, stating that they could not obtain them on the United States side? The reason is clear, and it is consistent with all the reports that I have been able to find—that our side of Lake Erie and our side of that river are peculiar.

Now, that is a great question. He wants to know why it was that Americans ask for permission to fish upon the Canadian side of the Detroit River, and if he establishes that there are a few more fish on the Canadian side of the river, he thinks his whole argument is established. Now, Professor Prince, in his report, speaks of this very subject, and says that it is owing to the pollutions of the Detroit side, and I find that confirmed in the American report:

In earlier years there was a great abundance of whitefish in this river, and the annual yield was very large. Mr. James Craig, of Detroit, who has for many years engaged in the fish business of that city, informs us that near Fort Wayne, within the city limits of Detroit, the average catch of whitefish in haul-seines was from 18,000 to 21,000 fish, weighing on an average from 2½ to 2⅞ pounds. On 12th November, 1871, at one haul of a seine, 3,100 whitefish were caught. With the growth of the city and the increase of the amount of sewage entering the river, the fisheries have declined to their present condition. The number of whitefish taken in the vicinity of Fort Wayne in 1890 was only 3,000, and the output of the entire river was only 35,000 pounds.

That is the answer to that statement. But here the hon. gentleman makes another, which shows that after all he does not understand every thing in connection with his own department. The hon. gentleman says: "The great fish market for Detroit, especially in regard to whitefish, is in our waters." The hon. gentleman stated that requests were made by American hatcheries on Lake Superior for eggs, and he wanted to know how it occurred that if their fisheries were not depleted they came to the Canadian side for their fish eggs. In the waters of Lake Superior it is not possible to keep fish in pens, which would necessarily be broken up, as can be done at Sandwich, and that is the reason and the only reason why they come and make requisition on our department for fish eggs. There is no scarcity of fish eggs in the United States. Here is a statement bearing on this subject:

Put-In-Bay, 15th May.—The hatch at the fish hatchery at this place beats the world's record in the number of eggs taken in one season at one station. During the year which will end with June, there have been taken at this station 115,000,000 whitefish eggs, 11,000,000 ciscoes, or lake herring; 404,000,000 pike-perch, or wall-eyed pike, besides lake trout, grass pike, yellow perch and other varieties. Besides the eggs and fry shipped away, 30,400,000 whitefish, 17,000,000 ciscoes and 200,000,000 pike-perch fry have been turned into the waters of Lake Erie.

There is no scarcity of fish eggs on the other side, as the hon. gentleman imagines. They have enormous quantities of them, and instead of the fisheries being depleted, as the hon. Minister endeavoured to show from extracts he read, I can read other extracts to show the reverse, and that in some sections of the American waters there has been a great increase in the fisheries generally, and in the whitefish particularly. I read from the commissioners' report of the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries for 1892, as follows:—

Whitefish is the second important fish in Lake Huron. It is especially prominent in the pound-net fishery of that part of the lake north of Saginaw Bay and in the gill-net fishery from Alpena. The average weight of the whitefish is about 2 pounds.

Everywhere in this lake the effects of whitefish propagation are manifested and appreciated by the fishermen and fish-dealers. While the output in the year covered by this inquiry was somewhat less than in 1885, the increase in the past few years has been marked. A prominent feature of the fishery for this fish was the unprecedentedly large run in many places of small fish of a size that had not been observed in abundance for many years.

Again:

Along the shore, between St. Ignace and Detour, an increase in the abundance of whitefish, as compared with a number of preceeding years, was reported, the increase being especially marked in Les Cheneaux and Pretence Bay. Trout and some other fish appear to be diminishing in number. One reason assigned by Mr. Isaac Goudreau, Mr. Charles Goudreau and other prominent fishermen for the increase of whitefish in the inshore waters and among the islands is, that the fish have been driven from their regular resorts in the lake by the large accumulations on the favourite grounds of saw-dust and other refuse from a mill at St. Ignace.

The principal fishermen of this section think there will be no difficulty in keeping up the supply of whitefish, if liberal consignments of fry are planted annually, and the size of the mesh in the cribs of the pound-net is regulated so as to permit the escape of immature fish. In the vicinity of St. Ignace, the fishermen want also a law to prohibit the pollution of the lake, either by saw-dust or other refuse, and some favour a close season on all kinds of fishing after 1st November for a period of years, in order to give trout and other fish whose abundance has decreased, a better opportunity to multiply.

In the fisheries of the southern side of the Strait of Mackinac, and the adjacent western shore of Lake Huron, whitefish constitute fully nine-tenths of the catch, the remaining species consisting of trout, pike, perch, herring and sturgeon. During the last two years the number of whitefish in the fisheries could be carried to Mackinac city have been steadily increasing.

The only dealer at Mackinac city who has bought and handled fish caught in that vicinity during the past six years, says that it has been no uncommon thing in the last two years to take

2,500 pounds of whitefish from one small pound-net in one night's fishing, while in previous years, if half that quantity was taken under similar circumstances, it was considered a big catch; he is satisfied that the fish now being caught were planted in that vicinity by the United States and Michigan Fish Commission.

In the vicinity of Cheboygan, while a great many trout are caught, whitefish is the principal specie. Every fisherman in this region has commented on the very large increase in the number of whitefish caught during the past two years. Mr. Maynard Corbitt, of the fishing firm of Corbitt & Duffy, stated that he had fished in that vicinity for twenty-five years, and up to two or three years ago the whitefish were becoming scarcer each season, but during the past three years they have undergone a marked increase in abundance.

I could read many other extracts. It is very easy for the hon. Minister to read statements regarding the depletion of fisheries in certain sections; I could read about the depletion in other sections. That is not the question. The question is simply this: has the policy of the department in preventing our people from taking a reasonable share of fish in Lake Erie, in preventing them prosecuting the fishery industry in that and other lakes, been a good policy? I say the only answer that can be given to the question is to show that the Canadian fisheries have increased, and that we in Canada have a quantity equal to the great excess caught by the American fishermen. I regret that I have been compelled to detain the House so long, but this is a question of very great importance, one involving a very large sum of money, one that gives employment to a vast number of American people, and if a proper policy had been pursued in Canada our fisheries would have contributed very largely to increasing the wealth of the province of Ontario.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not intend to take up the time of the House very long in speaking on this subject. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Allan) has gone over the points very clearly and has shown the House the exact position we occupy as compared with our American neighbours. In the county of Essex we are very peculiarly situated. We have a shore line of about 150 miles. Along these shores we have our American neighbours, in some places not more than 2,700 feet distant from us. What we feel to be a great grievance is that our American neighbours are allowed to fish from January to January, whereas our people are compelled to quit at the very time the fish are running. We have been fishing along these shores for 75 or 100 years. In a very large number of cases the fishermen have purchased the land along the shore for the purpose of getting the front from which to fish. The Government under its present policy, and under the policy that has been in vogue for many years, are depriving our fishermen of that privilege. While our shores are well adapted for the propagation of fish, we find that while the fish are small they remain there, but when they attain to that size to be of use to our people then the Americans are allowed to take them instead of our own people. The Minister stated that the fish do not go from one side of the lake to the other. But it will be found that according as the winds are the fish go for the deep and smooth water. So that if the Canadians are not allowed to fish, our American neighbours surely get them. It is stated also by the Minister that we are on the eve of having an arrangement made with our American neighbours, under which they will have a close season, the same as ours. For 20 or 25 years the same story has been going the rounds. Twenty years ago at a meeting in Detroit a proposition was made that the Americans should have a close season, but during the whole of those 20 years we find no arrangements have yet been made. The Americans have taken our fish and our fishermen are becoming poor. We know that in the United States each state has a fishery law of its own, and Lake Erie, the Detroit River, the St. Clair River, and Lake St. Clair, are under the jurisdiction of four separate states, namely, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York. It would be almost impossible for Canada to make arrangements with the whole of these four states at one and the same time. We are asking only for fair play. We are asking that we be treated the same as our American neighbours who are on the shores of the same waters as we are. We ask that when they fish we can also fish. If they are determined to deplete the waters let us have our share. If our fishermen are allowed to fish all through the year, observing no close season, our neighbours may become alarmed and be led to proclaim a close season. But if they will not, and are determined to take the last fish, let us have our share of it. Why is it that the Americans can take fish by the thousands, and as my hon. friend (Mr. Allan) has said by the million, while we are deprived of that privilege. We have petitioned the Government. We have shown the Government the necessity of a change in their policy. We have petitioned Parliament and the Government through the county councils of the counties in which we reside; we have petitioned through the town councils of the different towns along the borders; and we have petitioned this House through the townships. We have also had individual petitions asking for a change of policy in reference to the fishing regulations, but, Sir, we have had no answer to any one of them. We feel that this is a great grievance. We feel that our people having invested a very large amount of money in the purchase of land for fishing purposes and then being deprived of the fish, are obliged to suffer a great loss. They have not only invested in the lands, but they have

cleared the rivers for the purpose of fishing, and the fact that they have not been able to utilize their means of livelihood has left many of them in debt. They have lost their boats and their docks and many other investments they have made, all on account of the extraordinary and ruinous policy of this Government. Sir Charles Tupper said: Canada for the Canadians, but, Sir, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said: Canadian fish for the Americans. It is against the laws of Canada for a Canadian to have whitefish in his possession during the close season. The Government themselves come along and take large quantities of whitefish for the ova, and the fish being killed in the process, are sold to the Americans. The Canadians who have lived there so long, and who have enjoyed the fishing formerly, are not permitted to buy these fish even from our Canadian Government. The Americans have that privilege and honour. We feel that to be a great grievance. Talk about the Czar of Russia and his severity to Russian Jews. Sir, no Czar of Russia ever treated the Russian Jews as the people of Essex have been treated by these fishery laws. The Czar of Russia has been severe, but not so severe as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Not only does he keep the fish for the Americans, but when his officers find that a Canadian has made a mistake by fishing with a mesh a little small, or fishing outside of the close season, they seize his boat and break it up, they burn his nets, and the fisherman is taken prisoner. All this is done to him when he can stand at his own door and look across the river, which at many points is not broader than twice the distance from this House to Sparks street, and see his American neighbours take in fish by the thousands. We say that this is unfair and that it is ill treatment to Canadians. Now, Sir, we have no close season for herring in our fresh waters, and we find that in 1891, there were more herring in Lake Erie than there had been in any previous season. That shows that the policy of the Administration has not been in the best interests of Canadians. It is all the greater grievance, because it is we who grow the fish that the Americans catch. My friend from South Essex (Mr. Allan) has shown the very large amount of fish taken by the American people and sold at Sandusky and other American towns. If this enormous quantity of fish is taken on the American side, it is largely because the people of Canada have been forced to protect the fish for the benefit of the American people. When we have the spawning grounds, and the feeding grounds and all the advantages, why should we not have our fair proportion of the fish. May I read, and that is all I will say on the subject, the following petition:—

To the Honourable the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, in Parliament assembled:

The petition of the council of the township of Sandwich East, in the county of Essex, in the province of Ontario, humbly showeth: That the fishing interests of the province of Ontario are very valuable; that they belong to the people; that they should be administered in the best interests of the people; that in this province the most valuable fisheries are contained in the international waters which are common to the fishermen of Ontario and the United States; that in international waters the American fishermen have free fishing, are not restricted in the number or description of nets, and have practically no close season, while in Ontario our fishermen must obtain a license to fish, which places them under the control of the department, when applications may be discriminated against; when granted, a high license is exacted; they are restricted in the number and description of nets, locations for fishing, a weekly close season impossible to observe by lake fishermen, various close seasons for different kinds of fish, and a general close season for the month of November; to such an extent is over-protection carried that in Canada we have close seasons for mullets, suckers, sturgeon and herring, which live largely upon the eggs of other kinds of fishes. Results—the American catch in the great lakes in three years, 1880-85 and 1889—the only years in which we have official reports—the American catch is: 1880, 68,742,000 pounds; 1885, 99,842,076 pounds; 1889, 117,085,568 pounds; total in three years, 285,669,644 pounds. Canadian catch in all the great lakes and in lakes in Ontario, same years, was: 1880. 11,473,000 pounds; 1885, 27,378,180 pounds; 1889, 32,169,032 pounds; total in three years, 71,020,212 pounds. The Americans employed in 1889 fishing in the great lakes 6,896 men, whose average catch was 16,977 pounds of fish. The Canadians employed in the great lakes in the same year were 3,528 men, whose average catch was 9,118 pounds of fish. A comparison of the catch of fish in Lake Erie for the years 1880, 1885, 1889.—The American catch was 144,217,149 pounds, of which 10,189,427 were whitefish. The Canadian catch in Lake Erie during the same years was 18,928,252 pounds, of which 697,893 pounds were whitefish. The Americans employed 2,181 fishermen on Lake Erie in 1889, whose average catch was 29,134 pounds. The Canadian employed 465 men in Lake Erie fisheries during the same year, whose average catch was 20,700 pounds. The value of the American catch in the great lakes in 1889 was $6,743,-359.19; the value of the Canadian catch in the great lakes in the same year was $1,963,122.80; difference in favour of the Americans of $4,780,-236.39. The value of the American catch in Lake Erie in 1889 was $3,248,361.66; the value of the Canadian catch in Lake Erie in the same year was $487,604.47; in favour of the Americans, $2,-760,757.19.

The prices of the various kinds of fish have been reckoned at the prices used by the Minister of Fisheries of Canada in valuing the fish caught in Ontario in 1889.

Under similar regulations there is no apparent reason why as many Canadians should not be engaged in the fishing industry as Americans, or that the catch on their side should not be as large as by American fishermen.

Your petitioners, therefore, pray that Canadian fishermen be placed under the same system of free fishing as the American fishermen fishing in waters that are common to both, and that the fishermen of Lake St. Clair and Detroit River be granted permission to fish for whitefish in the month of November, the only month of the year that they are to be found in said waters.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

That is the case, so far as we can lay it

before you in a condensed form. I thank the House for the hearing they have given me.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, after the exhaustive remarks which we have had on this subject from the gentlemen who have just sat down, and for which I feel inclined to thank them, I do not intend to detain the House at any length. But this subject is one which deeply concerns not only the counties represented by those hon. gentlemen, but my own constituency; and I feel bound to call the Minister's attention through the pages of "Hansard," I hope, since he is not here, and I cannot do so personally, to one or two points.

I think the speech of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Allan) has fully demonstrated the fact that fishing on the American shore depletes the whole lake. There seems to be no room, on theoretical grounds, to argue further in opposition to that contention. It is, therefore, in the interest of Canadians in general that we should be allowed to take our share of the fish which swim in that lake. The question of a close season is, of course, one of a different nature. In regard to that, even though it be admitted that the United States fishing depletes the whole lake, it is a question whether it would pay us to put up with less than our share of fish in the spawning season for the purpose of making the fish last a little longer. It is clear it would not make them permanent so long as the United States fishermen deplete the lake without restriction. For my own part, I doubt whether it is worth while to preserve even the close season until and unless arrangements for uniform regulations can be made with the United States authorities.

But that is not the point to which I wish particularly to call attenion. I understand that the regulations hitherto complained of, and enforced by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, have been relaxed by the present Minister in regard to the Lake and River St. Clair, the Detroit River, and the extreme western end of Lake Erie. To that extent, the department has recognized the force of the arguments presented so ably on more than one occasion by my hon. friend from South Essex. But I think this recognition involves something more. If it be proper to relax the restrictions on the number of licenses, on the number and kinds of nets employed, and so forth, in the districts to which I have referred, it is proper to relax them also on the north shore of Lake Erie generally. If they are relaxed in the districts to which I refer, it can only be on the ground of giving our fishermen a fair share with the Yankees in the total catch of the lake; on the ground of admitting that Yankee fishing depletes the entire lake. If that be the case, the privileges should be extended along the north shore. We ought to be allowed to fish with gill-nets as well as with pound-nets, and, perhaps, also, under certain restrictions, with seines, although that is a matter of less importance.

But when we remember that American fishermen are allowed to fish with gill-nets up to the middle of the lake, so far as that can be ascertained, while we are not allowed to use them at all, it is clear that we are not put upon an equal footing with the American fishermen. I think the use of gill-nets should be allowed, a large number of nets should be allowed to each licensee, and perhaps, a larger number of licenses should be issued. The question of granting licenses is a very difficult one. It has been hitherto a matter of favour altogether, either on the part of the fishery inspector of the district, or of the head of the department. The shore has been mapped out into fishing berths, and a monopoly of each of these berths has been given to one or more persons at the option of the officials of the department. It has been a matter of favour who should be allowed to fish, and a lot of small monopolies have been created. I do not know how far that system is capable of amendment, but I think it should not be a matter of political favour, or of the favour of a local official, who gets the right to fish.

The necessity of relaxation having been admitted in the west, that relaxation should be extended along the north shore where the arguments in its favour are equally strong. I regret that the hon. Minister is not in his place to have his attention called to this point, but I hope that he will notice what I have said in the "Hansard" and will take it into consideration. I have every reason to believe that the hon. gentleman is turning his attention to this subject with a view of making some more practical and businesslike regulations than those that have been enforced hitherto. With regard to international uniformity of regulations, that is a goal at which we should aim. It is very difficult, no doubt, to know with whom to negotiate. Lake Erie is bounded on the south by three states, each of which claims the right to regulate its own fishing interests. I believe there is also a claim on the part of the Federal Government to regulate the fisheries in those navigable waters which form the boundary between the United States and other countries. It would be the perfection of fishery regulations if some uniform system could be agreed upon between whomsoever is found to have the necessary authority on the other side and our department. I trust the Minister will devote his best attentions and energy to securing such uniformity. The value that could be created in Lake Erie alone by the development of our fisheries, under an international system of that sort, with breeding establishments and so forth, is incalculable. Lake Erie would practically become a preserved fish-pond on a large scale, whence tremendous supplies of fish could be drawn; but until such arrangement be

made, our fishermen all along the north shore of Lake Erie should have much greater latitude than they have been allowed hitherto.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the House goes into supply, I wish to make an explanation with regard to a statement I made last night when the discussion was taking place on the boundary commission. I then said that the Deputy Minister of the Interior was in favour of the American contention with regard to the Portland Canal. I made that statement on information given me by a gentleman, on whose veracity I thought I could rely, and who told me that the Deputy Minister had, in conversation with him, made that remark. Since then I have been informed by the Deputy Minister that the gentleman in question must have been entirely mistaken, because in no way has the deputy ever said anything that could be so construed, and that the only gentlemen to whom he could have given an opinion were his own chief, the Minister of the Interior, and the late Sir John Thompson. Any one who knows the Deputy Minister of the Interior knows that he is man thoroughly to be relied upon and trusted, and, therefore, I must take his word and believe that the gentleman who gave me the information was entirely mistaken. I think, in justice to the Deputy Minister, that I should be allowed to retract what I said last night, my statement not being founded on fact.

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

Civil Government—Department of the Secretary of State..... $44,350

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to reduce that item to $37,062.57. I propose to strike off two of the first-class clerks at $1,800 each, one second-class clerk at $1,400, one second-class at $1,287.50, and one third-class at $1,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the parties, and are they superannuated?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The first-class clerks struck off are H. J. Morgan, 53 years of age, and E. Brousseau, 60 years of age. Mr. Morgan is superannuated at $1,260, and Mr. Brousseau at $1,116. The second-class clerks are H. G. Lamothe and C. Medlow. Mr. Lamothe's salary was $1,400 and his retiring allowance is $420. He was in charge of the franchise work in the department, which I have removed into the hands of the Queen's Printer, where it is done without extra cost. Mr. Medlow was an engrosser receiving $877, and his retiring allowance is $300. George Collins, whose salary was $1,000, is retired at $420. The work of Mr. Morgan and Mr. Brousseau is being done by Mr. Colson, Mr. Storr and others by redistribution of the work. Mr. Lamothe was in the service some years ago, but unfortunately he had to leave on account of his health, and on the recommendation of the Minister of Inland Revenue he was given a gratuity. He again entered the service, and has been allowed the full number of years he has been in the service. I have made the rule to add no years in any case. The superannuation allowances are just what the parties can claim under the Act.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Lamothe, some years ago, was compelled to ask for superannuation on account of his failing eyesight, but after a few years' rest he was taken again into the service, and the hon. gentleman says he has done very good service since.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I said nothing about the work; I made no comment.

Mr. LAURIER. I believe that testimony could be given by the hon. gentleman's predecessors that Mr. Lamothe was a very meritorious officer. At all events, he was trusted with work of a most important character. In fact for some years he had the management of the branch which concerns the Franchise Act, and I believe had more to do with the branch than any other officer. I have reason to believe he discharged his duty faithfully and well. He is yet a young man, not more than forty or forty-one and in good health, and I am afraid the Government are dispensing with the services of a valuable officer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not now saying anything with regard to Mr. Lamothe. I am not called upon to do so, but the department are treating him just as fairly as any employee. There is no work for him to do. I am getting the work done by the Queen's Printer, and I assure the House it will be done just as well.

Mr. CASEY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that in every case where he has superannuated an officer he has abolished the office?

Mr. MONTAGUE. In every case. That appears in the Order in Council, and the salary is dropped out of the Estimates. There can be no new appointment.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose that in that case notice was given to these gentlemen of the approaching abolition of their office, so that they might make arrangements for their future.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is generally understood that reductions were to be made, though I do not think that individual notices were sent. You must remember that I had but little time to consider the matter, and you cannot notify a man that he is to be superannuated until the Council gives the order.

Mr. CASEY. I think it would be only fair, even after that, to give these individuals notice that they were to be superannuated, not for any incapacity, but because of the abolition of the office.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is no vote out of which I could give them any pay for services after that.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we might deal with the items in agriculture now.

Experimental Farms—	
Maintenance	$70,000
Dairying branch	25,000

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. Minister will allow some latitude of discussion of this item on concurrence, I would not object to letting it go now.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that would be fair.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You can get as many promises of that kind as you like.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan) may want to discuss these items. And if discussion is permitted on concurrence, there is no objection to their going through committee.

To enable Dairy Commissioner to promote dairying interests by advances for making cheese and butter within the provinces, the proceeds of sales of products from such advances to be replaced to the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund	$40,000

Mr. CASEY. When this item was discussed previously, it was distinctly stated on one of the supplementary Estimates for the butter shop that was conducted during the winter, that nothing more was to be done in the way of making advances on butter for export. But this item is to promote the dairying interest by advances for making cheese and butter in the different provinces.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is not for the butter advances you speak of. This is to begin the dairying industry in parts of the country where they have not yet been engaged in it by paying to the farmers an advance of 50 cents a hundred pounds on milk to enable them to run on until the product of the factory is disposed of. The experience is that it is recouped to the public treasury.

Mr. FOSTER. It must be recouped.

Mr. CASEY. Where is this to be distributed ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. A considerable amount in Prince Edward Island, in Nova Scotia and in the North-west Territories : also, but not so large an amount, in New Brunswick.

Mr. CASEY. It is important to know where it is to be distributed, because it puts into the hands of the Government a large fund, which will undoubtedly promote dairying interests, but which may be used to promote political interests at the same time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is not the idea at all. Incidentally it may do us some good.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman says that no such idea would enter his mind. But it might be suggested by a candidate, and I do not know that we could trust the hon. gentleman to be proof against temptation. To put the vote in this form without stating distinctly what it is for, is simply to put $40,000 into the hands of the Government to be distributed amongst the patrons of cheese and butter factories so as to make the most political capital for the friends of the Government in the various constituencies. We have no objection to appropriating $40,000, or even a much larger sum, to promote the dairying industry, but we do object to voting this item without providing exactly what is to be done with it. To leave it open is to establish a fund which I must call a bribery fund, in the hands of the Government to be used as they please during the elections ; for there is no doubt that the application of it will be based upon political reasons rather than upon the needs of the locality. I might put the hon. gentleman's sincerity to the test by informing him that there are several districts in my own county where cheese-making has fallen back during the past few years for various reasons. I would suggest that it would be highly proper to make some grants in the constituency of West Elgin.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not know any cows were left there.

Mr. CASEY. There is a pretty good breed of calves there, at all events. If I were to suggest to the Minister the advisability of making some grants of this sort in West Elgin, I am afraid I would be met with a candid smile, and a statement that the funds were all appropriated somewhere else, where they were more needed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have established a creamery in Oxford, and took the money out of the treasury.

Mr. CASEY. A Government creamery is a place where people can go and sell their cream at ordinary rates, and get butter made out of it is a different thing. But this is a proposal to advance money to the patrons of creameries all over the Dominion. Creameries can only be put in a few places, but this could be used in a dozen different constituencies to the greatest advantage. I think the Secretary of State, or the Minister whom he represents, should present a scheme showing where this is to be spent, before we give the vote.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I understand that this vote is to assist in the establishment of creameries throughout the country. The creamery industry is in its infancy in the North-west at present. Every one who wishes to see the country prosper, must take a great interest in the good work being done by the Government at the experimental farm in teaching the farmers this new industry. I think the money spent in

this direction is most wisely spent; and while I do not for a moment believe that my hon. friend who has just taken his seat would oppose the spending of money so wisely as this is proposed to be spent, at the same time I would like to see him seconding it with all his influence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think, as a rule, the expenditure of public moneys for these objects is objectionable, and my hon. friend near me has no doubt good reasons for taking objection to this vote. But I must frankly say that I cannot join him in condemnation of the vote. I took some pains last year to examine into the expenditure of this money in Prince Edward Island, and although it is capable of being used for political purposes, I am bound to say that, under the present management of Prof. Robertson, it is not so used. The system of farming there is undergoing a gradual transformation, and the little assistance which is given by the Government in this way, which is actually no loss to themselves, is a great incentive to the people to adopt the changed method which it is desirable they should adopt. I think myself that, under proper checks, and for a little time only, the expenditure may be justified. While I consent to the vote, and concur in it cordially, I do not propose to commit myself to a continuance of the expenditure beyond a short time. So far as I have investigated the expenditure in Prince Edward Island, I have seen no evidence that any political use has been made of it. I am proud to see that our Liberal farmers as well as others take advantage of the opportunities offered them to improve their system of farming in this direction, and I think that no charge can reasonably be made that any distinction is made with respect to politics in this expenditure. A great deal of good has been done, and I look forward to good being done in the future, but it being a tentative measure, and for a little time only, and, knowing the good that has accrued from the expenditure, it has my cordial approval and support.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that we gave $36,000 last year. How much was spent, and what were the actual receipts?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The year before the whole sum was returned; for the current year, up to the 30th June, it is not all returned, but will be. There are about $15,000 yet uncollected, but it is all in good hands.

Mr. CASEY. Who is responsible for returning it, individuals or the factories?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is only done to the patrons of Government factories, and it is done for the purpose of starting an industry where it has not existed, and I am glad to see that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island testifies as to its value. In 1892, I think there were no dairies or creameries in Prince Edward Island. The Government loaned the machinery and started a creamery there, and the result was that in 1893 they had eleven dairy stations and 1,187 farmers were using them, and were making $48,000 worth of cheese. In 1894, there were sixteen cheese factories and two creameries, and others are being established this year. With regard to the North-west, the same policy is being pursued. The Government have one creamery at Moose Jaw, and they are sending three men to the North-west for the purpose of developing that industry at other points, in the same way it is developed in Prince Edward Island. Ontario is not being forgotten, but the point in which Ontario is behind at present is not in cheese factories, nor summer dairying, but in winter dairying, and the experiments which are being made in Ontario are for the purpose of establishing winter dairying in that province.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman's explanations had been given in the first place so as to make it clear that this money is applied entirely to Government dairies, a great many of my remarks would not have been made. But the item is open to the construction, and the hon. gentleman's first explanation did not remove it, that this fund would be available to make advances to the patrons of struggling cheese factories throughout the Dominion, and it was to that I objected when I referred to the use of the money.

Mr. BORDEN. I desire to ask the Minister whether his attention has been called to a petition forwarded by the fruit-growers of the Annapolis valley, asking for a grant for the purpose of establishing an experimental fruit station there. I have been requested by the president of the Fruit Growers' Association of Nova Scotia to ask the Government what its policy is to be with reference to this matter. I hold in my hand a copy of a petition which I understand is signed by over 1,000 representative inhabitants of every county in Nova Scotia, asking the federal Government for an annual grant to aid the Fruit Growers' Association in establishing and maintaining an experimental fruit station in the Annapolis valley. The hon. gentleman knows that during the past twenty years, fruit growing in the Annapolis valley has become an enormous industry. Twenty-five or thirty years ago we were actually importing into that valley fruit from the United States, but, during the past year we exported 300,000 or 400,000 barrels of apples to England and to the United States. The hon. gentleman can see at once the importance of this industry. There is an experimental farm in Nova Scotia. It is established at a point where on account of its location, fruit growing

cannot be followed advantageously, and the fact is that the Annapolis valley is the place above all others where fruit growing in Nova Scotia can be carried on most profitably. It is proposed, in connection with the school which has been established there, that the Government might very properly encourage that institution and the fruit-growing industry of the province by establishing an experimental fruit station there. I will not detain the committee by reading lengthy extracts from the petition, but I desire to refer to one or two points. It is stated in the petition as follows :—

1. (a). Value of fruit exported to England, United States, West Indies, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland amounts to about one million dollars.

(b). Orchards in full bearing at present, 7,500 acres.

(c). Orchards less than twelve years old, probably 5,000 acres.

(d). Average annual increase of trees planted, 20 per cent.

(e). Value of vegetables (principally potatoes) exported in 1894, over $600,000.

(f). Average price per barrel for apples last year, delivered f.o.b., $1.75 ; plums, $2.25 ; potatoes, 40 cents per bushel.

(g). Average number of labourers employed during the season, picking, packing and shipping of fruit, from eight to ten thousand men, over six thousand men being constantly employed in fruit culture.

(h). Small fruits grown in 1894 : bushels, 25,000. Value of small fruits grown in 1894, $50,000.

2. Other industries assisted directly by the fruit trade :

(a). Railroads, steamboats, sailing craft and truckmen. About $50,000 was paid the Dominion Atlantic Railway in 1894 for freight ; and over $200,000 was paid to steamships for freight and loading for London alone for the crop of 1894.

We respectfully submit, that in the interests of Canada adequate means should be taken by the Government to develop these natural resources.

(a). The fact that the United States, with whom our fruit-growers come into competition in foreign markets, have an established system of experimental stations, numbering from one to four in every state, making in the aggregate fifty-six. besides numerous substations, makes the importance of a fruit station more evident, if we hope to contend with them in the open markets of the world.

(b). The association, aided by a subsidy of two thousand dollars from the Nova Scotia Government, has succeeded in establishing a horticultural school located at Wolfville. The school is not connected with any other institution, but is controlled by the association. It is the only horticultural school in the maritime provinces, and, we believe, in the Dominion, in which the tuition is free. It has begun its second year with sixty pupils. It is a great benefit to farmers and farmers' sons.

In view of the large opportunities for increased growth of fruit ; in view of the necessity of an experimental station in this part of the country to successfully use these opportunities, and in view of the intelligent and financial interest in this enterprise of the Fruit Growers' Association, we believe our petition will be found worthy of the most favourable consideration and action of Her Majesty's Government for Canada.

The petition is signed by J. W. Bigelow, president, and S. C. Parker, secretary. The only way in which this Government can possibly promote the fruit-growing industry is in some such way as this. We have in this country a system of protection in vogue and those engaged in the fruit-growing industry contend that so long as the present system prevails, they have a right to assistance from the Government, as they are very heavily taxed in many other respects, and that they should receive some return by way of direct assistance to their industry. I should like to know what the Minister representing the Department of Agriculture is prepared to do in regard to this petition of the fruit growers of Nova Scotia ?

Mr. FOSTER. The petition has been received, I am informed. We have had petitions before for the establishment of experimental fruit farms in other parts of the Dominion. All of these matters have to be taken up gradually. We cannot devote more money for experimental farm work and the dairying business at the present, and it is impossible to take up several other branches, which are very laudiable and praiseworthy in themselves and which would be generally beneficial to the people. We have taken up what seemed to be the most pressing, and those which most had need of guidance and actual help, and in doing that we spend $200,000 annually. The matter of fruit-growing stations, although it has had the attention of the department, and has been experimented with by the department on all the experimental farms in the different parts of the Dominion, and is being carried on in connection with farm work, has not been taken up as a specialty. That industry must wait its turn. My hon. friend knows that if any industry in Canada is strong enough to wait its turn it is the fruit-growing industry in the fertile valley of the Annapolis, where fruit grows almost indigenous to the soil. I am told that at Nappan, where the experimental farm is, and where it had been supposed it was of no use to attempt to grow fruit, experiments are being made and with great success, and it has been demonstrated that fruit can be grown in that section of the country, and this has stimulated other portions of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia not so well situated as is the Annapolis valley to raise fruit, and the system is thus working in the direction of extending fruit culture. So that generally good results in that respect are flowing from the experimental farms. By and by, when the exchequer is flush of money, when the dairy and butter business are established, no doubt the Government will take up fruit culture in different parts of the Dominion.

Mr. BORDEN. I am glad to know it is the intention of the Government to take these matters up gradually, and I hope the Finance Minister will begin with the Annapolis valley, as these fruit growers

are first on the ground with their petition, and he will find it convenient at an early date to answer favourably the prayer of the petition to which I have referred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You might strike out the Haras National vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is passed; this is its last year.

Mr. GRIEVE. Is the record of work done at all the different dairying stations embodied in the dairying report?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes.

Mr. GRIEVE. What is the number of dairying reports that have been issued the last year?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Government does not control the issue.

Mr. GRIEVE. Reports for 1892-93 were only placed in the hands of members of this House a few weeks ago. Farmers are not very fond of studying ancient history, and if these reports are to be of any benefit to farmers they should be placed in their hands as soon as possible. We are paying $75,000 per year for the maintenance of expermiental farms, and from $30,000 to $40,000 for dairy purposes. There is no possible way how that expenditure can benefit the farmers of the country generally, other than by their receiving a copy of these reports. If the reports are not ready in proper season and in sufficient numbers to distribute amongst the bulk of the farmers of the country, then they might as well not be published at all. It is all very well for farmers residing within 30, or 40, or 50 miles of the experimental farms to visit the farm as they do in large numbers; but it is impossible for the farmers throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion to come here. The only benefit these farmers living at a long distance can receive, is from reading the Experimental Farm and Dairy Reports. A return I moved for a month ago, shows that there were something like 35,000 Experimental Farm Reports published all told in English and French last year. What is that number amongst 800,000 farmers in this country? I believe this is a valuable report, but to make it of any practical value at all, it should be published in large numbers and sent out among the farmers. I hope the Secretary of State will see in the future that those reports are generously distributed and sent out in proper season.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I trust my hon. friend (Mr. Grieve) will suggest to the Agricultural Committee to make the recommendations he has referred to.

Mr. GRIEVE. A recommendation was made by the Agricultural Committee to publish 150,000 copies of the report, but that number was cut down after it left the committee.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The report is brought up to the 30th June, and it is impossible to get it down for the session, unless the sessions should extend over the half year.

Mr. GRIEVE. Speaking for myself it is only since last New Year that I received some 500 of the Dairy Reports. It is no easy matter for many of the members of this House to have to cart these reports home from the post office and have them addressed and carted back to the post office again. They should be placed in the hands of members while the House is in session. It is since January, 1895, that I have received the Dairy Report of 1892-93. Surely the Minister will see that that will not be repeated again.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend's point is that we do not get the report for the current year, but that we do not get the report of the year before. The reports for 1892 were distributed in the winter of 1895. That reflects very little credit on the department. The Agricultural Committee recommends that a certain number of the reports be printed, and if the department accepts that recommendation they print them two years too late.

Mr. FLINT. The Dairy and Experimental Farm Reports are not like the ordinary financial reports of the Government which must necessarily be brought down to the 30th June in each year. I would suggest for the Minister's consideration that these reports be brought up to the end of the calendar year. The time of their publication and preparation could be varied without any injury to their value, and perhaps with a great deal of advantage to the members of the House and to the farmers of the country. It seems to me that the time the farmers would like to have these reports would be at any time after the 30th December, and before their early spring operations commence.

Distributing Fishing Bounty $5,000

Mr. BOWERS. I wish to call the attention of the Government to the unfair distribution of the fishing bounty. The principal fishing counties in the Dominion do not receive the amount of bounty to which they are entitled. For instance, Digby County, being, I think, the third or fourth county in the province of Nova Scotia or in the Dominion of Canada, in regard to its catch of fish, does not receive within $1.70 of the general average that is paid in the Dominion to each man who fishes in a vessel. $78,653.29 is paid to vessels and crews, and I contend that while half of that money should be paid to the vessels per tonnage, as it is at present, the other half should be divided among the fishermen, according to the number of men who fish in the vessel, giving each of them $6.63, which was last year's average. Instead of that, the follow-

ing statement, giving the bounty of each county for 1893, which I have carefully compiled, will show how unfair the distribution has been:

AMOUNT paid for Boats and vessels, $158,234.10. Vessels and crews, $78,653.29.

—	Vessels.	Tons.	Men.	Amount drawn.	Amount per man.
				$ cts.	$ cts.
Northumberland with	2	94	8	250 85	14 32
Victoria with	2	48	6	139 20	11 60
Guysboro' do	13	372	51	964 04	8 33
Cumberland with	1	17	3	49 00	8 22
Prince Co do	8	358	48	989 02	9 79
King's, N.S. do	5	72	6	155 25	8 47
Saguenay do	27	812	142	2,349 34	8 25
Lunenburg do	164	10,953	1,943	31,588 21	8 08
Inverness do	9	290	57	841 00	7 38
Queen's do	8	406	17	1,136 34	7 11
Charlotte do	52	929	156	2,427 24	6 93
King's, P.E.I. with	16	500	93	1,345 70	6 67
Richmond with	70	2,202	467	6,227 13	6 50
Halifax do	92	2,661	577	7,321 32	6 00
Annapolis do	8	260	54	700 52	6 00
St. John do	11	198	41	535 92	6 97
Queen's, P.E.I. with	3	52	10	133 40	5 80
Cape Breton with	7	120	26	317 34	5 52
Yarmouth do	48	2,353	614	6,560 45	5 56
Shelburne do	53	1,880	493	5,256 94	5 13
Gloucester do	143	1,655	426	4,634 07	5 25
Gaspé do	4	130	35	370 71	5 21
Digby do	55	1,550	403	2,247 50	4 97
Bonaventure do	1	10	2	24 17	4 83
Kent, N.B. do	2	46	3	69 01	0 71
Antigonish do	1	11	3	15 95	0 00

The average in the whole Dominion we find to be $6.63. The highest bounty paid per head to vessel fishermen was $21.75 in 1893, the lowest 83c., although, according to the Marine and Fisheries report, I find that in Antigonish only the vessel drew bounty, while the crew drew nothing—something peculiar in itself. You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that Northumberland drew $14.32, or $7.69 more than the average; Inverness drew $11.60, or, $4.79 more than the average; and Guysboro' drew $8.33, or $1.70 more than the average. Cumberland, Prince (P.E.I.), King's (N.S.), Saguenay, Lunenburg, Inverness, Queen's and Charlotte drew from 30c. to $1.59 more than the average paid, while the rest of the counties, with one or two exceptions, received amounts far below the average amount they were justly entitled to, Digby receiving only $4.79, or $1.66 per man below the average, or an amount for the county of $668.98 less than it was entitled to. I called the attention of the late Minister to this matter two or three years ago. He told me this policy was for the encouragement of the building of larger vessels. But you see that this of itself does not necessarily encourage the building of larger vessels. If you divided the $78,625 and gave half that amount to the vessels, you would encourage the building of larger vessels just as well. Then the other half should be divided pro rata among the fishermen of the whole Dominion. That would be the fair way to distribute the fishing bounty. Why should three or four men who have a vessel of fifty tons receive more per man than six or eight men who fish in a vessel of twenty tons? The men fishing in the larger vessel should not receive any more money, because they probably work no harder than the men in the smaller one. At the same time, I would also call the attention of the hon. Minister to another thing. In the county of Gloucester, N.B., in 1892, there were forty-one vessels, and in 1893, 143 vessels. They have turned about 100 or more of these boats, which were drawing bounties of one dollar each, into vessels of ten or twelve tons—simply large, open boats, such as we have in Digby and other counties which only draw a dollar each. They have turned them into vessels, making a difference in the receipts of Gloucester County in 1892-93 of $2,094 more than they were entitled to. I would also call attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that Gloucester, with only one vessel of twenty-five tons, one of eighteen tons, one of seventeen tons, three of fifteen, five of fourteen, fifteen of thirteen, and the balance of ten to twelve tons, drew more

bounty than Digby County with its large fishing fleet, because these boats that have been turned into vessels only carry about two men, and all ten-ton vessels get $14.50 or $7.25 for each man. This thing is very unfair. Gloucester County is one where the late Minister of Marine had to throw out at one time, over 500 claims on account of fraud. Now, they have turned these large boats into vessels in order to get more bounty than they are rightfully entitled to. They measure these boats on the outside, while our vessels are all measured under decks, on the inside, so that the Gloucester boats measure more tons than they should rightly, and are drawing more bounty than they are entitled to. I would ask the hon. Minister to examine into this matter and see whether he cannot divide the bounty more fairly so that the vessel fishermen will get an average per man all over the Dominion. Do not give one man $21.75, who perhaps may have fished barely three months, and barely caught the 2,000 pounds required, while some other man, who fished seven or eight months in a vessel with eight men, only gets a couple of dollars. If this money were divided pro rata to each man, the clerks in the Fishery Department could make up the cheques very much quicker, because they would have a regular amount to give each man. I hope the Minister will give his early attention to this matter, so that before another year we may have a more equal distribution of this money.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I shall be very glad to give every consideration to the statement made by the hon. gentleman. It is very difficult to divide that bounty, and all that I can say is that I feel confidence in the existing system. There may be some improvement possible, but my predecessor gave his most earnest attention to that subject, and his most earnest endeavours to prevent fraud.

Mr. YEO. Has the hon. gentleman received any petition from Prince Edward Island with regard to the oyster fisheries there? I notice that the fishermen have been holding meetings in different parts of the county, and have made representations. I hope that when their petition reaches the hon. gentleman he will give it every consideration.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to express my gratification at the promise of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to look carefully into the statement made by the hon. member for Digby. The House is certainly indebted to my hon. friend for having so persistently called attention to this matter during two or three successive sessions, and for having so forcibly and clearly expressed his views. It is apparent that the present basis of distributing the fishing bounty is unscientific and illogical. The tonnage of vessels and the number of men inextricably mixed up and confused, thus placing the men at a disadvantage. The hon. member for Digby has evidently given this question a great deal of thought and calculation, and his figures are certainly very convincing. It does appear rather extraordinary that the average fisherman in Digby County should only receive $4.97, while each fisherman in the county of Northumberland receives $14.32. This disparity runs through the various counties. Take the county of Yarmouth. In the county of Yarmouth the average fisherman receives $5.56 from this fund set aside for the fishermen, while the average fisherman in the county of Victoria receives $11.60 or 100 per cent more. It is evident there is something wrong in the method by which these results are arrived at, and I believe that the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) has the clew to the difficulty when he shows that tonnage and number of men are confused in the distribution and that the money is divided upon the basis that is entirely unscientific. The number of men engaged in the fishing industry in any district is one thing, and the tonnage devoted to fishing is another thing; and the money devoted by the state to encouraging tonnage should be distinguished from the money devoted by the state for the encouragement of men in the industry. I would press with earnestness the most careful consideration of this matter upon the Department of Marine and Fisheries; and, if we are spared to come here another session I hope hon. members representing districts largely interested in this industry will devote attention to this matter with a view to devising a more equitable method of distributing this fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A great deal might be said upon this subject but I will reserve my remarks for concurrence—provided that the hon. gentleman will not ask us to go further to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. There are just two little things that have been bothering us that might be put through.

The Post Office Department—	
Clerical and other assistance	$18,000
Printing	12,400
Stationery	4,100
Sundries	4,500
	$39,800

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The report that was asked for has been brought down—well take your contingencies.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there is a little matter of the post office at Marysville.

Marysville public building	$5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Better let that stand.

Mr. FOSTER. We will talk about it on concurrence.

Resolutions reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 141) for the settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and British Columbia relating to lands in the railway belt (from the Senate)—(Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 8th July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

JOHN CONNOR, ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. GRIEVE asked, Is John Connor, of St. John, N.B., employed by the Government in handling the twine manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary? Has he a stated salary, or is he selling on commission? If the latter, what commission does he receive?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. John Connor is so employed on commission, and receives 10 per cent of the sales, and guarantees the payment.

CHAS. BEDARD, REVISING OFFICER.

Mr. MONET asked, At whose request was Mr. Chas. Bedard, notary, appointed revising officer for part of the county of Laprairie and Napierville?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The records of the department only give the official appointment, and I will lay that on the Table.

Mr. MONET. I hold in my hand the Order in Council making the appointment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is all the record I have in the department.

REVISING OFFICERS, COUNTY OF NAPIERVILLE.

Mr. MONET asked, For what reason were two revising officers appointed for the county of Napierville, when there is but one for the united counties of St. John and Iberville, and but one in Chambly-Verchères?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. J. A. Roberge was first appointed for the whole district of Laprairie and Napierville. But after his refusal to accept the commission, the Government appointed Bedard for Napierville and Roberge for Laprairie. In the two other electoral districts the revising officers have accepted their commissions.

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION FRAUDS.

Mr. BRODEUR asked, Has the Government still in its employ any of the persons found guilty of fraud at the time of the Civil Service examinations at Montreal in 1893? If so, who are those persons?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

PATRICK McDONALD, LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. BRODEUR asked, Is Patrick McDonald employed by the Government in the office of the collector on the Lachine Canal? If so, what is his salary? Did he undergo an examination before the Board of Civil Service examiners entitling him to be appointed to the position he occupies?

Mr. HAGGART. A. P. McDonald is employed in the office of the collector of the Lachine Canal, at a salary of $58.33 per month. He has not passed an examination, as he is only temporarily employed.

SUPERANNUATIONS SINCE 1st JANUARY, 1895.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, What are the names of the several parties superannuated since 1st January, 1895, to date? The date and their superannuation, and the amount of retiring allowance granted, and the department to which they belonged?

Mr. FOSTER. I must ask my hon. friend, in accordance with our usual custom, to put that in the shape of a motion for a return.

AGRICULTURE IN THE CENSUS.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Bruneau) asked, 1. Is the publication of the last census now complete? If not, why? 2. Is it the intention of the Government to have that part of the census relating to the agricultural class printed and distributed soon?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The compilation of the last census is now completed, and the publication will be made as soon as the printing will be completed. The part relating to agriculture is included in this forthcoming volume.

INTERNATIONAL ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Bruneau) asked. Is the International Fraternal Alliance Assurance Company registered at Ottawa? Has it made the deposit with the Government required by the law relating to foreign assurance societies?

Mr. FOSTER. The International Fraternal Alliance Assurance Company has not made any deposit with the Government, and is not licensed or registered under the Insurance Act.

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR.

Mr. LANGELIER asked. What has been the total cost up to 30th June, 1895, of the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners' operations? Are there any claims outstanding for work performed or for properties purchased? If so, what are those claims? What is the annual revenue of the Three Rivers Harbour Commission? What are the annual expenses of the said commission, for salaries and all other expenditure? Is the Three Rivers Harbour Commission in debt to the Government? If so, the details of such indebtedness?

Mr. FOSTER. The Three Rivers Harbour Commission, on the 30th June last, owed the Government for loan, $81,760.97; arrears of interest, $30,479.24; arrears and interest thereon on account of sinking fund, $8,751.82. There is a sum of $800.52 at credit of the sinking fund. I think that is as far as my department goes. The other parts of the question belong to the Public Works Department.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. RIDER asked, Is it the intention of the Government to continue in the service of any department, any or all persons now employed therein, whether as temporary clerks or otherwise, notwithstanding the passing of Bill (No. 130) intituled: "An Act further to amend the Civil Service Act"? If so, in what department? 2. Has an Order in Council to that effect been passed? If so, when passed, and what is the object of such Order in Council?

Mr. FOSTER. It has been the custom of the Government to make these appointments from time to time, generally for six months, in case of what may be called permanent temporary clerks. There is provision in the Act just passed by which those temporary clerks in the employment of the Government can remain on under that Act. No general Order in Council has been passed.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

THE DOMINION BANK.

Mr. DAWSON asked. 1. Have the Government received declarations made by Peter Vanluven, and others, respecting certain transactions of the Dominion Bank, relating to the purchase of grain, coal, and lands during the last eight or ten years? 2. Did the said Peter Vanluven, and others, petition the Government to make inquiry into the said trasnactions? 3. Have the Government made any, and what inquiry into the said transactions, and are they satisfied the bank had acted in accordance with the provisions of the Bank Act? 4. If not, will the Government grant permission to the said petitioners to bring an action at law against the bank for violation of the Act?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has received declarations by Mr. Peter Vanluven, and others, respecting certain transactions of the Dominion Bank, alleging that the bank had violated the Bank Act, and asking leave to proceed against the bank under the Bank Act. The bank deny that there has been any violation of the Act, and express their determination to contest any action that may be brought. The matter has been put in the hands of the Department of Justice with instructions to give the parties who have made the charges a chance to proceed against the bank, on their giving satisfactory guarantee to indemnify the Crown, and also the bank, against all costs, &c., in case the action should not succeed.

DAM AT WEST RIDEAU LAKE.

Mr. DAWSON asked, 1. Have the Government examined into the claims for lands in the township of Bedford, alleged to have been damaged by water held back in the spring of 1893 by the new dam at the foot of West Rideau Lake? 2. If so, by whom, and when was the examination made? 3. Is it the intention of the Government to compensate the persons whose lands are damaged? If not, why not? 4. If so, when will the claims be adjusted?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. The Government have examined into the claims for lands in the township of Bedford, alleged to have been damaged by water. 2. By Acting Superintending Engineer Phillips, in August, 1894. 3. No; it is not the intention of the Government to compensate persons whose lands are alleged to have been damaged, because the Government dam, it is reported, has caused no damage.

MANITOBA SCHOOLS—MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENT.

Mr. LAURIER. I suppose the hon. gentleman leading the House will now make to the House the statement he promised on Friday last.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state, that the Government has had under its consideration the reply of the Manitoba legislature to the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895, and, after careful deliberation has arrived at the following conclusion :—Though there may be differences of opinion as to the exact meaning of the reply in question, the Government believes that it may be interpreted as holding out some hope of an amicable settlement of the Manitoba School Question on the basis of possible action by the Manitoba Government and legislature ; and the Dominion Government is most unwilling to take any action which can be interpreted as forestalling or precluding such a desirable consummation. The Government has also considered the difficulties to be met with in preparing and perfecting legislation on so important and intricate a question during the last hours of the session. The Government has, therefore, decided not to ask Parliament to deal with remedial legislation during the present session. A communication will be sent immediately to the Manitoba Government on the subject, with a view to ascertaining whether that Government is disposed to make a settlement of the question, which will be reasonably satisfactory to the minority of that province, without making it necessary to call into requisition the powers of the Dominion Parliament. A session of the present Parliament will be called together to meet not later than the first Thursday of January next. If by that time the Manitoba Government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievance of the minority, the Dominion Government will be prepared, at the next session of Parliament, to be called, as above stated, to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority, based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council, and the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I regret to have to state that the present attitude of the Government——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. There is nothing before the House.

THE THOUSAND ISLANDS.

Mr. TAYLOR moved :

That in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that a few of the large islands in the River St. Lawrence which are yet undisposed of, should be reserved for the use of the public as a Dominion park.

He said : In making this motion, I beg to offer a few remarks respecting the Thousand Islands, and the action of this Government and the Government preceding it in respect to their mode of dealing with those islands. Opposite the constituency that I have the honour to represent are known as the Thousand Islands group. On the American side of the boundary line and in the same neighbourhood, are situated from two to three hundred of the same group of islands. Many years ago, twenty or twenty-five years ago, the American Government disposed to a syndicate of a number of the islands situated on that side of the line. Many capitalists invested in those islands, and some of them built palatial residences, and to-day within a distance of ten or twelve miles from the village of Clayton to Alexanderia Bay, there have been expended some ten million dollars on residences for people who make there a watering-place at which to spend their vacation. The Americans reserved several of the larger islands or portions of them for public parks. During some months, eight or ten thousand, or more, citizens from the United States, and many from Canada, I am sorry to say, resort to those islands and parks for the purpose of spending their holidays. In 1882, when I was first elected a member of this House, I pressed on the Government the desirability of placing those islands on the market, from the fact that the Americans, having settled there and built up those watering-places, the travel on the St. Lawrence had been diverted from the Canadian channel to the American channel, and I thought, and I thought wisely, that if the Government disposed of our islands, watering-places would be established, and many people would come to the Canadian side of the river, thus making a market and furnishing labour to our Canadian people. However, the Government claimed that those islands belonged to the Indians, that they had them in trust, and they thought the time was inopportune for disposing of them. In 1887, the Government decided that they would select twenty or thirty of those islands, and dispose of them at public auction, under the leasehold plan, and that the parties purchasing should receive a lease for twenty-one years, at an annual rental. The islands thus selected were put up and sold, and sold at high rentals ; but many of those who purchased and paid one year's rent in advance, declined when they saw the form of lease presented, to carry out the contract, from the fact that the Government reserved the right, at the end of twenty-one years, to terminate the lease, and any improvement the lessor made he would be compelled to remove, unless he agreed to pay a higher rental, if the Government saw fit to enforce it. Therefore, there were very few of the islands thus disposed of under the rental system, and the contracts carried out, and subsequently those who purchased on the rental plan were allowed to purchase absolutely by paying a sum equivalent to the rental, capitalized at 4

per cent. A few availed themselves of this opportunity, and secured islands, and a few buildings have been erected under that plan. In 1891, the Government again having found out that the selling under lease plan was unsatisfactory, decided to call another sale and to sell subject to the conditions that the purchasing party should be compelled within three years to erect a house and make other improvements of not less value than $1,000. Some thirty or forty of the islands thus selected were sold and at a good price. The Government then decided to dispose of the entire group by public competition, but protests were made through the press claiming that the islands should be reserved as a national park. I might say that the majority of the small islands are at present so overgrown with small brush that it is nearly impossible for a person to find a place to sit down on them, and they have nothing but a scenic value. I presented petitions from the township councils and from the county council, asking the Government to adopt some system, and the suggestion was made that a revaluation be made of the islands. There were many islands not found on the map and persons were applying to purchase these islands, and it was decided, and decided wisely by the Government, to have a resurvey and a revaluation of the whole group of all the unsold islands. This was done, and in my opinion the values placed upon them were very high. However, it was decided that the Government would sell at the upset price of the valuation, every island on the river. Representations were also made asking the Government to reserve a few of the larger islands for the purpose of a public park. A catalogue was gotten up by the Government giving a description of every island in the river, and it was prefaced by the following statement :—

The Government of the Dominion, which is the trustee of this property, has determined to sell immediately all the undisposed of portion of it which lies opposite the townships of Leeds, Lansdowne, Escott and Yonge, as shown in the descriptive list herein. This will place upon the market between 600 and 700 of the most beautiful and picturesquely situated islands on the continent, and offer unprecedented opportunities for obtaining lovely and salubrious summer homes.

The map at the end of the pamphlet gives the surroundings and location of each island. The designation (by name or number) on the map enables reference to be made to the descriptive list. The latter contains the area, brief description and upset price of each island.

The small map herewith gives a general or geographical view of the district, and information as to distances, &c., from United States and Canadian cities.

I might here refer to the prices placed on these islands by the valuators. One called "Surveyors Island," containing four and one-fifth acres, partly timbered and well located on inside channel, was fixed at a price of $450, or $100 per acre. The Two Sisters Island, containing two-fifths of an acre was valued at $100, and so it goes on, the values ranging from one to two hundred dollars per acre, being the upset price as fixed by the valuators. A day was set for the sale to commence and any person applying up to that date was to have the island he applied for. But if two or more persons applied for the same island, then they would be asked to tender and the highest tenderer got the choice. Notwithstanding this, the Opposition press charged the Government with having parcelled out these islands to their friends. Now, I have a return in my hand which I myself moved for showing the action taken by the Liberal Administration in dealing with this same group of islands. During the time, from 1874 to 1878 that my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Mills) had charge of the Department of Indian Affairs, the Government of which he was a member, sold 2,642 acres of these islands, for $6,007, or an average of $2.07 per acre. From 1879 to 1885, the Government of that period, being obliged to carry out contracts of sale which had been entered into by the Mackenzie Government, sold 723 acres for $3,697, or an average of $5.06 per acre. I may say that all the sales during the time of the Mackenzie Government were made privately. The sales which had been made by the present Administration since that time have been by public competition, and since that date they have sold 488 acres for $42,097, or an average value of $86.06 per acre, as compared with an average value of $2.37 per acre obtained by the previous Government. Not an island has been disposed of by the present Government except by public competition and at prices ranging from $100 to $200 per acre, while the Mackenzie Government sold the islands at prices ranging from $2 to $5 per acre. These are the facts as proved by the returns which I have in my hand. Here is an island called the Little John Island, sold on the 5th April, 1875, to a gentleman by the name of A. G. Payne. It contains seven and eight-tenths acres, and it was sold for $84. I see one place on the list here that was purchased by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways from private individuals. It contains 7 acres, and was sold at $1,000. $900 was the upset price by the Government, and he purchased at private sale for $1,000. Here is an island sold in 1877 to Mr. Henry Campbell of Gananoque, a good Reformer at the time, and it contains eight and seven-tenths acres, the price paid for it being $100. That island is now owned by Mr. Finlay of Montreal, who has erected a palatial residence upon it and occupies it every summer with his family. That island is situated close to one that I occupy. I purchased it on the rental system of $12 a year. It contains one and one-fifth acres, and I paid $300 for the island under the plan of paying the equivalent of 4 per cent capitalized, while a seven acre island alongside of it was sold

for $84 by the Mackenzie Government. Suffice it to say, that hon. gentlemen opposite disposed of 2,600 acres of these islands to their friends at an average price of $2.07 per acre, while this Government have in every case sold at public competition, and have realized on the average $86 per acre. At the time of the survey of the islands, several of the larger islands were selected and a special upset price put upon them. Up to the present time these islands have been reserved from sale; and the object of the present motion is to have a number of these islands, containing each twenty or twenty-five acres and every two or three miles apart, reserved as a national preserve or national park. At a very small expenditure the Government might clean up these islands, so that they would become inviting places for tourists from Canada or the United States, or elsewhere, to come and camp, and spend the summer under canvas if they wished. They would make beautiful pic-nic grounds, where steamers from the east or west could call, and where people could spend a day pleasantly. I hope a majority of the members of this House will approve of my proposition to authorize the Government to set apart some of these islands for a national park or preserve, as I am satisfied that it will meet with the approval of every person who has ever visited these islands.

Mr. SPROULE. In seconding this motion, I do so because these islands are situated in one of the important international highways lying between Canada and the United States, over which thousands, and even millions, of people have passed and will continue to pass in their travels, either for pleasure or for business. The St. Lawrence, from its situation and its picturesque nature, has attracted a great many foreigners to pass that way for the purpose of seeing the beautiful islands which are scattered there in such large numbers. I was very much surprised, in passing over the St. Lawrence a year or two ago, to find that some very important and very beautiful islands, containing valuable agricultural land and good timber, and very conveniently situated with reference to the towns on both sides, had been sold for a trifle. It appeared to me that they were as good as given away, the price obtained for them was so low. I am quite sure that had it been known that they were to be sold, had they been offered at public competition and well advertised, as they shou'd have been, they would have commanded ten times or perhaps twenty times what was obtained for them; and yet they were sold absolutely. These islands might have been leased for a term of years, so that the property would have continued to belong to the Government. Then, from time to time, the leases might have been renewed, or, if the islands were wanted for some other purpose, the Government could have taken them over. But, to make an absolute sale of these islands for the trifle for which they were sold, was, in my opinion, entirely unjustifiable and indefensible. I think the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said, during the Mackenzie Government's time, that there were sold within a few years 2,600 acres, a great deal of which was good agricultural land, and that not more than $2.26 per acre was realized. If they had been sold simply as sites for summer cottages, and had been properly advertised, I am sure they would have brought ten times or twenty times that price. The present Government have followed the same course, and during the past year have sold a good many of the islands. It is true, they realized a great deal more money for them. They put upon them an upset price, which the public considered exorbitant, and at which they would not make an offer. For those which have been sold during the last year a fair amount of money has been realized by the Indian Department. Many of them were, to my mind, of little or no value, in some cases being only a rock projecting out of the water, and the upset price was such as hardly to give the purchaser a chance to get any return for his money. Yet, from time to time, some of the best islands are being gradually picked up. Therefore, I think it is important that the Government should, at the earliest possible date, take into consideration the advisability of having an inspection of the islands made, and having some of the best of them selected and reserved for a park—if not an international park in conjunction with such islands as might be appropriated by the United States for the same purpose, at least for a national park which would be available to tourists and sight-seers, and all who travel up and down the waters of the beautiful St. Lawrence. This cannot be done too early, because if the sale of the islands continues, the most beautiful of them, and those best fitted for this purpose, will be bought up from time to time. At Niagara Falls there is a park on the American side and one on the Canadian side, the one reserved by the American Government and the other by the Government of Ontario—practically a joint park, because those who visit the one generally visit the other. So I believe it would be, but to a much greater extent, in the case of the Thousand Islands. Then, there is the additional advantage that the waters of the St. Lawrence can be navigated by the tourist and sight-seer. This resort is also of great value, not merely to pleasure-seekers, but to invalids seeking for the restoration of their health. It also contains excellent fishing grounds. These and many other reasons make the Thousand Islands much more attractive than the park at Niagara Falls, where there is, comparatively speaking, nothing but the Falls themselves; after you have seen the Falls, you have seen

every attraction that nature has provided for the tourist and sight-seer. But down on the St. Lawrence there is a great deal more than that. You can combine pleasure with your other pursuits during the time you spend there, and also derive great profit in regard to your health. One can be stationed there for a time with great benefit to his physical and mental constitution, from the recuperative forces of nature, whereas at Niagara such benefit cannot be had. The islands on the St. Lawrence are said to number over a thousand, and hence it is called the waters of the Thousand Islands. Very many of those islands, however, have been sold, and if we continue to sell them in the future, some of those most important ones may be parted with. I think we should not sell them at all. If we dispose of them in any way, we should dispose of them by lease to parties who will hold them for a time, the country still retaining the ownership. The suggestion that the Government should set apart a number for the purpose of a national park is one which should meet the approval of the House, and therefore I hope the Government will see their way clear to let this motion pass.

Mr. DALY. In reply to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, and the mover of the motion, I may say that when the Government undertook to sell these islands last year, under the valuation that had been made the year previous, a reservation was made of eleven islands. For instance, the Government reserved Aubrey, Mermaid, Beau Rivage, Camelots, Endymion, Gordon, Ninette, Georgine, Constance, St. Catherines, Adelaide, and others. These islands are all of a good size and are scattered along through the group, in order to give people living on the mainland, an opportunity of going on these islands in close proximity to their homes and enjoying camping upon them, but I understand the hon. gentleman goes further and asks that the Government should reserve these islands for the purpose of a national park. I understood him to say that the Government, in addition to reserving them, should erect landing places and clean them up; but he overlooks the fact that they are the property of the Indians, held in trust by the Government, which consequently could not undertake to pay any expenditure for the purpose of erecting buildings and constructing wharfs on the islands out of the Indian funds. The Government can only leave them in a state of nature. Anything done would have to be done by a vote of Parliament. It is a question whether the House thinks this is a matter of such importance as to grant a sufficient vote to make landing places and clean up these islands.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is very much more than that.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. DALY. Yes, the Government in reserving the islands in question had another object in view. These islands are valuable and we do not think it right to dispose of them at once, as we could realize a larger sum for the Indians eventually than we could at present. No harm can be done by reserving the islands in the meantime, and the object of the hon. gentleman, namely, that the people should have the right to go and camp on them is reserved to the people so that, so far as the public is concerned, they will have the privilege the hon. gentleman desires they should have, and the Indians will not be deprived at present of the proceeds of the sale of the islands. It would be a matter of serious consideration whether the Government should undertake to meet the views of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the proposition is very extraordinary after what was done last year. The provincial government offered to purchase these islands for a fair consideration from the Government of the Dominion and to convert them into a provincial park. The Government last year refused to entertain that proposition, but went on and sold the best of these islands.

Mr. DALY. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They have simply the culls of the islands of the St. Lawrence left on their hands.

Mr. DALY. Not at all; the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Now there is a proposition made to convert the remaining islands into a national park. Well, in the first place, the Government must make an appropriation for them out of the public funds and hand over to the Indians the value of the islands. We cannot take the property of the Indians in these islands for nothing and use the islands as a national park. The hon. gentleman should have gone much further and proposed to acquire these islands from the Indians at a fair valuation.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the circumstances of the debate, I move that it be now adjourned as some others may wish to speak.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

BARRY'S BAY STATION—OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RAILROAD.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Copies of all petitions, correspondence, documents, or other papers from the electors of the riding of South Renfrew, or any one or more of them, or any other persons, addressed to the Governor General or the Minister of Railways, in reference to the closing of the railway station at Barry's Bay, a station on the Ottawa, Arprior and

Parry Sound Railway, in the county of Renfrew, and for papers or correspondence, as above, containing complaints of any persons against the said railway company, for inconvenience and business losses occasioned by the closing of said railway station, and for papers or correspondence, as above, complaining against the action of said railway company, so largely assisted by Government moneys, for inconveniencing and injuring public business, in attempting to coerce an individual into giving the company land or privileges which the company could not obtain by action at law.

He said: In moving this resolution, I am asking for the information in the interests of the public in the district concerned, I am informed that the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway made an arrangement with a Mr. Stafford and another party—the name is immaterial—to get a free grant of land for the purpose of building a station at a point agreed upon by both parties. The railway made and registered a survey of their route, locating the line and the station, as agreed upon between them and Mr. Stafford. They afterwards built both track and station in such a way that the station incommoded Mr. Stafford's private residence. I believe the water tank was built right up against his door, and this being in violation of the original agreement between the parties, Mr. Stafford declined to give them a deed of the land. Thereupon the railway company ceased to stop their trains at the station, as they had undertaken to do, and carried passengers and freight a couple of miles further, to a stopping place in a swamp, as I am informed, where there are no conveniences for the landing of passengers or freight. By this course they greatly discommoded the people using the line, and interfered very much with the trade of the adjacant country, and broke faith with Mr. Stafford and those associated with him. But, notwithstanding this fact, they continue to persecute Mr. Stafford for the deed of the property. Now, I am informed that some arrangement has been come to between the railway company and Mr. Stafford; but, as I have brought this motion forward in the public interest, and not in the interests of Mr. Stafford personally, I think I am still justified in calling for the information mentioned. I am informed that petitions were put in from municipalities and from private individuals in the neighbourhood, as well as from private parties and companies in Montreal, pointing out the damage to trade resulting from the course pursued by the railway company. And the people in the vicinity are very anxious to know, and insist upon knowing, whether the Government have taken any notice of these petitions, whether they have done anything to induce the company to abate their pretensions and come to an agreement with Mr. Stafford, and whether the Government and the member for the riding have used their influence to bring about an adjustment that would be in the public interest. It is for these reasons, Sir, notwithstanding the arrangement between the private owner and the railway company, that I persist in asking for this information. But, as we are not likely to have the return this session, perhaps the Minister will make some statement with regard to the matter.

Mr. HAGGART. I have no information in the department except a petition to the Governor General asking for the reopening of Bary's Bay station. Immediately upon the reception of the petition, I sent a copy of it to the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company, asking them to give me some reasons in answer to the petition. I have not received any answer yet. There is no objection to furnishing the petition, and also the answer to it when I receive it. I believe the whole matter has been settled.

Mr. CASEY. I understand it has been settled; but I am not asking this return in the interest of private parties. I suppose the return will be ready by the first Thursday in January.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, yes.

Motion agreed to.

SEIZURES OF SMUGGLED GOODS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return showing the number of seizures of goods or wares of any kind smuggled into Canada in violation of the Customs Act, the country whence brought in, the value of the goods seized in each case, the name or names of the claimants, and where seized, for each of the years commencing the 1st day of July, 1890, to the 30th day of June, 1894.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish my hon. friend would not press that motion. The return will involve a great deal of labour; and I doubt very much that it would be wise to bring down the names of parties in all cases. The seizures of goods precede the investigation—necessarily, because the goods are seized in transit and must be taken in charge by an officer—and until the investigation takes place, it is impossible to say whether the charge is well founded or not. To bring down this return would be to publish the names of many thoroughly honest and reputable merchants, giving them a publicity which I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to bring about.

Mr. McMULLEN. If I thought there was any injustice to any person involved in this return, I would not press the resolution. I think that the information would be useful in the public interest. Of course, if there is any point in the resolution the propriety of the adoption of which the hon. Minister doubts, I would not press that unfairly. I cannot see the force of the hon. Minister's objection. There is no discredit in the publication of a merchant's name in such a connection unless he has been found guilty of bringing in smuggled goods.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend sees that his return, as now asked for, would make no distinction between the guilty and the innocent; it would be unfair to give, indiscriminately, the names of all those from whom seizures had been made. I think if my hon. friend will allow it to drop, that when the Controller of Customs comes in, he will talk it over with him, and there will be a disposition to grant all the information which can fairly be given.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the Minister will allow it to stand, I have no objection to talk it over. But I want to be assured that I will have an opportunity of moving it again.

Mr. FOSTER. I meant that the hon. gentleman should not ask formally for the information. We will give the hon. gentleman what information he requires, and which could fairly be brought down without a motion. We will treat my hon. friend fairly.

Mr. McMULLEN. At the Minister's suggestion, I will consent to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

1. Return showing the names of the several railways in the Dominion to which a cash subsidy was paid. 2. The province in which said railway is located. 3. The number of miles subsidized. 4. The number built. 5. The amount per mile granted, and the gross amount paid. 6. The number of acres of land granted per mile, and the gross number of acres given or now due to each company. 7. The gross amount of cash subsidy given to railways in each province. 8. The gross number of acres of land granted in each province, and the grand total of money and land given to railways in the Dominion.

He said: If the hon. Minister would kindly supplement the Railway report by adding what is here asked for, it would answer all purposes.

Mr. HAGGART. I will do that. Most of the information is furnished in the annual report, and I will supplement it with what is lacking that the hon. gentleman now asks for.

Motion agreed to.

INDIANS ON ST. PETER'S RESERVE.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copy of all memorials, petitions and other documents from the Indians of St. Peter's Reserve, Manitoba, and of all correspondence in relation thereto.

He said: I would like to call particularly the attention of the Minister of Interior to this motion. I imagine that he has had several communications from the Indians on that reserve, because, if they have applied to me several times, who can do nothing for them but to bring their grievances before the House, I imagine they must have applied to him several times already. The grievances of which the Indians on that reserve complain are of three kinds. In the first place, there are two tribes, I understand, who are settled upon the reserve, the Saulteaux and the Crees; and, as sometimes happens with political parties, there is not the best of union among the Indians of the same reserve. They often quarrel, and, as I understand, have petitioned the Government more than once to be separated altogether. That is the first complaint they urge. As to the merits of that complaint, I do not pretend to speak with knowledge. It may be well or ill-founded; I have not the information at my disposal to enable me to pronounce judgment upon it; but I simply bring it to the notice of the Minister. Probably he has sufficient information on the subject, and could deal with it in a manner which I could not pretend to do. Their next complaint is of a more practical character. As I understand it, the Indians ask that they should not be subjected to the close season for fishing, but that they should be allowed to fish all the year round, without any reference to the close season. They allege that as they do not fish for the purpose of selling, but simply for food, they should be allowed to fish at all seasons, even during the close season for the whites, and they claim that this privilege would not prejudically affect the increase of fish in the river. There may be something in their contention, and, so far as I am informed, I believe the Indians do not fish for trade, but entirely for their own sustenance, and consequently there may be sometimes a hardship in depriving them of the privilege they ask for. The matter, no doubt, has received the attention of the hon. gentleman already, and if it can be done without any serious prejudice to the propagation of fish in the reserves, it seems to me that the complaint of the Indians on the subject ought to be favourably considered. Then their third subject of complaint, as represented to me, is concerning the agent. When I was in Winnipeg last September, they complained to me in very severe language, of the conduct of their agent. Now, I beg to say at once, that whilst I repeat their complaint in the House, I would be sorry indeed to say anything detrimental to this agent. I do not know him, I do not know whether he is a good or a bad officer, I should rather presume he is a good officer; therefore, in bringing this complaint before the House, I want it to be particularly understood that I am not saying, personally, anything prejudicial to his character as an officer in the department. If the complaint the Indians make to me is well founded, it seems to be a very serious matter. They complain that the agent, instead of handing over to them the treaty money to which they are entitled under the treaty,

employs that money in making roads, and for other objects, as he states, for the purpose of improving the reserves. Well, that may be true or not, as to that I have no information. But if it be true, it seems to me that it is a practice that ought not to be tolerated. The treaty money is intended for the Indians, personally, and whether the money might be better employed or not, is not a question for the agent nor even for the Government. The treaty money must be paid directy to the Indians in the manner stipulated in the treaty. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, will agree with me that it would be a most unwise policy on the part of the Government to follow even what might be, in the judgment of the department, a better course than to pay over the money directly to the Indians. The policy which we have always maintained towards the Indians, and which ought to be maintained at all hazards, and under all circumstances, is most rigidly to keep faith with them, and whatever has been promised to them, we must rigidly adhere to. Now, I suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should ascertain at once whether that complaint is well founded, and if it be true that the treaty money is diverted from its object, as the Indians complain, there should be at once a change in this respect, and the agent should be dealt with in a manner which the wisdom of the Government might deem advisable. At all events, this practice should be put a stop to at once.

Mr. DALY. I presume that all the hon. gentleman desires to accomplish is to bring this matter before the attention of the House, because it will take a long time to prepare such a return as he asks for. I think sixty-five different petitions or memorials have come from the different chiefs on the St. Peter's reserve since 1876 or 1878. In every instance, the complaints made by the Indians have been inquired into and sifted to the bottom, and I believe the hon. gentleman is sufficiently aware of the character of the Indian to know that a great deal of trouble arises owing to the Indians consisting of different tribes, the Swampees and Saulteaux. The chiefs have become acquainted with the English language and have learned to write, and besides they live near Winnipeg or Selkirk, and are influenced by outside people to send forward grievances. Whatever those grievances have been, they have been sifted on every occasion when made. The chiefs have been satisfied for the time being, but they change their views very rapidly, and in dealing with them the department has sought to lay down a certain line of conduct as regards the Indians on the St. Peter's reserve as a whole. As to the fishing privilege, we have had considerable correspondence with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, not only as to the Indians on St. Peter's reserve, but also as regards the Indians in the North-west generally, we urging on the department that although they might require the Indians to take out licenses to which the Indians did not object, they should not charge them any fees. The experience of the department has been that wherever the fishing laws have been reasonably enforced on Indian reserves they have acted beneficially to the Indians. Although we at first protested against enforcing the law, although it was stated that the lakes were being depleted, especially as regards whitefish, and it being alleged that while a great many of the Indians were fishing for themselves, some were also fishing for commerce, the enforcement of the fishery regulations have proved to be in the interest of the Indians themselves, and the better class and influential Indians have come to that conclusion, and we do not hear so many complaints now as formerly in regard to the enforcement of the laws, especially when it has been pressed upon the Department of Marine and Fisheries that they should not charge the Indians any fees for licenses. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has also made some concessions in relation to the close season, so that the Indians may not be deprived altogether of food resources in that particular. As to the other statement made by the hon. gentleman, and which is a serious one, namely, that the agent has employed treaty money in making roads and bridges, and in ways other than those prescribed by the Act, I never heard of that charge before, and I cannot conceive it to be true. The agent receives the treaty money for one purpose only, and that is to pay it over to the Indians, and it cannot be diverted to other uses at his discretion. He would not dare to undertake to do so unless he received instructions from the department, and no such instructions have ever been given or could be given. There must be some mistake as regards this allegation, as the statement made by the hon. gentleman cannot be founded on facts. I will, however, make the strictest inquiry into the allegations made by the hon. gentleman, and ascertain whether there is any truth in them, but I am satisfied there is none. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the money to be paid as treaty money should be paid to the Indians, and not disposed of in any other way, and that is the line of policy pursued by various governments from the time they made any treaties whatever with the Indians, and under this head, so far, I have not heard any complaint. The hon. gentleman will understand, from the interviews he had in the North-west, that the Indians are very hard to satisfy, and the fact that we have received sixty-five communications from the chiefs on this reserve alone shows that it is a pretty difficult matter to satisfy them. At one time they called upon the department not to pay the treaty money at a certain place, but at some other place, and when the department

agreed to this request and sent instructions to the agent, they in the meantime sent another request to have the money paid at the old place. We have also had some difficulty by doing away with the distribution of food and luxuries in the shape of tea and tobacco at the time of payment of the treaty money. The Indians are now satisfied that the Government did right under the circumstances. We have also had some difficulty at the time of treaty money payments with the tradespeople, who assembled and were ready to take away from the Indians their money in exchange for goods. So we have kept them at as great a distance as possible. As to the agent who has been there for a great many years, Mr. Muckle, I never heard any complaint in regard to him; but, on the contrary, we have had several communications from the Indian chiefs thanking the department for his services, and expressing approbation of his administration. I will, however, have full inquiry made in regard to all the matters referred to in the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. LAURIER. In view of the statements made by the hon. gentleman, I desire to amend my motion by inserting the words, "or complaints since 1st January, 1892."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

DAIRYING IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That in the opinion of this House, it would be expedient to apply $20,000 to aid in establishing creameries and cheese factories in the North-west Territories, and that this sum should be considered as an addition to the immigration grant; that, further, the Government should at once take into consideration the propriety of giving a bonus on butter exported to the London markets, as is done by some of the Australian colonies, and also of raising the customs duty from 4 cents per pound to 6 cents, in order to enable the North-west farmers to compete with the Australian exporters in the British Columbia markets.

He said: I will not detain the House at any great length in bringing the subject of this motion before it, because we have in the Agriculture Committee, as well as on a former occasion in this House, discussed the subject, and the importance of encouraging our farmers to go into dairying is recognized by the Government. I may refer to the fact that in Denmark, Sweden, Bavaria, and all through Germany, in fact, Government encouragement is given to dairying. And what I ask in this motion is simply that a special form of the same kind of help which the Government has given already to dairying should be given to us in the North-west. I am a member of the Agricultural Committee, and when Prof. Robertson was before that committee lately he made a statement, every word of which I can endorse. He said——

Mr. DALY.

Mr. SPEAKER. Has the report been brought down?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, the report has been brought down. In his evidence of 14th May, Prof. Robertson said:

For myself, I believe in the widest possible application, within legitimate bounds, of co-operative methods for the promotion of the public good; and government in the highest exercise of its functions, is one way whereby the people co-operate for their own benefit. The protection of life and property is perhaps only the primary function of government, and the making of one's country a desirable land to live in, is a responsibility inseparable from the carrying on of government in the highest order of civilization. The clearest illustration of this is found in the existence of schools maintained by the taxes of the people and kept in a measure under the control of the Government.

He points out further what great advance had been made in the cheese industry in consequence of the help given by the Government:

But for the organization of dairymen's associations, the employment of travelling instructors, the holding of conventions and the issuing of reports, the cheese trade could not have been established as it now exists. That trade has grown so much, that while in 1886 the exports reached only a value of $6,754,626, last year the exports reached a splendid total of $15,488,191.

He dwells with regret on the fact that the output of butter in Denmark is 54,000 tons, whereas the output of Canada is only 3,000, and he quotes evidence from London and elsewhere to which we shipped butter to show that we can ship as good butter as Australia, aye, and as good butter as Denmark. Why, Sir, it is only a few years ago that the Holstein system was introduced into Denmark. It is only a few years ago that the true way of making butter was understood in Denmark, a country which to-day takes the first place as a maker and exporter of butter to the United Kingdom. The system that they have adopted with such success has been introduced into Canada, but there are portions of the North-west where people cannot afford to establish dairies. We have a dairy established under the guidance of a dairy inspector at Moose Jaw, and it is doing well and has been a great benefit to the farmers around there. But there are parts of the country where the people, for reasons it is not necessary to enter into, cannot themselves establish these dairies. Maple Creek is one of those. Now, $1,000 spent by the Government at one of those points would enable the people to establish a dairy, and the Government need not be out of pocket. The Government could arrange for the slow payment back of that amount, and the result, of course, would be the development of the dairy interest in those localities and a great help to the farmers. Every one who has been studying those questions, recognizes that we must divert the attention of the

people of the North-west from relying on any one staple. We must—as they were advised by the Minister of Agriculture—train them to go in for mixed farming, and one of the ways to do that is by encouraging the dairy industry. Now, the form that my motion takes is this :

That in the opinion of this House, it would be expedient to apply $20,000 to aid in establishing creameries and cheese factories in the North-west Territories, and that this sum should be considered as an addition to the immigration grant ; that, further, the Government should at once take into consideration the propriety of giving a bonus on butter exported to the London market, as is done by some of the Australian colonies.

Victoria, for instance, is giving a bonus and has aided the butter industry in other ways, and the result is that an immense trade is being developed between Australia and the United Kingdom. The motion goes on to say :

And also of raising the customs duty from 4 to 6 cents per pound, in order to enable the North-west farmers to compete with the Australian exporters in the British Columbia market.

The reason why I put the motion in that form is this : There cannot be the least doubt whatever that the policy I advocated would not only be the means of developing the dairy industry, but it would be one of the most potent means of impelling immigrants to come to the North-west. I would therefore be quite willing to have $20,000 taken from the immigration fund for that purpose. Then with the line of steamers across the Pacific, butter is being imported into Canada, as I learned from the Customs Department myself. It is not imported in large quantities, but some butter is coming from Australia and enters into competition with North-west butter in the British Columbia market. We used to have a ready and profitable market for our butter in British Columbia, and I think that this Government, which is a protectionist Government, ought to consider whether an additional protection ought to be given to butter in order to enable us to compete with the Australian exporters for the British Columbia market. This question is so well understood, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think it will be necessary to enforce it at any great length, but I cannot too highly impress upon the Government that it should give its active attention to this matter. One reason is, as I have explained again and again to the Government, we do not receive, by something like $150,000, the amount we are entitled to as subsidy, on calculating it on the same basis as the other provinces. Under the circumstances this Government would be perfectly justified in coming to our aid and giving us this help. I do hope that we shall not have this deferred until next session. I do not expect that the Minister of Finance would bring down further supplementary estimates in order to suit my motion, but if I can persuade the Government to adopt the policy we advocate, there will be no difficulty in getting a Governor General's warrant for this sum, and so the dairies could be established this summer.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following amendment to the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) :

That this House cannot find any special reason for granting at the public expense a protection for creameries and butter factories in the North-west which is not granted to the same factories existing in the other provinces of the Dominion.

The reason why I propose this amendment is because a vast quantity of cheese is now being manufactured throughout the Dominion of Canada, and it is easily understood how the glutting of the English market will result injuriously to the cheese industry in the future. A few years ago, the Government undertook to send Professor Robertson, to Manitoba and to the North-west in order to establish creameries and cheese factories ; at the time, this policy did not receive a strong opposition from the House ; but to-day, I think it would be a great mistake to promote the establishment within the Dominion of Canada of a further number of creameries. I am speaking more particularly of cheese factories, not of creameries. At all events, I cannot find any reason for granting a subsidy of $20,000 to that province, when the state of our finances does not warrant us in giving the same gratification to the other provinces.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I want to say a word or so, as to the motion of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and incidentally with reference to the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rinfret). I suppose we must all agree, Sir, that any motion or any proposal which has for its purpose the legitimate encouragment of dairying in the Dominion of Canada, ought to receive a good deal of favour at the hands of this House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) supporting, as he always does support loyally the interests of the North-west Territories, has brought to the attention of the House a most important subject and one with regard to his views upon which, the House, to a very great extent must sympathise. The House is not able to accept the proposition in toto, especially with regard to the voting of such a large amount for the purpose which he has described here this afternoon. Those of us who have visited the great North-west, and who have seen its splendid pastures and its great herds of cattle, and who know its great dairy capabilities, know full well that this House would be justified in lending to that industry every possible encouragement. The hon. gentleman has called attention to the fact that we have assisted dairying in other parts of the Dominion. It is true, as regards many of the

provinces, particularly those in which the dairy industry is new, the aid given in so practical a manner as it has been given by the Department of Agriculture, with the concurrence of this House in the matter of funds for the purpose, has had a splendid effect. The House will remember the case of Prince Edward Island already referred to, where only a few years ago no creamery or cheese factory existed, but where to-day no less than $90,000 worth of dairy products are annually shipped; and it is calculated by those who have thought on the subject and who are conservative in their estimates, that that amount is fully $50,000 more than would have been received from the same investment in cattle had the old methods been followed and had the creameries and cheese factories not been established as they have been by the aid of the Department of Agriculture. That system has been to a certain extent adopted elsewhere. It has been adopted to some extent in the province of Nova Scotia; and, as the House knows, at Nappan, in the province of Quebec, there is an experimental dairy which is doing good work. In the province of New Brunswick experiments have been made in the dairy school, and the people are receiving instruction in that. In the province of Ontario we have had experiments and instruction in winter dairying under the auspices of the Dominion Government. The same thing has been done in the province of Manitoba, where aid has also been granted by the local government. As regards the North-west Territories, I promise to my hon. friend that we propose to follow the same liberal policy of assisting that industry in a country so well fitted by nature to make it a great industry, as we have in the various provinces of the Dominion. Already we have at Moose Jaw, as my hon. friend is well aware, a creamery; and I am informed by the dairy commissioner that during the present year dairy instructors will go through the North-west Territories for the purpose of holding meetings and giving instruction wherever that instruction will be received; and I am sure it will be received gladly everywhere by the settlers. While I am on my feet I may remark that the same work is being done this year in the province of British Columbia, though, owing to the limited areas in which population is settled, the work there will perhaps refer more particularly to the betterment of the people individually than in connection with big concerns. So that, so far as the first proposition of my hon. friend is concerned, though the Government cannot pledge themselves, especially at this time, with the finances such as they are, to expend any such large sum as my hon. friend asks, I have the authority of the Government to say to him that we are most sympathetic with regard to that industry in the Territories, and that we will not fail to use every legitimate method of promoting that industry, whether by means of sending instructors or by means of spending a certain sum of money each year for that purpose. As regards the bonus which my hon. friend asks this Government to grant, I think that is a proposition on which Parliament might very largely hesitate if it were intended to make it continual. It is true, in Denmark, Sweden, the German principalities, and other countries of Europe to which my hon. friend has referred, the great dairying industry has been largely aided by money taken from the public treasury; and there can be no doubt that to-day those countries are being amply repaid by the return in wealth which is going every year into the pockets of their people as a result of their success in this industry. The same thing has been done in Australia, and, as my hon. friend knows, it was done to a limited extent last year by the Government of Canada. It is true, some $3,000 or $4,000 was lost in that experiment, but that is a very small sum if we have established, to the very smallest extent the character of our butter on the British market. Though the Government do not pursue that policy this year, my hon. friend knows that they are pursuing what is perhaps a still more important policy, namely, that of making arrangements with the railway companies of Canada, and with the trans-Atlantic steamship companies, and also making arrangements for providing cold storage facilities both on this side of the Atlantic and on the other side; and I am sure that in making these arrangements we shall be endorsed by every man who has the betterment of the people of all our provinces at heart. As regards the question of the increase of duty, I do not intend to speak upon that now, as it may perhaps be much more fittingly discussed when the general question of the tariff is before us. Just one word in passing, and it is this, that the Government still very firmly by their policy of protecting, by their tariff and by other means, the agricultural industries, including the dairying industry, in the Dominion of Canada. I have only to add, in conclusion, that the people of the North-west are indebted to my hon. friend for pressing this matter upon the attention of the House, and the House is indebted to him for the very valuable information he has given to it this afternoon.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure the House must have been deeply impressed with the remarks of the Minister, who has told the country that in consequence of the state of the public finances the Government are able to extend nothing but sympathy towards the agricultural interests of the North-west.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. He stated that he deeply smypathized with the farmers, but that owing to the state of the finances, he could

give them nothing but sympathy. Fancy feeding cattle with sympathy! What a flow of milk would come from sympathy, and Government sympathy! Fancy establishing dairies and creameries with sympathy! You are to pay bills, purchase machinery, and buy cold storage with the cold sympathy of the Administration. And so we have the Government claiming credit for whatever development has occurred in the dairying industry, in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Ontario, because of the few dollars of aid which they have at times granted from the public treasury, but denying credit to the industry of the Canadian farmers themselves. Sir, I thought the success that has attended the dairy industry of Ontario at least was attributed wholly and solely to the enterprise of the Ontario farmers; but we now have it for the first time from the hon. Secretary of State that the farmers are entirely mistaken in that, and that their success is attributable to the action of the Government. I shall not further detain the House, except to allude to the other branch of the motion, the proposed bonus for cheese and butter. The hon. Minister said that there is a great deal in that, too, but all he has to bonus them with is sympathy and cold storage. Does it not occur to the Government that they are bonussing butter from Australasia with the money of Canadian farmers? They have established a line of steamers, at the expense of the Canadian people, seven-tenths of whom are farmers, to bring into Canada the bonussed butter and the other bonussed argicultural products of Australasia to compete with the butter and the other dairy products of the Canadian farmer; and to-day we have Australasian butter finding its way down from the Pacific Ocean to the province of Ontario and meeting in competition the butter manufactured by the Canadian farmers. No wonder that under these circumstances, a Government supporter finds it his duty to stand up here and beg the Canadian Government to relieve our farmers of the consequence of a glut in our market, produced partly by the extraordinary policy of the Government, and ask them to sweep away the surplus by shipping it to a foreign land. When our farmers ask for bread, all the answer they get is a stone, and when they ask for money, they get sympathy. No wonder the Secretary of State congratulated the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) upon his deep interest in the people of the North-west, because all he could give to the people of the North-west in reply was a few words of congratulation to the hon. member for Assiniboia for advocating their interests better than the Government of Canada has guarded them.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend who has just sat down has stated the case in rather an extravagant manner from his own point of view; and it is in order to put the case as it stands, I venture to say a few words. The hon. gentleman twitted the Secretary of State with having nothing but sympathy upon which to feed the farmers, and asked how far cattle could go upon sympathy as an article of food. He said that although great claims were made by this Government as regards their aid to farmers in various ways, yet when we came to look at that aid from a hard money point of view, all that the farmers got was simply sympathy and not money. Well, my hon. friend has had something to do with the Estimates this and previous sessions, and we will see whether the facts tally with his presentation of them. Everybody knows that, about six years ago, this Government undertook the policy of establishing experimental farms in different parts of the country for the purpose of making experiments in every branch in which our farmers are interested and distributing accurate information as to the results of these experiments broadcast throughout the Dominion. That policy has been carried on at a very heavy expense from that time to the present. For the maintenance of this experimental work on the scale upon which it has been conducted the past seven years, Parliament has voted this session $70,000, and voted an equal amount each previous session. That is not sympathy but hard cash voted out of our consolidated revenue. Again, take the dairy branch, which has made great strides in the past few years and with reference to which this Government has a definite policy as well—having at the head of this branch one of the best experts that can be found, not in Canada alone, but on this continent, who, wherever he has gone, has earned the greatest commendation for the manner in which he is carrying on the work and the good results that flow from it—this House has voted, at the instance of the Government, $25,000 this year, for the purpose of carrying on this work for the benefit of our dairy interests. This, again, is not sympathy but hard cash. More than that, in order to give an opportunity for establishing winter and other creameries in portions of this Dominion, where the farmers have not taken up this branch of work, there has been for three years a sum of money voted for the purpose of starting and carrying on these creameries, by advancing to the farmers, in hard cash, a certain percentage of the value of the milk which they brought in, and by marketing these products in the British markets, and then rendering to each farmer at these factories the exact return his butter brought to him after deducting the cost of marketing. Not in cold sympathy, not even what he denominates Government sympathy has the Government shown its appreciation of that industry and its desire to carry it on. Not to be expended in Ontario alone or in Quebec alone, but in the maritime provinces, in the North-west, Manitoba and British Columbia, a sum of money of $40,000 has been voted

in the main Estimates for that purpose. More than that, to aid agricultural societies in the North-west, where the farmers are scattered and where it is of great moment to them that a little aid be given these companies, should enable them to carry on their societies, there has been a vote of $7,000 given. More than that, again with the idea of sending out butter to the British market in its fresh state in the summer season, when the weather is hot, and when the butter will command a fair price in the British market, if laid on the market fresh, the Government has shown its practical sympathy with our farmers by a vote of $20,000 to provide cold storage, so that the butter may be taken from the creameries in different parts of Canada, put on refrigerator cars, arranged by the steam railway companies, and then put on board vessels with refrigerating apartments and machinery, at Montreal and other seaports and landed in Great Britain in as cool and fresh a state as butter can come from Denmark or the other countries of the continent of Europe. This new vote indicates a new policy, the object of the Government being to do two things, first, to demonstrate that there is an advantage to the farming community in having their butter sent from the factories under cold storage arrangements, shipped at Montreal on board steamers, with refrigerating apartments and sent into the British market; and, in the second place, to direct the attention of the farming interests and the butter factories especially, to the advantages of that market and draw greater trade to the steamship companies, so that this appropriation of $20,000, made this year as a gift, will have the effect, not simply of a transitory arrangement, but of so developing the trade and increasing its volume that hereafter the butter will itself bear the cost of its storage, having established its name and qualities in the markets of Great Britain. That is not mere sympathy, that is cash voted on wise lines of policy; and this action of the Government in this respect, when contrasted with the rather ludicrous presentation from my hon. friend's point of view, will appeal, I think, to the hard-headed farming community of this country. My hon. friend thought he had a wonderful argument with which to reproach this Government, when he said that we had actually bonussed steamers to run across the Pacific from Australasia to this country and bring in Australian butter to compete with the butter of this country. Sir, is it possible that in this country, at this time, we have men who occupy the places of statesmen and leaders of a great party who will bring up an argument of that kind—that you must not have steamship communication between two great countries, because, forsooth, there will be some competition in the articles that are produced in those countries? And, Sir, let my hon. friend remember, and let this House remember, that whatever butter comes into this country from Australia or anywhere else has to meet the protection which this Government gives to the farmer of this country who makes the butter in this country and finds his market here. How can a reproach come from my hon. friend and his party, whose platform is not only to have Australian butter come into competition with ours, but to adopt a system of free trade which would wipe out every vestige of customs duty on the farmer's products and thus have all products, as well as butter, coming into competition with native products.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Finance Minister has availed himself of this debate, and tried to improve the occasion, in order to bestow enconiums on his policy of protection to the agricultural interests. This is hardly a favourable moment to indulge in such boasting. Butter now sells at from 14 to 15 cents per pound. It costs the farmer about four cents to make one pound of butter, so that he only makes a profit of 10 cents per pound. Such is to-day the position of the farmer, whose lot, according to my hon. friend, is so enviable. To-day, in the province of Quebec, cheese sells at seven cents and one-fourth to seven cents and a half a pound, so that one hundred pounds of milk fetch to the farmer but forty-five cents, or, let us say, fifty cents in round numbers. At all events, such is the position of the farmers in our province. This is the time selected by the hon. the Minister of Finance to expatiate upon the beneficial results of his policy. The interest I have always taken in the betterment of the farming community and in the prosperity of agriculture, prompts me to give them new proofs of sympathy upon all occasions. As often as we are called upon to vote new appropriations for the promotion of this important industry, every time I feel disposed to yield to the demand. But to-day, I doubt very much whether voting in favour of the appropriation mentioned in the motion would be warrantable on my part. First, we have no information as to the uses this money is going to be applied to. The crisis the Government is now going through is not calculated to allay our suspicions in that regard. Should no marked improvement occur in the political atmosphere, well may the Government lavish extravagant promises on the farming community. I am not satisfied that the appropriation of $20,000 we are called upon to vote for, would receive the proper application, so as to promote the best interests of the farming community. At all events, there is one sure thing: it is that we have already done a great deal in favour of the North-west. The farmers in the west have already been so largely aided by money granted from the public treasury, that I am at a loss to see how we should deem ourselves justifiable in extending to them any

such preference. How comes it that the farmers in the North-west, and those so-called great capitalists imported from abroad to develop the North-west prairies, cannot afford to establish for themselves a few creameries and cheese factories? The cost of a cheese factory, fully equipped, aggregates about from $700 to $800, and a creamery, from $1,500 to $2,000. I wonder how these great farmers cannot be self-supporting, without hankering after Government aid. There are many other ways in which the Government may promote the interests of the farming community. They might aid them more substantially than they have done in the past by cutting down the tariff. They might give the farmers lower rates on many articles which are of primary necessity to them. The machinery used in the manufacture of cheese and butter ought to come in free of duty, rather than granting the farmers money from the public treasury, which is already depleted. The hon. Minister could have enlarged the free list and let in free of duty many other articles necessary for the farming community, and altogether indispensable to the creameries and cheese factories. On these several grounds. I think, Sir, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Lotbinière should pass. He is one of the men in this House who have the largest experience of the requirements of the farming community, and I fully concur in his views on the matter. On the other hand, as the arguments alleged are not cogent enough to warrant our voting in favour of the main motion, I think the amendment should pass.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, as this is a very important question, and as I would like to say something upon it, I move that the debate be adjourned.

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Bain (Soulanges),	Lippé,
Baker,	Macdonald (King's),
Bennett,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bergeron,	Maclean (York),
Bergin,	McAlister,
Boyd,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Cameron,	McDonald (Victoria),
Carling (Sir John),	McDougald (Pictou),
Chesley,	McDougall (Cape Breton)
Coatsworth,	McLennan,
Corbould,	Mara,
Costigan,	Miller,
Craig,	Moncrieff,
Curran,	Montague,
Daly,	O'Brien,
Dickey,	Patterson (Colchester),
Dugas,	Pridham,
Foster,	Reid,
Fréchette,	Roome,
Gillies,	Ross (Lisgar),
Girouard (Jacques Cartier),	Sproule,
Grandbois,	Stairs,
Grant (Sir James),	Taylor,
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Haslam,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Hazen,	Wallace,
Henderson,	White (Cardwell),
Hughes,	White (Shelburne),
Kenny,	Wood (Brockville), and
Lachapelle,	Wood (Westm'd).—62.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Godbout,
Bain (Wentworth),	Grieve,
Béchard,	Guay,
Belth,	Harwood,
Bernier,	Innes,
Boston,	Langelier,
Bowers,	Laurier,
Bowman,	Leduc,
Brodeur,	Lister,
Brown,	Lowell,
Bruneau,	Macdonald (Huron),
Carroll,	McGregor,
Casey,	McMillan,
Charlton,	Martin,
Choquette,	Mignault,
Christie,	Mills (Bothwell),
Davies (P.E.I.),	Monet,
Davin,	Mulock,
Dawson,	Perry,
Delisle,	Rider,
Devlin,	Rinfret,
Dupont,	Rowand,
Edgar,	Semple,
Flint,	Somerville,
Forbes,	Sutherland,
Fraser,	Tarte,
Frémont,	Vaillancourt, and
Gibson,	Yeo.—57.
Gillmor,	

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

FREIGHT RATES IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That the commissioners appointed to inquire into Canadian Pacific Railway freight rates have reported that Canadian Pacific Railway existing rates for grain are from ½ to 1 cent per 100 pounds less that the Dakota schedule from all points west of Regina, which last, however, applied to Edmonton and Prince Albert, would be 6 and 7 cents lower than the Canadian Pacific tariff; that, as regards live stock, the Canadian Pacific Railway rate runs at $1.35 to $1.84 per car to Montreal, while the Northern Pacific and Great Northern charge from $1.63 to $1.91 for the same distance; that, as regards coal and lumber, the comparisons show still more favourable rates to the Canadian public. That this House would suggest to the Government that it would be well to open negotiations with the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the view of coming to an arrangement with that company to carry for the next twenty years produce from the North-west to the sea-board 10 per cent cheaper than at present, on condition of the Government guaranteeing bonds to a certain amount for twenty years, and should the railways of the United States lower their rate, the Canadian Pacific Railway shall lower theirs proportionately.

He said: This, Sir, having in view the vast interests involved is a most important

motion. There cannot be the least doubt of this, that we must adopt measures to give the people of the North-west Territories lower freight rates to the sea-board. So far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned, we have had an inquiry; and, although I have not seen the official report, yet I believe that I am correctly informed as to what that report is, and that the figures I have given in this motion are correct. If so, where is the lever which the Government can use with the Canadian Pacific Railway to lower the present freight rates? For the Canadian Pacific Railway can show, as I have declared, and as in fact they did show to a committee—a self-constituted committee—of this House which met some years ago, that when the figures for all the railways on the continent were compared, it was clear that the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway were lower than those of any other line. Again, Sir, suppose that were not so. There is a clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter that takes this matter completely out of the control of the Governor General in Council until a certain percentage upon the capital has been earned. Under these circumstances it is perfectly useless to move for an inquiry. These inquiries can accomplish nothing, for the simple reason that until a percentage has been earned which it is very unlikely any Canadian railway directors will ever report that they are earning, the Governor General in Council is perfectly helpless to interfere. What, then, are we to do? The people of the North-west are placed in a peculiar position. They are opening up that vast territory which is bound to be the greatest source of strength and wealth to Canada. They have gone in there under difficulties and are engaged in a task of the greatest possible value to the country. One of the greatest difficulties they have to contend with is the long haul. When the Minister of Finance visited the North-west Territories in company with the Minister of Agriculture, he saw at once that one of the difficulties that the North-west farmers had to contend with was the distance from the sea-board. And, Sir, after we have preached to the farmer the necessity of going into mixed farming, after we shall have taught the farmer that he must raise everything he needs, as far as possible, upon his own homestead—still, if he is to make the reasonable amount of money that he may fairly look for and aim at, he must do it in the face of great difficulties on account of heavy freight rates to the sea-board. Therefore, the only way that I can see to meet the difficulty and solve the problem is that suggested in the motion—that the Government should not attempt to do the impossible, because we have no power to coerce the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that the Minister of Railways should open negotiations with the company. As suggested in this motion the Minister of Railways might say to the company: I find that the commissioners appointed to take evidence as to the rates charged, have reported that your rates were not only reasonable but lower than the rates of any other line on the continent. However, it is important for us that the farmers of the North-west should be able to get their products to the sea-board at a reasonable rate. You are a great national line and you may or you may not need money. We will guarantee bonds for you to the amount of a certain number of millions, on condition that for the next twenty years while, so to speak, we are laying the foundation of our farming in the North-west, you shall carry the produce of the North-west to the sea-board at rates 10 per cent cheaper than at present, and at the same percentage cheaper than the United States lines, even if at any time they should lower their rates. Now, Sir, what will that cost the Government or the people of Canada? It will cost the Government of Canada just nothing at all; it will cost the people of Canada nothing. All that the people of Canada are asked to do is to loan their credit to the Canadian Pacific Railway in order that the Canadian Pacific Railway may strengthen itself financially. I want to guard against a possible, though very improbable, misconception. I have no authority to speak for the Canadian Pacific Railway; not one word has passed between me and anybody connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway on this subject. I do not know whether the company would entertain the proposal, but I know that a great company of this kind at all times desire to strengthen themselves in the money markets of the world, and they are generally forward as borrowers; and I am inclined to think that, if I could persuade the Minister of Railways and the Government to take this course—which, as I say, will not cost a cent—we shall be able to effect great things, the greatest thing at present needed for the farmers of the North-west—the lowering of the freight rates on their products to the sea-board. But let me say that something in this way must be done. Our farmers in the North-west cannot progress, nay, some of them cannot make a comfortable living unless some course is taken that will enable them to carry their produce to the seaboard at a reasonable rate. I urge, with all the earnestness I am capable of, that the Government should take some such course as I have indicated in my motion. I have not had the means of knowing what view the Minister of Railways will take in regard to this; but I would say that in the North-west we all look with the greatest interest on his career as Minister of Railways. We were glad to see what he had done with the Intercolonial Railway, by his originality and force of will, and we hope that he will apply those same qualities of mind

and of character to deal with the problem of freight rates in the North-west Territories. If he will do this, I am confident that he will solve the problem, which I believe is one of the most important problems with which the Government can concern itself.

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I have to state that I have not had the good fortune to read the report of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the freight rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Only a few days after receiving the report, I sent it to be printed, and it has not yet been printed. I would like to have an opportunity of carefully perusing that report in order that I may inquire into this question of freight rates, and make a comparison between those in force on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and those prevailing on the Northern Pacific Railway. I have no doubt that the statement made by the hon. gentleman as to the rate of freights on the Canadian Pacific Railway, on the various articles mentioned, and those prevailing on the Northern Pacific and other railways, is strictly correct. But even his statement makes a favourable showing towards the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I think his comparison shows that the settlers in our own North-west Territories and in Manitoba are in better condition as regards freight rates than the settlers in any other part of America; and that the produce of our own North-west is carried to the sea-board much cheaper than it is carried over the more southern lines. The hon. gentleman wishes to supplement the present rates by some arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway by which freight shall be carried at a still lesser rate. I do not know whether there is a prospect of the Canadian Pacific Railway entertaining such a proposition. I do not know that the Canadian Pacific Railway are offering any bonds which they wish to be guaranteed by the Government. The hon. gentleman states that it would not affect the people of Canada at all, that they would not be required to pay one copper more than they otherwise would pay, because the Canadian Pacific Railway are perfectly able to provide for the interest upon their bonds; and that the people of this country, although guaranteeing their bonds, would not be required to pay anything for that purpose. The hon. gentleman must remember that the indebtedness of the country would be increased by exactly the amount of the guarantee of the bonds; that the inevitable effect would be to increase the charge upon the credit of the country by what we would have to pay in the way of interest, and our borrowing powers would be affected to the extent that we guaranteed the bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in trying to suggest some scheme by which freights could be lowered between the section of the country which he represents and the sea-board; but I do not see that the Government could, in any way, guarantee bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and place the whole country under an indebtedness for the benefit of a particular portion of it, in order that they may get freights cheaper than they do at present, especially when, according to the showing of the hon. gentleman himself, those rates are now cheaper than they are in any other similar part of America. I do not know that I can add further to what I have said. It is true that I have read in the newspapers of a portion of the report, but I have not read it all. The report is being printed, and when it is printed, I shall give it as fair a consideration as the time at my disposal will permit.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman must surely have made a mistake in his figures when he says that the rate on live stock runs from 1·35 to 1·84 per car to Montreal.

Mr. HAGGART. He means per cwt.

Mr. MARTIN. Then the hon. gentleman goes on to say that as regards coal and lumber, the comparison shows still more favourable rates to the Canadian public, and then he winds up with the suggestion that there should be some arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway by which produce from the North-west should be taken 10 per cent cheaper. I suppose the hon. gentleman intends to include coal and lumber along with grain?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Surely, then, the hon. gentleman does not expect that the North-west Territories will be able to send their coal down to the sea-board. They are now trying, ineffectually, to send it to Winnipeg; but the idea of sending coal or lumber, either, from the North-west to the sea-board, is perfectly absurd.

Mr. DAVIN. They sent coal to the Pacific notwithstanding that they have plenty of coal on the Pacific. I am told that some anthracite coal goes to the Pacific.

Mr. MARTIN. That is not what is meant by the sea-board in discussing freight rates from Manitoba. There has been no commission to inquire into freight rates from the North-west Territories to the Pacific sea-board.

Mr. HAGGART. I think they inquired in reference to British Columbia, also.

Mr. MARTIN. There is anthracite coal that might be sent away, and no doubt a reduction of freight might be desirable. But where is there any lumber to send? The freight rates do not particularly affect coal or lumber, but they specially affect live stock and wheat. Last session the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Macdonald) proposed to the Government the advisability of having a freight rate commission to in-

quire into this question. The hon. gentleman made that suggestion, no doubt, in view of the strong agitation prevailing in his constituency with respect to what were considered the high freight rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believed at the time, I have no doubt of it now, that the freight rates commission was simply a farce, simply put forward for the purpose of giving the people there an idea that the Government had some thought of doing something for them in connection with freight rates, and the declaration of the Minister of Railways that while that report has been in his hands nearly three months he has not yet found time to read it, shows clearly it was merely done for the purpose suggested. There was considerable dissatisfaction in Manitoba in regard to the action of that commission. First, the members of the commission were of a kind not calculated to inspire a very great degree of confidence in the people there. I have nothing personally to allege against any of the three gentlemen who composed that commission, but the fact that each was a civil servant in the employ of the Government was sufficient in itself to condemn them as proper persons to make inquiry as between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway with respect to freight rates. In fact I would not at all be surprised if the Canadian Pacific Railway did not look upon the appointment of that commission as one very much in their own interest, because it gave them an opportunity of making elaborate comparisons with the railway freight rates on American railways running into a country somewhat similar to the North-west. They were able to show by taking certain roads that their rates were cheaper than those of certain other American railways; but it is not correct, as the Minister of Railways suggested, that the people of Manitoba and the North-west enjoy railway rates much lower than any other part of the continent similarly situated. I can show by comparison with other portions of the United States different from those selected by the Canadian Pacific Railway officials, that the railway freight rates enjoyed by communities in the North-west, active competitors with the North-west for immigrants, are very much less than ours. What we complain of with respect to this question is this, that in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway it may be fairly said that that road was practically constructed by Canada. No less than one hundred millions of dollars of Canadian money and property have gone into the road, and what settlers find fault with is that notwithstanding that enormous bonus having been given, they are told when they cry out about heavy freight rates, and the member for West Assiniboia correctly voices the opinion of the people there that something must be done in this matter, and that the rates are most burdensome. The settlers say, why should this be so when Canada gave a hundred millions to the Canadian Pacific Railway to build the railway and yet we find ourselves absolutely at their mercy when discussing the question of freight rates. We are told that there is no use in appealing to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or the Governor in Council, because the Government allowed to be inserted in the contract, which is binding between the Government of Canada and this company, a provision that until 10 per cent had been earned and paid upon the capital invested the Governor in Council was to have no authority or right to interfere in connection with that matter. Even with respect to that point, I am not sure that this answer of the Government is a complete one. Can it be said that this railway under that provision is to be allowed to carry freight in competition with the American railways at prices only one-twentieth, or perhaps one-fortieth, or one-fiftieth as much as they get from the Canadian people for hauling freight over the same line? It has been said and proved that the Canadian Pacific Railway enters into competition with the American transcontinental lines in carrying freight from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic coast, and they carry that freight at prices low beyond the expectation of the settlers of Manitoba and the North-west. Can they do that under this contract? Is it allowable to them to make their rates anything they please, and use the money probably earned from the high charges on Canadian freight for the purpose of competing, for the purposes of their own, with other transcontinental lines carrying American sugar, wheat and other products at prices very much below what similar articles are carried for the Canadian people? That is a matter which it is the bounden duty of the Government to investigate, and to consider whether under the unfortunate contract made, and which is binding between the two parties, there may not be some redress given to the people of the North-west. I have pointed out whenever this matter has come up that it is the Conservative party of this Dominion which is entirely responsible for the present condition of affairs in Manitoba and the Territories, because when the contract was going through this House, an amendment was moved by the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) to the effect that it was advisable to add a section to the contract by which the Governor in Council should have absolute control of the freight and passenger rates. One would have thought that when the country was giving the enormous bonus it was giving to this company, consisting of money, lands and work done, and when we consider also what they have done in addition for this company since the date of its original contract, aiding them in their dire distress, giving the company all kinds of encouragement, when we con-

sider all these things, the suggestion of the Liberal party when the contract was being discussed in this House was a most reasonable one, and if that suggestion had been adopted and carried out we would not have to-day the hon. member for West Assiniboia suggesting a proposition which the Minister of Railways very properly tells us is impracticable. The hon. gentleman knows it himself. He comes forward here on the eve of an election, knowing perfectly well——

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. MARTIN—knowing perfectly well I say, that his constituents feel keenly with respect to railway rates and they are inclined to blame, not the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but the Conservative Government for the predicament in which they now find themselves. And the hon. gentleman comes forward with a proposition so absurd and ridiculous that the Minister of Railways simply rises and tells him that he cannot consider it.

Mr. DAVIN. He said he would consider it.

Mr. MARTIN. No; he said it was quite out of the question.

Mr. DAVIN. He said he would consider it.

Mr. MARTIN. I understood him to say that to expect other provinces of Canada to devote public funds to the Canadian Pacific Railway in order that the company might reduce its rates in favour of a small portion of the Dominion was a proposition —the Minister did not use the words, but I use them—so absurd and ridiculous that it did not require any consideration. He practically said that it was out of the question. The hon. gentleman says, to guarantee bonds to a certain amount for twenty years. What kind of bonds and to what amount? Bonds!

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman suggest some means.

Mr. MARTIN. I have suggested the means. I have pointed out, how the Liberal party at the proper time and place and before this bargain was entered into, did suggest a means.

Mr. DAVIN. That is all past now.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I cannot help it. That is one of the unfortunate things. We are not a party of repudiation. When a thing is done in this House, and when Canada has once pledged her name and credit to a contract, we propose as Canadians to carry out these pledges.

Mr. DAVIN. Then you are opposing what is suggested.

Mr. MARTIN. I am not opposing it. It does not require any opposition. I am stating what the Minister of Railways has said with regard to it. I have expressed no opinion myself. The hon. gentleman tells us that Canada is not to be obligated for one cent in this matter, and that without costing us a dollar we are to get from the Canadian Pacific Railway a reduction of 10 per cent in their freight rates in the Northwest. Well, that is rather a strange proposition, and the hon. gentleman has pointed out in no way how Canada would not be obligated in connection with this matter. Of course it depends entirely upon what kind of bonds are guaranteed as the Minister of Railways has pointed out. Bonds——

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

After Recess

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order for third reading of Bill (No. 34) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company,

Mr. COATSWORTH moved:

That the order for third reading be discharged, and that the Bill be recommitted, with instructions to amend the same by striking out the words "and all others," in the sixth line of clause "9 c," and by adding as new clauses "9 d" and "9 e":

9 d. The debts to be paid under the foregoing provisions of this Act, shall include only the following unpaid claims:—

(1). The claim of the assignee of Bracey Brothers & Co. against the Dominion Construction Company for wages paid and material supplied by him in the completion of the line from Hamilton to Cainsville.

(2). The claims of sub-contractors of Bracey Brothers & Co. against them for work done and material supplied in the said construction.

(3). The claims for advances by the Bank of Hamilton and the Bank of Commerce to or for Bracey Brothers & Co., amounting to about $11,000 and $2,000 respectively.

(4). Claims for labour actually done upon or in connection with said construction.

(5). Claims for board of men and teams employed upon said construction.

(6). Claims for material actually used in said construction.

(7). Claims for goods supplied to employees of Bracey Brothers & Co., or their sub-contractors, engaged on said construction, and supplied 'pro tanto' in reduction of wages claims.

9 e. That payment by the railway company of the said debts, or any of them, in respect of which the Dominion Construction Company is now under liability to Bracey Bros. & Co., or their assignee or others, shall, to the extent of such payment by the railway company, operate as and be a release and discharge of the Dominion Construction Company as against said Bracey Brothers & Co., their assignee and others, but nothing herein contained shall in any way prejudice any existing right of any creditor of said firm or their sub-contractors, or any of them.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this clause has been agreed to by all who are interested in the Bill either for or against.

Bill again considered in committee and reported.

COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANIES, NOVA SCOTIA.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Flint for:

Copies of all petitions and correspondence between the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, or any of its promoters or directors, and the Government, in relation to the company's undertakng. Also, for copies of all correspondence between E. Franklin Clements, J. D. Rolston, Frederick Bard, or other promoters of the South Shore Railway Company of Nova Scotia, or any of the directors of the said company, and the Government, up to date of proceedings in the courts of Nova Scotia to wind up the said company. Also, copies of all petitions, agreements, and correspondence between the said company and the Government, with reference to the obtaining of a charter for a new company from the Dominion Parliament, and relating to the undertaking of the said company or the undertaking of the company proposed to be incorporated.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, just a remark before you put the motion to the House. It is a motion bringing to the attention of the Government and the House the case of two rival railway companies, both likely, perhaps, sooner or later, to appeal to Parliament for financial aid. As the Government have probably never heard anything whatever of the organization of the South Shore Railway Company, or even that it had an existence, I venture, for a few moments, to call their attention to the present position of that company, if company it be; and I more particularly feel in duty bound to do so, as the Minister of Justice, a short time ago, said he considered that this company had a meritorious claim upon the resources of the people. I was greatly surprised when I heard that statement.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What statement does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot give the answer in detail, because it might be said I was out of order in discussing a Bill which might come before the House. As I understand the facts which are likely to become known to the Government should the South Shore Company make an application to them for aid, I will briefly state them. It appears that the people in the vicinity of Yarmouth very properly desired to obtain railway facilities with other parts of the province. Accordingly, a railway company was incorporated, known as the South Shore Railway Company, for the construction of a railway to connect Yarmouth, ultimately, with Halifax. That company received its charter on the 30th April, 1892. There was a provision in the charter that the company should build the line and complete its works within four years after its incorporation, or should commence and make such progress within two years as to meet with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, or, in default its charter should absolutely cease. I am told that after the expiration of over a year, nothing whatever having been done by the company, some of the promoters themselves, having become dissatisfied, withdrew from the company as a swarm of bees would leave the parent hive, and applied to the legislature of Nova Scotia for another charter, which the legislature granted, incorporating a new company, known as the Coast Line Company, to build a railway between the same points, intended, in fact, to supersede the other company, should it not avail itself of the corporate powers given to it, and thus to render the other wholly unnecessary. However, the Coast Line Company did not organize, but very properly waited to see whether the South Shore Company would take advantage of its privileges. The two years elapsed; the South Shore Company did not organize; and thereupon after the expiry of the charter of the South Shore Company, the Coast Line Company organized under the statute, began operations, attracted foreign capital, and, with considerable activity, and at great outlay of capital, proceeded with the construction of the road. At this stage we have these two railways appearing before this Parliament. It appears that the South Shore Railway, after its charter had expired, made an effort to reorganize. They had done some little surveying, I believe, prior to that time, but the surveying was not by the company, because the provisional directors had no power whatever to do anything in the way of construction at all. They had not elected their directors, the capital had not been subscribed, and they had not complied with the conditions of their charter until the expiry of these two years. After the expiry of the two years, they went through a sham of pretending to organize and proceed with their work. The courts were then invoked, and an action is now pending in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia to declare their charter void. Well, I will not say that the Shore line is applying to Parliament to defeat that action by asking Parliament to declare their charter alive, notwithstanding the fact that it is dead, because I could not, on a motion like this, refer to a matter of that kind, but I only rise to call the attention of the Government to the condition of the Shore line—an expired company, having no corporate existence, but which is seeking to thrust itself upon the attention of Parliament in order to make a raid upon the treasury and get authority to build its line at the expense of the country, and of those per-

sons who have put honest capital into the coast line. It is bringing itself before the attention of Parliament for the purpose of paralyzing the parallel line and for illegitimate purposes. Now, I am prepared to favour, in a business-like way, all railway enterprises calculated to be of public service, but I am not prepared to give my voice or vote towards the encouragement of enterprises which come here, not in the public interest, but for private advantage—not for the development of the country, but to ruin a rival railway, unless, perhaps, they may be successful in levying an illegitimate tax, commonly called blackmail, on the other company. And I will tell the Government that, in view of what has taken place, they should now make a fatal mistake if they encourage the other line by aiding them to that extent and thus retarding the construction of the coast line. But if they should go further and pay a dollar of public money towards that enterprise, they will make a very improper use of the public treasury. What this particular motion may ask for is immaterial. The papers are all well enough, but in this case there is a distinct object in view, and I trust that the Government, being in possession of these facts, will take them into their serious consideration. I trust, with this due notice, that they will decline to give any encouragement to an enterprise which is hardly now entitled to be dignified as such, but which is intruding itself upon the public notice without sufficient grounds.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I beg to make the following amendment to the motion :—

Also for copies of all correspondence between the promoters of the South Shore Railway Company of Nova Scotia, or any of the directors of the company, and the Government, from the date of the proceedings in the court of Nova Scotia to wind up the said company, up to the present.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). The hon. gentleman from King's the other evening complained that I had occupied the time of the House with ancient literature ; and at the risk of wearying the House with this subject, I propose to-night to give him something a little more recent, and which perhaps will be quite as interesting. The hon. gentleman from King's opposes this Bill on two grounds. First, he says that the Coast Line Railway Company commenced their surveys and work after the South Shore Company's charter lapsed. Of course, in taking that ground, he assumes—which I think is an incorrect assumption—that it was absolutely necessary for the South Shore Company to commence work within two years after the granting of their charter. I do not think that anybody who reads the clause will come to that conclusion. They will rather come to the conclusion that the company had four years in which to commence and complete the work ; but even if we adopt that assumption of the hon. member for King's and the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Mulock), that it is absolutely necessary for the company to commence work within two years, let them look at the report of the chief engineer, who is a person not at all prejudiced in favour of the South Shore Company, and they will be convinced that the South Shore Railway Company did commence work within two years. The company not only commenced their surveys with a very strong staff, as the chief engineer said in his report, on the 2nd January, 1894, but they filed their plans for twenty miles on the 5th and 7th April, and they have since filed plans for forty miles of the road. These plans have been approved by the provincial government and certified correct, which shows beyond doubt that the provincial government felt, at all events, that the company were making reasonable progress with their work. I may say that never to this day has the provincial government intimated that the reasonable progress required by the charter was not complied with. The hon. member for King's also said that the Coast Line Company were quite aware that this charter had lapsed before they began operations. But surely that is not the case. The surveys commenced simultaneously, the work progressed simultaneously, and these companies worked side by side until the whole sum of money was expended, until all the work which has been done on the road was completed, and it was not until March last that any proceedings were taken to set aside their charter. Another ground of opposition is that the rights of way had been granted by the municipal council, and that petitions had been sent by the various municipal councils at a very recent date, asking that the existing line of railway should be built in opposition to the South Shore Company. The documents that were produced here as the petitions from the municipal councils turned out to be not official petitions from the municipal councils at all. Take the petition from Shelburne, for instance, that is a petition signed only by a portion of the council. The warden, it is true, appended the word " warden " to his signature ; but that was a mere matter of description. The warden and the councillors who signed were all of one political party. They were all Liberals ; not a Conservative signed it. It did not contain a resolution passed at a meeting of the municipal council ; there was no certificate of the clerk ; it was not under seal ; and, while it purported to be a petition from the municipal council, it was really nothing more than the petition of certain individuals. I take also the petition from Queen's. It was stated that this was from the municipal council of Queen's. But if the hon. member will look at it, he will see that not all the councillors of Queen's have signed the petition,

but only a portion of them. And perhaps it would be well to let the House know how some of the signatures that were attached to the petitions from Queen's were obtained. I read a letter dated 30th of May, sent to me from Caledonia, a place in Queen's County which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) knows all about. This is a letter from Mr. W. H. Banks, editor of the "Gold Hunter," addressed to myself:

Dear Sir,—James Collie, clerk of the municipal council, came into this section on Tuesday for the purpose of getting our three councillors (Crocker, Harlow and Freeman) to sign a petition praying Parliament not to aid the standard gauge in any way. If those councillors' names are on that petition, they were not signed by the parties themselves, as all three were away. Mr. Charles Harlow was at Keejamcoogie, fishing, but I hear his wife was prevailed upon to sign the document.

Mr. FRASER. He "hears" that his wife was prevailed upon to sign.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Mr. Harlow was away anyhow. There is a very good reason too why the municipal council of Shelburne were not asked to sign that petition. I will refer you to one of the letters I read the other night from Mr. Robertson, in which he states that it will be utterly impossible for him to obtain another vote from the municipal council after all that had transpired; it would be utterly impossible for him to obtain again what he had already obtained—a resolution for the rights of way. Therefore, you see, there is good reason why no application was made to the municipal council of Shelburne at this time, and you see why it was they contented themselves with getting the Grit councillors to sign it and send it here as if it was the petition of the whole council. Now, it has been said that these rights of way were granted to the narrow gauge railway by the various municipalities. As I stated previously, that is not correct. The municipality of Argyle gave their right of way on condition that the road should be completed to Lockeport before they would pay anything, and then they would only pay $5,000. But the Coast Line Railway, notwithstanding that they entered upon the land over a portion of their railway have not paid a single cent to the individuals over whose lands they passed, while the standard gauge road, the South Shore Company, purchased their right of way and have paid for it. I hold in my hand a list of the various persons from whom they purchased the right of way. It is a long list and I will not trouble the House with the reading of it.

Mr. CAMERON. Read, read.

Mr. FORBES. Read.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). If the hon. member for Queen's wants to hear it read, I will read it:

MEMO. of deeds for right of way held by the South Shore Railway Company, and the consideration actually paid for each.

Joshua Surette and wife	$ 23 00
William Halstead	40 00
William Henry Gilman and wife	500 00
Moses Muise	40 00
William H. Forbes	40 00
Mary Robbins	200 00
Norman L. Trefry	50 00
Robert S. Eakins	100 00
Simon Spinney	26 00
Almira Wetmore	47 50
William McGill and others	47 50
Lydia Hatfield	12 50
Geo. Sanderson, trustee for Brown	25 00
John Holmes	35 00
George Bullerwell	30 00
Hallet C. Trefry	60 00
Asa Hatfield	20 00
Aaron W. Blauvelt	20 00
Jacob H. Reynard	150 00
Thomas Goodwin	150 00
Lydia M. Killam	5 00
Roland Van Norden	150 00
Benjamin Hines	32 00
Simeon Spinney	25 00
Morris Forbes	1 00
Ambrose Surette	5 00
Théophile Doucette	5 00
John Doucette	5 00
Léon Doucette	5 00
Morris Forbes	150 00
Jeremiah Doucette	20 00
Silvain R. Surette	50 00
James R. Pitman	45 00
Daniel Sargeant	50 00
Joseph H. Crowell	25 00
Richard L. Spinney	25 00
Frank Little	100 00
Joseph W. McMullen	25 00
John Rogers	75 00
Foster Perry	35 00
Nathaniel O. Blauvelt	45 00
Albert B. Robbins	20 00
Silvain Babin	30 00
Charles K. Robbins	20 00
Locke W. Hersey	150 00
Lewis Nichols	20 00
William Hattie	250 00
Cyriac LeBlanc and others (lesse of granite quarry)	100 00
James F. Landers	125 00
Arthur W. Kinney	30 00
Mary Landers	15 83
John Babin et al	10 00
Austin Seeley	80 00
Benjamin Horton and wife	180 00
Nehemiah C. Wyman	5 00
Douglas Watters	5 00
Paul Surette	10 00
Julian Surette	10 00
Joseph E. Surette	100 00
Silvain Burke	30 00
Israel Vickery	20 00
William J. Burke and others	150 00
Basil Burke et al	50 00
Ralph Blauvelt	175 00
Mande C. Potier	57 80
Peter Babin	35 00
Oliver Babin	18 40
Jacob Reynard	5 00
Paul F. Surette	4 00
Zacharie Surette	10 40
Silvain Potier	87 50
Joseph Joshua Surette	50 28
Gabriel C. Babin	15 00
Gabriel C. Babin	60 00

Peter Porter	.....
Mary Ann Porter	15 60
Crepin Surette	12 00
John A. Hatfield	50 00
Mary E. Hatfield	100 00
Joshua White	10 00
Samuel Robbins	10 00
John R. Blauvelt	10 00
Michael Babin	5 00
Michael Surette	30 00
Asa Robbins	45 00
Jackson Ricker	.....
Jacob Reynard	40 00
James Lambert	60 00
John C. Burke	11 25
Barry Bingay et al	15 00
E. Smith Allen	40 00
Moses Muise	25 00

That makes a total of about $5,300.

Mr. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman say how many miles of right of way that covers.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I think about 12 or 15 miles. It may be more, but that is within the limit.

Mr. FORBES. That is the length of the line.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Now, with regard to the legal proceedings that have been taken, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that no legal proceedings were taken to set aside this charter until March last, and not until after all the money had been expended, and all the rights of way had been acquired. In fact, it was not until the South Shore Railway Company gave notice of their intention to apply to this Parliament for the passing of an Act relating to the company that proceedings were taken to set aside this charter. As I stated before when this matter was discussed a few evenings ago, an actual agreement was made between the Coast Line Railway Company and the South Shore Company for the sale of the narrow gauge road to the standard gauge company, on 8th December last. Now, I have two other letters here which I will read to the House; and they are not ancient literature, as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) remarked the other night, but they are very recent literature. Here is one dated 25th January, 1895, addressed to G. A. Fletcher, Esq., care Mitchell, Fletcher & Co., Philadelphia. He is the first gentleman who put a sum of money into the narrow gauge railway:

Dear Sir,—Your letter of 24th inst. duly received. We were not aware that the delay complained of in closing the arrangement that was contemplated by our mutual agreements——

That was the arrangement for the sale of 8th December:

—was due to the fact that you and your associates were waiting upon our convenience; indeed, we had received a distinct impression from you, that there were certain features connected with your performance of the agreements that required some further attention by you. We also beg to call your attention to the fact that though you agreed to stop all legal proceedings then pending or contemplated against us or our company——

These are the very proceedings taken by the Attorney General to set aside this charter:

—in Nova Scotia, in your interest, that has not been done, as we are informed and believe. Will you advise us on this point.

Very truly,

H. E. ALEXANDER.
President South Shore Railway Co.

Now, here is the reply:

Philadelphia, 28th January, 1895.

Mr. H. E. Alexander,

Care Latham, Alexander & Co., New York.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of 26th January, instant is received. I regret that you have been under the impression that you were waiting upon our convenience to comply with the terms of our agreement. Such is not the case, however, and we desire you to fix an early date for its settlement. The Messrs. Brill and myself control everything we agreed to deliver to you. As to the legal proceedings pending in Nova Scotia, we have not instigated them, and desired them stopped; but we think politics and politicians have become mixed with them, and have stood in the way of their withdrawal, but we think and believe that as soon as you have settled with us, and have possession of our property, and occupy our legal position, all proceedings will cease, as the local factions will have nothing to fight for.

Yours truly,

GEORGE A. FLETCHER.

Now, here is a letter from Mr. Fletcher, the man above all others who is interested in this narraw gauge road, who put his money into it, and agreed to the sale of it on the 8th December. He positively states in this letter that the legal proceedings that were taken, and were contemplated by the government of Nova Scotia, arose from political partisanship altogether, that he did not wish them, and that as soon as this sale took place all these proceedings would stop. Now, after that, this telegram was sent to Mr. Fletcher:

7th January, 1895.

To G. A. Fletcher, Philadelphia.

To convince Fielding of sincerity, you should wire him early to inform him that contract made with us is binding and you wish it carried out. Duplicate to Bard. Answer.

H. E. ALEXANDER.

This is Mr. Fletcher's answer:

8th January, 1895.

To H. E. Alexander,
Care Latham, Alexander & Co.

Mr. Fielding will not listen to the proposition, and writes me he is astonished we should make it. Expect to see Williamson to-morrow.

So that it appears that the obstacle in the way of the sale, the obstacle in the way of the transferance of the Coast Line Railway to the South Shore Company, a thing most desirable in order that these two roads should become amalgamated, and that there

should be no further difficulty between them, was Mr. Fielding himself, who stood in the way of the desirable end. That it was a desirable proceeding, we have the testimony of the provincial engineer himself, in his report dated 1st January, 1895, from which I will read this extract :

Even now, at the present stage, if the two companies could only come to some agreement whereby the interests of both could be mutually and agreeably arranged, a good adjustment might be effected. For although a large sum must be lost to both parties, expended on unproductive work, still, if an amicable understanding could be now arranged, the loss would not be so much as might be apparent. In some sections, such as that between Yarmouth and Acadia, where but one line, the narrow-gauge one in this instance, has been graded, the work might, with some alterations of curvature, be utilized for the adoption of the standard gauge, and so on. Of course, when the lines run counter, and the work has been performed on both of them, such saving could not be effected.

Now, the agreement for the sale was actually made and dated on the 8th December. The provincial engineer, in his report, expresses his views on the situation, and he says as strongly as he can put it, that it is very desirable these two roads should be amalgamated, that the result should be a standard gauge road, and that the narrow gauge road should be changed and its curvatures should be altered for that purpose. And we find that the arrangement was absolutely made, we find that Mr. Fletcher, the man who really owns the narrow gauge road, lock, stock and barrel, was anxious that the arrangement should take place, and it appears from Mr. Fletcher's telegram that the only man who stood in the way of this arrangement being consummated, was the provincial secretary of Nova Scotia, and that these legal proceedings were adopted at that time by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia to prevent this charter from being granted by this House.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) has taken advantage of the amendment which was moved, to make a few remarks, and I will do him the justice of saying that he necessarily did so by way of explanation of some previous remarks that were made by himself. I beg the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I submit some evidence to show that the hon. gentleman is still in default as regards the facts relating to the South Shore Railway, as well as to the Coast Line Railway of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman has seen fit to quote from the report of Mr. Martin Murphy, provincial engineer of Nova Scotia, well known as a gentleman engaged in railway enterprises throughout Canada, and a member of the Institute of Canadian Engineers, also of a similar society in the United Kingdom, and also in the United States. Now, in his report published on the 1st January, 1895, on page 3, he says :

The Coast Railway Company submitted, according to section 8, chapter 53, of the Revised Statutes, maps, profiles and books of reference for the first 8½ miles, Yarmouth to Salmon River, on the 21st day of March, 1894, which, after due examination, was formally certified by the Commissioner of Public Works. Work of construction commenced near Yarmouth in May following. Both surveys and works of construction were steadily prosecuted up to December (ultimo), when field work was suspended, the cause of which is alleged, by the company, to be owing to the extreme cost of performing such work as grading in the winter months.

If we turn to page 7 of that report, we find he says as follows, referring to the South Shore Railway Company :—

About 1st October, 1894, work of construction commenced, and since that time has been proceeded with on the line of the South Shore.

One was commenced in May, 1894, and the other in October, 1894, or six months afterwards.

Mr. CAMERON. What about the surveys ?

Mr. FORBES. I thought you would jump at the ditch before you reached it. At page 7, this engineer, speaking of the south shore line, says :

During the session of 1892, a charter was applied for by the South Shore Railway Company, which was granted under the conditions already named, and passed on the 30th day of April, 1892. It will be seen by the preceding remarks that from April, 1892, to February, 1894, a period of one year and nine months, no work was begun or active steps taken towards construction, so far as could be noticed.

On the same page, further on, he says :

The Coast Railway Company, during 1893 and until February, 1894, had the field to itself, and had a party making a location survey on the first 6 miles from Yarmouth during the fall of 1893.

In the meantime the South Shore Railway Company seemed to awake from its lethargy, new hands took the helm and placed strong survey parties in the field in February, 1894.

Is not this substantial evidence as to which company had the right of way by reason of actual occupancy and commencing of work ? We have the provincial engineer, who has been so freely quoted by my hon. friend opposite, saying that in the fall of 1893 the coast line commenced surveys, and in May, 1894, commenced grading and employed hundreds of men, and proceeded to build the railway ; and it was not till the spring of 1894 that the South Shore Company started surveys, and not until 5th October, 1894, they did any actual work of construction. Here we have the Coast Line Company from the fall of 1893 to the beginning of 1894 ahead of the South Shore Company on the work on surveys, and from May, 1894 to 5th October, 1894, ahead of them, by over six months, in actual work of construction. I trust that will be a sufficient answer to any contention made that the South Shore Company had the right of occupancy by being first

on the line. The Coast Line Company got its charter because the people along the shore wanted a road, and, knowing that the railway now known as the South Shore Company had collapsed, was insolvent, and had done nothing, and was out of the field, they applied to the legislature, and asked permission to build this line of railway. Further than that, it appears that on 19th May, 1893, nearly four weeks after the Coast Line Railway had got their charter, in the province of Nova Scotia, Mr. E. Franklin Clements, one of the promoters of the South Shore Company, wrote a letter in which he used this language:

> He (Atwood) has said he can get all the money he wants. Well, he may possibly get it. I cannot get any banker to listen to any new railway venture of mine.

This was the gentleman who was promoting the South Shore Company who had control of the charter, who was trying to sell it and float the scheme. Here we have this statement made four weeks after the Coast Line Company had got its charter, that he, as promoter of the South Shore enterprise, was unable to get any banker to take hold of the scheme or lend any money on it. I, therefore, do not want to hear any more remarks from the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) to the effect that the South Shore Company has the right of preemption over the South Shore route by reason of the fact that they were first on the ground and willing and ready to carry out the enterprise. I have submitted the very best evidence to the contrary. The hon. member for Shelburne also stated that the petitions presented did not appear to have been submitted from the various municipalities along the South Shore of Nova Scotia opposed to the South Shore Company's Bill. The hon. gentleman undertook to refer, in a jocular way, but to some extent offensive, to the petition from the municipality of the county of Shelburne. He said it was only signed by a few Grits, that it was not regular in form, that it was not a petition from the council, but was a petition only from some individuals. I hold in my hand the original petition, which is signed by seven members of the municipal council: J. E. Lloyd, warden; W. A. McDonald, Alexander F. Harlow, James Bowen, Phillip E. C. Bowers, James A. McKay and Ed. Greenwood, councillors. I do not know how many members of the council there are for that municipality. Perhaps the hon. member for Shelburne can tell me. But that is a majority, if not the whole of the council. Shelburne is divided into two municipalities, one called Barrington, the council of which does the business for the western half of the county, and the other is Shelburne, the council of which does the business for the eastern half. This is a petition from the eastern half. I have not the petition from the municipality of Barrington, but I believe it was presented. These gentlemen are well known as most respectable and reputable men, whose word can be accepted equally as well as that of the hon. member, if not better, and it ill-becomes that hon. gentleman to make game of those who signed the petition, and claim they did not sign it in good faith, but merely as a temporary benefit for some political wire-pullers of that county. I deny that allegation entirely. It was signed honestly, with the intention of influencing members of the Railway Committee of this House and inducing them to support those members who might oppose the passage of the South Shore Company's Bill before committee, and in the House. That petition has been presented to the Railway Committee, and will be presented to the House at a later stage. The hon. gentleman also made sport of the petition from the municipality of Queen's, and he undertook to read a letter from Mr. Banks, editor of the "Gold Hunter" in Caledonia, and I do not believe he had obtained Mr. Bank's permission to read it. I know Mr. Banks would not have made the statement he did unless he felt he was sure of the facts, and he would not have made it had he thought the hon. gentleman would have used it in this House. The statements made in it I do not think can be verified. No one in Queen's County would venture, without authority to place the names of three councillors on a petition. The charge against some person of having signed the names of Crocker, Harlow, and Freeman, as made by the hon. member for Shelburne, is unsupported by any evidence beyond the mere statement of the hon. member himself. The hon. gentleman took occasion to say that this was another petition signed by individuals only. This petition is signed by every one of the municipal councillors—it is not an individual petition by any means. It is headed "The petition of the council and municipality," and it is signed by all the councillors, and by the municipal clerk, and also bears the seal of the municipal council.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). How many signed it?

Mr. FORBES. Every one in the council.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). How many?

Mr. FORBES. Twelve.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). That is not every one.

Mr. FORBES. Yes, I think it is the full council. Here are the names: Allen Tupper, warden; A. W. Moren, vice-warden; Chas. Harlow, W. S. Crooker, H. G. Freeman, I. Leslie, W. H. Farquhar, I. N. Mack, John E. Freeman, Jas. McLeod, T. A. Hemeon, J. N. Wylde. Four of these are the names of four of the most prominent Conservatives or Tories in the county of Queen's.

One of these gentlemen from the north district Mr. W. S. Crooker, is one of the most estimable and upright men in the county of Queen's, and that gentleman's name is signed to it.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). It is said he was away.

Mr. FORBES. He might have been out when Mr. Banks was there, but I thoroughly believe that Mr. Crooker signed that petition, or that it was signed by his authority, and notwithstanding the charge of the hon. gentleman from Shelburne (Mr. White), I say that nobody in the county would undertake to sign his name without his authority. Mr. Freeman and some of the other gentlemen have not been out of that county for several years except temporarily. I know they have been there for the last three months, and I know, because I have had communications, that they have been there within a few days of the date given here. I venture to say that the statement made by Mr. Banks that the names of the three northern councillors were forged is an unwarranted statement. Mr. Banks who signs that is the editor of a strong Tory newspaper. He is a party man from the word "go." He is of the strongest Tory predilections, and in every respect he is known to oppose anything and everything I might do for the county of Queen's. He has shown his hands, in more ways than one, as being deadly opposed to any move the Liberal party might make in that county. He is known from his newspaper as being directly antagonistic to the Coast railway. He is no supporter of Mr. Fielding or the local government. He is not a supporter of the local Liberal members for Queen's. He is a strong Conservative partisan who sometimes for the benefit of party or personal advantage to himself will pose as an independent. These are the most dangerous kind of men to have in a community. As regards that petition from the county of Queen's, I believe it to be a most authentic petition, and it is one which the House ought to give all possible attention to. It is worthy of the greatest amount of credence. There are a few other things mentioned by the hon. gentleman from Shelburne (Mr. White) to which I will refer. He said the South Shore Railway Company have paid for their right of way. It is a most curious state of affairs if they have done so. Nobody will believe it because it is impossible to imagine that they ever had money enough to pay for the right of way. The member for Shelburne, took the advantage this evening of reading a list of names of those who hold property which he alleged had been purchased and paid for by the promoters of the South Shore Railway Company. Well, I have in my hand a declaration under the statute, made by one Edwin S. Fraser, of the county of Yarmouth, N.S., civil engineer who solemnly declares as follows :—

Dominion of Canada,
Province of Nova Scotia,
County of Yarmouth, S.S.

I, Edwin S. Fraser, of Yarmouth, in the county of Yarmouth, province of Nova Scotia and Dominion of Canada, civil engineer, do solemnly declare as follows, viz. :—

1. Herewith marked "A" is a list of the owners of lands intended to be passed over and taken for the railway of the South Shore Railway Company (limited), from the proposed terminus of said railway in the town of Yarmouth to the line between the counties of Yarmouth and Shelburne, taken from the books of reference of "The South Shore Railway Company (limited)," filed in the offices of the clerks of the municipalities of Yarmouth and Argyle, respectively, under the provisions of chapter 53, of the revised statutes of Nova Scotia, fifth series.

2. There are no books of reference or plans of said company certified to or filed in the offices of the clerks of the municipalities of Barrington or Shelburne, as I am credibly informed and believe.

3. Said list, herewith marked "A," also shows the numbers of each lot, its acreage and its stations as marked on the plans of said South Shore Railway Company (limited), also filed in the offices of said clerks of the said municipalities of Yarmouth and Argyle, all being taken from said books of reference and corresponding therewith, as I verily believe.

4. I have personally prosecuted inquiries from some of the owners of said lands and other credible persons having knowledge of the facts, and have also had inquiries prosecuted, and as a result of said inquiries I believe and am satisfied that only those of said owners marked paid in said list, herewith marked "A," have been paid for their said lands, and that those of said owners marked unpaid in said list have not been paid for their said lands in whole or in part.

5. I am also credibly informed and believe that the properties Nos. 31, 90 and 92 on said list have been partly paid for.

6. Out of a total of 366 owners of lands, shown by said books of reference, I find and believe from said inquiries, that seventy have been paid in full for their respective lands, three have been partly paid, and 293 have not been paid in whole or in part.

7. From personal knowledge and from inquiries made and prosecuted, I believe and am satisfied that not more than twelve and one-quarter miles of said line of said railway, for which plans and books of reference have been filed as aforesaid, have been graded, and that at least twenty-three miles of said line remains ungraded, that not more than eleven miles of the right of way of said line has been paid for, and that at least twenty-four miles is not paid for in whole or in part.

8. The line of railway of the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia (limited) has been located and approved of from its proposed terminus in the town of Yarmouth to Port Clyde in the county of Shelburne, and plans and books of reference thereof have been duly certified and filed in the offices of the clerks of the town of Yarmouth, the municipality of Yarmouth, the municipality of Argyle, the municipality of Barrington, and the municipality of Shelburne.

9. From personal knowledge, I can say that at least eighteen miles of the said line of railway of said Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia (limited) has been graded, and this almost continuously from the end of Water Street, in the

town of Yarmouth, to Argyle, in the county of Yarmouth, and that seventeen and three-quarter miles of said line in the county of Yarmouth remains ungraded. No part of the said line has been graded in Shelburne County.

10. The town of Yarmouth have agreed to pay for the right of way for the line of said Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia (limited), within the limits of said town. The municipality of Yarmouth have agreed to pay for the right of way for the line of said Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia (limited) within the municipality of Yarmouth and have paid for all of the same, except in two or three cases where titles were defective, and in these the moneys have been provided to be paid over as soon as the titles can be perfected. And the municipality of Argyle have agreed to pay $5,000 towards payment of the right of way for the line of said Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia (limited), in the municipality of Argyle, provided it costs this amount; if not, then the amount of the cost. The municipalities of Barrington and Shelburne, through which the line of said Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia (limited) is also to run, have also agreed to pay for the right of way through these municipalities respectively.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

EDWIN S. FRASER.

Declared before me at Yarmouth, in the county of Yarmouth, province of Nova Scotia, and Dominion of Canada, this eleventh day of June, A.D., 1895.

G. JUDSON BURRILL,
A Justice of the Peace in and for the County of Yarmouth.

And yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. White) pretends to tell the House that the right of way of the South Shore Railway Company has been paid for. As a matter of fact every municipality along the route of the proposed Coast Railway have either paid for the right of way for the Coast Railway Company or have agreed to do so, whereas as regards the South Shore Railway Company, the fake company, who propose to get their charter revived they have not paid for any but a few unimportant ones. This affidavit says that eleven miles have been paid for. The hon. gentleman said fifteen miles. No municipality has ever agreed to pay for any right of way for the South Shore Railway. I have in my hand the list of those rights of way, setting them out by name and giving those unpaid for. They embrace a large number of pages, which I will not weary the House by reading, but I offer them to the hon. member for Shelburne for his perusal. This list is the very best evidence to submit to any committee of this House to prove that the statements I have made are absolutely in accord with the facts. I have another affidavit of Mr. Farrar with respect to the same matter. It has reference to a map, showing the portions that have been built, the portions graded, the portions not graded, and the amount of work done in the different localities; but as I have not the map with me, I wil not weary the House by reading the affidavit. The hon. gentleman also read a letter from one, Mr. Fletcher, known to be the chief promoter of the Coast Railway Company, and I believe, at one time, if not now, its president. This letter was dated January, 1895, and purports to express Mr. Fletcher's opposition to a law suit which is brought against the South Shore Railway Company to void its charter. In that letter there purports to be a statement that a proposed amalgamation of the two companies would likely take place; that in this way all litigation would cease; and that the gentleman from Philadelphia deprecated the introduction of politics into railway matters affecting the south shore of Nova Scotia. With this portion of the letter I most distinctly concur; and if it were not for the actions of some politicians, headed by the present hon. member for Shelburne, there would have been no politics introduced affecting either of these railway schemes. Were it not that Mr. Charles Cahan, the former leader of the Liberal-Conservative party in the legislature of Nova Scotia, took it upon himself to carry through the south shore scheme in order to make votes by the agitation he started, backed up as he was by the efforts of the present hon. member for Shelburne in this House, there would have been no politics whatever affecting the railway enterprises of the south shore of the province of Nova Scotia. The statement of claim in the suit against the South Shore Company, is dated the 13th March, 1895. The House will therefore see that the letter written by Mr. Fletcher could in no way have referred to that suit. The suit was not then in esse; the writ was not issued; the statement of claim was not drawn; that letter could not have deprecated the stoppage of a law suit attacking the charter of the South Shore Railway Company, because that suit had not been entered in the courts. That action was brought after mature deliberation upon the part of all concerned, including the Government of Nova Scotia. Several months of hearing and arguments of counsel for both parties were had before the Lieutenant-Governor in Council; the members of the Nova Scotia Cabinet, I am informed, were divided upon the matter; the Attorney General was very averse to granting his fiat; and he only did so when he was convinced, either by the arguments of counsel on behalf of the Coast Railway Company, or by his own colleagues in the Cabinet, that it would be wiser and better all round to attack this charter, which was being used to attack and vitiate an honest enterprise then in operation along the south shore of Nova Scotia. This statement of claim, among other things, says:

That no directors of the South Shore Railway Company have ever been elected under the pro-

visions of sections 9 and 11 and other provisions of the said Act of Incorporation, and no directors or officers of said company have ever been appointed, and the said company has no directors or officers except the provisional directors constituted by section 6 of the said Act of Incorporation.

That in July, 1892, although no stock of said South Shore Railway Company had been subscribed, E. Franklin Clements, one of the incorporators of said company, proceeded with a pretended organization of said company. The said pretended organization was entered into without any stock of the said company being subscribed or paid in and without the time and place of the first meeting of the company being determined in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of said Act of Incorporation, or notice thereof having been given in accordance with the provisions of said section. And such organization was not in accordance with said Act of Incorporation and was not a valid or effectual organization of said company, but was wholly unauthorized and contrary to law. If any capital stock of said company had been subscribed, or any subscribed capital paid in, such subscription and payment were not bona fide, but were fictitious and fraudulent. Particulars are as follows :—

Defendants, E. Franklin Clements, Albert M. Perrin, William V. Brown, Edgar N. Clements and one Dean F. Currie subscribed for ten shares in all, amounting to one thousand dollars, but none of them paid anything thereon. The defendant E. Franklin Clements further subscribed for 500 shares, either in his own name or as the pretended agent of pretended and fictitious undisclosed principals, but the said defendant, E. Franklin Clements, was, and is, a person wholly without means and wholly unable to contribute such proportion of the capital stock, and was not a person who was, or is, even apparently able to pay the assessments which might be made upon said shares ; and said E. Franklin Clements paid nothing whatever upon said stock, and never intended to pay anything thereon, and the said subscriptions to said capital stock by said E. Franklin Clements were fictitious and fraudulent. There were no other or further subscriptions to said capital stock, nor was anything paid in on the capital stock, but, in order to make a colourable or simulated payment, said defendant, E. Franklin Clements, discounted his own note for $12,600, or thereabouts, at a bank in Yarmouth, and had the proceeds placed to the credit of the said South Shore Railway Company in said bank under an agreement or arrangement that the same should remain there as security for said note, and said proceeds were very soon thereafter applied to the payment of said note, and the said proceeds of said note were not, nor was any part thereof, ever the property of said South Shore Railway Company, or under its control. In the alternative, the said colourable or simulated payment was made by means of the deposit in a bank at Yarmouth for a short time of a cheque not the property of said company.

That the said defendant, E. Franklin Clements, in or about the month of December, 1893, without the authority of other the incorporators or other the provisional directors named in the said Act of Incorporation of the said South Shore Railway Company, or any or either of them, or any other legal authority, undertook to sell to the defendants, Tunis G. Bergen, Frederick B. Bard, Frederick A. Farrar, Henry E. Alexander, Jacob Bingay, Edgar K. Spinney, William C. Clark, and others, the charter of the said company ; and the said defendants, Tunis G. Bergen, Frederick B. Bard, Frederick A. Farrar, Henry E. Alexander, Jacob Bingay, Edgar E. Spinney, William C. Clark, and others, purposed to purchase the said charter.

Under said pretended organization and said pretended sale, the defendants, Tunis G. Bergen, Cyrus E. Staples, Frederick B. Bard, Frederick A. Farrar, Henry Eugene Alexander, Jacob Bingay and Edgar K. Spinney have assumed to be and act as shareholders and as directors and officers of said company, and the defendant William C. Clark has assumed to be and act as general manager thereof.

Under the said pretended organization and said pretended sale, the said defendants, Tunis G. Bergen, Cyrus E. Staples, Frederick B. Bard, Frederick A. Farrar, Henry E. Alexander, Jacob Bingay, Edgar K. Spinney and William C. Clark, assuming to act on behalf of said company, have in the name of said company assumed to go into operation as said company and to proceed with its works and to exercise its corporate functions, although one-half of the capital stock of said company was not, and has not been, subscribed, and 25 per cent of the subscribed capital stock was not, and has not been, paid in.

That the defendants, Tunis G. Bergen, Cyrus E. Staples, Frederick B. Bard, Frederick A. Farrar, Henry E. Alexander, Jacob Bingay, Edgar K. Spinney and William C. Clark, under said pretended organization and the said pretended sale of said charter, which were, and are, illegal and wholly null and void, have assumed, and are assuming and pretending, to be officers of said company. And the said defendants, Tunis G. Bergen, Cyrus E. Staples, Frederick B. Bard, Frederick A. Farrar, Henry E. Alexander, Jacob Bingay, Edgar K. Spinney and William C. Clark, in the name of said company, but wholly without the authority thereof, are exercising the corporate functions of the said company, and constructing in the name of said company the line of railway authorized by the said Act of Incorporation, and are entering into, and have entered into, contracts and obligations in the name of said company.

That within two years from the passing of the Act of Incorporation of said company, nothing was done upon the portion of said company's railway lying between the town of Yarmouth and the town of Barrington, and reasonable progress towards the completion of said portion of said company's railway, satisfactory to the Governor in Council, to insure the completion of said portion of said company's railway within four years after the passing of said Act of Incorporation, was not made ; and no steps were taken within said period of two years to obtain the approval of the Governor in Council of the progress made by the said company towards the completion of said portion of the company's railway, and no such approval was ever obtained. And the plaintiffs say that, by reason of the matters aforesaid, the said Act of Incorporation of the said company has ceased and determined, and said company has ceased to be a body corporate, except for the terms and purposes mentioned in section 10 of chapter 73 of the Revised Statutes ; and in the alternative the plaintiffs say that the charter of said company never went into operation, and that the Act of Incorporation of said company and its charter have wholly ceased and determined, and the said company has ceased to be a body corporate for any purposes whatsoever.

This section is drawn in the words of section 28 of chapter 130 of the Acts of 1892, being the Act of incorporation of the South

Shore Railway Company. In the alternative the plaintiffs say that the charter of the said company never went into operation and that the Act of the incorporation of the company and its charter have also ceased, and the said company has ceased to be a body corporate for any purpose whatever. Now, with this statement of claim before us, can it be otherwise held but that there is an attack upon the charter of the South Shore Railway Company in the courts of the province of Nova Scotia. A direct attack is made, and the suit is pending in the courts of that province today. Yet, in spite of that, efforts are being made by legislation in this House to override what may be the issue of this suit in the courts of that province, to trample on provincial rights, and to take out of the jurisdiction of the provincial courts that which belongs to them. This action was brought in March. In February a previous action was brought by some of the landholders, through whose land the proposed South Shore Railway Company were going to extend their line. It was held, after consultation with counsel, that such an action would not lie in the name of the landowners. Therefore, that action was dropped, and subsequently this action in the name of the Attorney General, on the relation of a gentleman of the name of Alfred W. Potter, for and on behalf of 298 others, landholders along the South Shore line. It has been asserted that this suit was brought by this gentleman to protect his individual rights. I deny that. It is simply a test suit, one of 290 odd which are standing in identically the same position, although the writs have not been yet issued. Politics were imported in the spring of 1894 into railway matters affecting the South Shore Railway Company as well as the Coast Railway Company, and they were imported by political agitators out of the camp of hon. gentlemen opposite. Up to that time there were no politics in the matter, and the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) himself was until then the exponent or advocate of the Coast Railway Company. He had put himself on record in more ways than one, as far back as March, 1893, in support of the Coast Railway. He sent a letter dated the 2nd March, 1893, to the Right Hon. Sir John Thompson, asking for a subsidy to that company. That letter reads as follows :—

Adverting to the personal application recently made to you by Mr. Leonard Atwood, of Philadelphia, for a subsidy of fifteen hundred per mile for a line of narrow-gauge railway, 91 miles, from Yarmouth to Lockeport, in the county of Shelburne, I beg leave to recommend this application to your most favourable consideration.

The contemplated road will pass through almost a continuous settlement, connect with the Western Counties Railway, now happily joined with the railway system of the province by the completion of the missing link, and at last, after the people of the county of Shelburne have agitated for some years, they will be afforded the advantage of railway facilities for travel and traffic.

A careful survey has been made of the contemplated line by the provincial engineer of Nova Scotia, who has given the proposed system his unqualified endorsement as suitable for this section of the country, and the councils of the several municipalities through which the road will run, after having fully inspected the working of similar lines in the United States, have unanimously agreed to assess the ratepayers for land damages and right of way.

Mr. Atwood and other gentlemen associated with him have taken the necessary steps to obtain a provincial Act of Incorporation, and desire to commence work as soon as the spring opens ; and, considering the utter want of railway facilities in the district and the necessity for the immediate encouragement of this work, I trust this application will receive your prompt and favourable consideration, and that, in case no railway subsidies are granted at this session, some assurance will be given that the road, if proceeded with, will be subsidized next year.

Your obedient servant,

N. W. WHITE.

This letter is dated 2nd March, 1893, nearly a year after the Coast Railway had got their old and now defunct charter from Nova Scotia. The hon. Minister replied on 6th March, 1893 :

My dear Mr. White,—I have received your favour, confirming your verbal application for a subsidy for a line of railway between Yarmouth and Lockeport. I shall submit your application to the Minister of Railways without delay, and request for it as favourable consideration as possible.

Yours always,

JOHN S. D. THOMPSON.

That is the application and the reply, and it shows that there were no politics in this railway matter up to the middle of March, 1893. On the 30th April, 1894, there were no politics in it, for the hon. member for Shelburne would surely be an exponent of his party in railway matters in Nova Scotia, especially affecting this enterprise, and I hold a letter from that gentleman dated 30th April, 1894, advocating the granting by the Dominion Government of the subsidy and all possible assistance to the Coast Railway of Nova Scotia. Here is the letter :

Ottawa, 30th April, 1894.

L. Atwood, Esq.

Dear Sir,—Your favour of 4th would have been replied to earlier, but I was absent at Montreal some days. The Government and several Ministers are so much occupied with the new tariff just now that it is difficult to get a discussion on other subjects, and indeed, until that is over, no announcement will be made as to their policy on railway subsidies this year. Under any circumstances, these subsidies are always given and voted for a line of railway between certain points and not to any particular company ; and, in view of the changed condition of affairs, it will, I think, be necessary for you to satisfy the Government on the financial ability of your company to complete your proposed line.

Yours truly,

N. W. WHITE.

Matters progressed in that line for several months. From April to July we find that

the Coast Railway received the support and approval of the Government of Canada. We find it receiving the unqualified support of the hon. member for Shelburne. We find that hon. gentleman openly advocating the granting of aid to what was then known to be a three-foot gauge railway. We find him, as late again as the 11th July, 1894, drafting a letter to the Right Hon. Sir John Thompson, again advocating assistance and the granting of a subsidy to the Coast Railway. The original draft letter in the handwriting of the hon. member for Shelburne I now hold in my hand, this letter as copied is signed by the vice-president of that company, which reads as follows :—

Ottawa, 11th July, 1894.

Right Hon. Sir John Thompson.

Dear Sir,—Finding that your time is, and has been, fully occupied, and not wishing to trespass on your good nature, I have thought it best to write very shortly what I would like to submit for your consideration respecting the railway I have under construction between Yarmouth and Lockeport, by the way of Barrington and Shelburne.

A preliminary survey has been made the entire length of the line. Actual surveys have been made for 22 miles east from Yarmouth, and the location of same has been approved by the local government. The necessary rights of way have been secured, and active work was commenced in April upon the grading. The number of men employed has been steadily increased each month up to the present time. The financial resources of my company are such that work will be prosecuted with all possible despatch to an early completion.

As I had the pleasure of an interview with you last year, and have also explained to-day to Sir C. H. Tupper, this matter more in detail, and have put Mr. White, the member for Shelburne, in possession of all the facts and circumstances connected with this enterprise, I feel I need not trouble you further, but trust that the importance of this road will be favourably considered by your Government in the way of substantial aid to the undertaking.

Yours very respectfully,
LEONARD ATWOOD.

Now, we have a curious state of affairs. Within two weeks after that we have the Government of Canada bringing down a series of resolutions to Parliament asking Parliament to vote money to railroad enterprises in the Dominion ; and, among others we find them voting $3,200 a mile not, as the hon. member for Shelburne says, to aid in the construction of a road from one point to another, but we have the Government deliberately coming down to Parliament and asking Parliament to give them power to grant $3,200 a mile to the South Shore Railway Company for 35 miles of railway from Yarmouth toward Barrington. Why this sudden change on the part of the hon. member for Shelburne and the members of the Government, I cannot understand. Surely it cannot be that they did it in order to gain political advantage to the detriment of the coast railway and to the injury of the people of the south shore of Nova Scotia. Can it be that they intended to strangle the enterprise, the coast roads, upon which so much money has been spent ? Nearly $100,000 in cash had actually been spent upon the road ; and yet ten days after they had expressed approval of it they lend their ear to a proposal that they should give aid to a rival road. Their position may possibly be explained when we learn that the Nova Scotia Government, finding that the people of the south shore were most anxious to have some kind of a railroad complete, and knowing that the Coast Railway Company was backed by capitalists in the United States, made a bargain and received bonds signed by men known to be worth several millions of dollars agreeing to build the road within a specified time according to the terms of a strict contract. That line was under construction with the consent and approval of the municipalities along the south shore. Surely it could not be for political reasons that the hon. member for Shelburne backed by the Government of Canada desired to baulk and destroy this enterprise. But, Sir, I can give no other reason for the extraordinary course that the hon. gentleman has taken. The hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) sought to lend his countenance and aid to the hon. member for Shelburne by saying that the board of trade of the city of Halifax advocated the building of the south shore railway and the giving aid to that road. And he drew a long bow when he said that the board of trade of the great city of Halifax desired to kill the coast road by so doing. Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to say that the hon. gentleman stated what he knew to be different from the facts as related by the members of the board of trade of Halifax. But I do say that the hon. gentleman has not stated them as I believe them to be ; and the subjective matter of his mind did not agree with objective nature of the phenomena as stated by certain members of the board of trade. The advocacy of the south shore railway was based upon one thing only. The merchants of Halifax hoped to trade along that shore, and they wanted to transfer the orders given to them by the merchants of the south shore to the wholesale and manufacturing establishments in Ontario and western Canada generally, and therefore they advocated a standard gauge as being preferable to the three foot gauge which the Coast Railway Company were going to build at that time. Now, the hon. member for Shelburne said that, for like reasons he, forsooth, would advocate the building of the south shore railway. What, Sir, has he to say for his action in Parliament to-day when he knows, as he ought to have known, that the Nova Scotia legislature at its last session had passed an Act giving the Coast Railway Company power to enlarge its gauge from three feet to the standard

width of 4 feet 8½ inches. This was asked for by the company, I may say, upon the statements of the hon. member for Shelburne, and other distinguished politicians of the Conservative stripe, that if the company should build a standard gauge road, they would receive the assistance of that distinguished gentleman and the members of this Government. They applied to the legislature to have their charter amended. I hold in my hand a copy of the last amendment, passed on 20th March, 1895. Section 2 says :

The lines of railway authorized by the Act of Incorporation of the company, and the Act in amendment thereof, and any lines of railway acquired by the company under the provisions of section 1 of the Act, may be of such gauge as the company may determine ; and the company are hereby authorized to lay out, build, own, equip, construct and operate the lines of railway authorized by the Act of Incorporation of the company, and the Act in amendment thereof, and any line or lines of railway acquired by the company under the provisions of section 1 of this Act, of such gauge as the company may determine ; provided, that, in the event of any change being made in the gauge of any line of railway from the gauge upon which the same was laid out or constructed, the same must be approved by the Governor in Council.

In plain English that meant that the company was given an authority to build a standard gauge railway. Now, Sir, on the 5th June, 1895, the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia passed an Order in Council proclaiming, in terms of this Act, that the same should come in force. This was published in the "Royal Gazette" of Nova Scotia, a copy of which I hold in my hand. It says :

The following sections of an Act of the legislature of Nova Scotia, passed on the twentieth day of March, 1895, entitled "An Act to amend chapter 154 of the Acts of 1893, entitled 'An Act to incorporate the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, Limited,' and the Acts in amendment thereof," are now published by order of the Governor in Council, as provided in the 9th section of said Act.

H. CROSSKILL,
Clerk of Executive Council.

That gave the company power to go on and build a road of standard gauge. The first step taken to carry that out was the calling together of the company and the passing of a resolution. This meeting was held on the 6th May, 1895, and the resolution reads as follows :—

At a meeting of the stockholders of the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, held at Yarmouth, 6th May, 1895, the following resolution was unanimously adopted :—

"Resolved that the president and board of directors be hereby authorized to immediately bring into effect the amendment to the charter of the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, Limited, enacted at the last session of the local legislature, empowering the company to change its gauge from 3 feet to 4 feet 8½ inches, for the regular standard gauge, and the president is hereby further authorized to have such changes made in the plans and in the work now under construction as may be necessary to conform with specifications of the local government for standard-gauge railways, and that the gauge of the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, Limited, be changed from 3 feet to 4 feet 8½ inches.

Passed by unanimous vote.

Attest (signed) S. D. Pettit, Secretary Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, Limited.

Then the next step in the regular course of business was to apply to the Government for power to amend the contract made with the Government, and by the company. The Hon. Mr. Fielding, at that time, had been taken seriously ill, and had been ordered south to a warmer climate for the benefit of his health, and had gone away.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he is fairly launched in his subject. It is very hot in the Chamber, and I think hon. members on both sides would like to get away. If there is a great deal more to be said, the hon. gentleman might move an adjournment.

Mr. FORBES. Very well, at the request of the leader of the House, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT.

Report of Trade and Commerce, for the year ending June 30th, 1895.—(Mr. Foster).

ADJOURNMENT—RUMOURED RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I take advantage of this motion to ask the leader of the House if he can give any information in regard to a rumour which is now current, that three members of the Cabinet have resigned this afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER. I can give no information to my hon. friend, but I advise him not to put his trust in rumours.

Mr. LAURIER. Then I inform my hon. friend that I shall renew this question to-morrow, and I will then take the opportunity of drawing the attention of the House to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would like to ask the leader of the House whether there is the authority of His Excellency the Governor General for the announcement made this afternoon as to the meeting of Parliament in January next. The hon. gentleman did not say whether he had such authority, and it seems to me that an announcement that Parliament would be convened by a certain day, and another session would be called, is rather usurping the prerogative of His Excellency, unless the Government had such authority.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will be pleased to hear that we have not usurped the prerogative of His Excellency in this regard.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 9th July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RUMOURED RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I would renew the question I put last evening to my hon. friend leading the House, with respect to the resignation of certain members of the Administration.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can say to my hon. friend and to the House is this: I have not any authority from His Excellency the Governor General to make a statement to the House other than this, that no resignation has as yet been received by him.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I hardly believe that the statement just made by my hon. friend can be satisfactory to the House. Whether certain members of this Administration have placed their resignations in the hands of His Excellency or not, I must accept the hon. gentleman's statement that it is not so. But whether that fact is official or is not official, there can be no doubt that we are in the midst of a ministerial crisis. His Excellency is here. His Excellency has cancelled a trip which had been arranged for him weeks in advance, which he had looked forward to with great pleasure, it being to a part of the country which His Excellency has not yet visited, and this fact is sufficient to show that there is a crisis. Moreover, here are two seats vacant, vacant since yesterday, and although the hon. gentlemen who occupy these seats may not yet have tendered officially their resignations to His Excellency it is quite evident that they are no longer in harmony with their colleagues, otherwise they would be in their places to discharge their share of the business of the country. There is another fact: another hon. gentleman who occupies a place in the Administration, and who sits in the other House, was not in his seat yesterday, and I am led to believe is not in his seat to-day. Under such circumstances, again I say, that it is simply trifling with the House for the hon. gentleman to say that we are not in the presence of a grave crisis. I do not know, I do not care at the present time what stage it has reached, but there is the fact: under our system of government, under the Federal system of government, we have it as an unwritten law of all Administrations, that all the provinces, as far as practicable, should be represented in the Cabinet. No Administration would dare to sit and discharge the public business of the country unless the different provinces, or at all events the great provinces, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, were properly represented in the Cabinet; and when it is known at the present time that three Ministers, representing one province, that three of those gentlemen who represent a great portion of the population of the country, are out of the Cabinet at the present time, whether officially or not, they are practically out of the Cabinet. I say that we are not only in the midst of a great political crisis, but that we have reached a position unprecedented in the history of Canada, where the Government would undertake to carry on the business of the country, one great province, the second in the Dominion, being altogether unrepresented in the Cabinet. I do say to my hon. friend that the situation is altogether unprecedented. Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman were to form an Administration—if any Administration were to be formed by himself or by anybody else to-morrow, no Prime Minister would dare to come to this House and ask Parliament to transact the business of the country with one great province altogether unrepresented in the Cabinet of the nation. So, Mr. Speaker, I say that at the present time we are in this position: That the Government is not in the condition in which it ought to be in order to ask Parliament to transact the business of the country. The Government, I submit, has no right to ask Parliament to vote a single penny under the circumstances, and I conceive that there is nothing else to do but for this House to adjourn and give to the Government an opportunity of either making up the vacancies that exist, or being prepared to advise His Excellency of the condition of things which does exist. I do not conceive, Sir, that the hon. gentleman can allow the Chief Magistrate of the nation, the representative of the Queen, not to be properly advised that there is a political crisis. His Excellency has not yet received the resignation of three of his Ministers. But three of his Ministers, at all events, are not here to discharge the business which His Excellency has entrusted to them, and for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), who has just taken his seat, if he did not start out with, closely followed his opening remarks with the state-

ment, that to-day witnessed a proceeding unprecedented, or a state of things unprecedented in the history of Government in this country. I am quite willing to admit with him that his phrase was well chosen, although I would apply it in a different way from the application which he evidently meant should be made. I say, that it is a thing unprecedented in the parliamentary history of this country, that an hon. gentleman leading Her Majesty's Opposition, should on the strength of mere rumour, and newspaper rumour, or common rumour, come to the conclusion, that in the first place, any part of this country, any one of its provinces, was not represented in the Government; and, that even if it were unrepresented, that so long as there was a Government which held the confidence of the House and had its majority here, it could not therefore carry on the affairs of the country. Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), as I stated, has nothing better than rumour upon which to go. He asked me for authentic information. He received the whole modicum of authentic information that I could give, and he should have rested satisfied with that, and have restrained his ardent impetuosity in the course which he has pursued. He should have waited in a statesmanlike and calm manner until the truth, from an authoritative source, was carefully and fully stated to the House and then have taken whatever action seemed to him best in the premises. But, Sir, he chooses another position. And in doing that, and in making a grave charge and following it by a serious and grave motion based on mere rumour, he has put himself in the position of taking a stand which is certainly unprecedented in the parliamentary history of Canada. Sir, he leaped to the conclusion from rumour, from newspaper rumour, that because there are vacancies on the ministerial benches, that, therefore, the members who were in these seats—and whom he would like to see there now—were no longer members of the Government in union or in harmony with the Government. And he leaped from that conclusion to the still broader conclusion, that one of the great provinces of the Dominion was totally unrepresented, and that therefore the Government should not proceed with its business. He is wrong in both. He has not the slightest foundation of authority for taking the position that he did, and he could only take that position upon an authoritative statement made with the consent of His Excellency the Governor General before this House. And, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) is curiously inaccurate in his assumption, even though his assumption were warranted by facts to the extent to which his inquiry went. He must remember that the province of Quebec has several representatives and that even if he were correct in basing upon fact (which he has not) that which he had based upon rumour, he must still recollect that the province of Quebec had members in the Government with whose names even rumour has not been busy, and with reference to whom he has no right, even on the basis of rumour, to make the assertion or to make the statement which he has made before this House. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman went on to state the doctrine: that if it ever happened in the Government of this country, that any one of its provinces was for the time being unrepresented in the Cabinet, that, therefore, there was no constitutional right, or at least by unwritten law, there was no right, and by custom there was no right—no right for the Government to pass a single governmental measure if it were in that position that it was a Government in which one, even of the smallest of the provinces of the Dominion was unrepresented. It merely needs that I state this to show its untenable character, and I imagine that in cooler moments, and when not acting under the excitement which is evidently pressing upon my hon. friend just now, he would not attempt to maintain that, either as constitutional or as practical good statesmanship or good doctrine in this matter. Sir, I have no intention of carrying on this discussion further. I have no intention of following my hon. friend on his devious pathway of rumour and of what he may hear, and of what may be told to him and whispered to him. In due course of time I shall be able to make an authoritative statement to this House. And when I make that, it will be open for my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), possessing his soul in patience for the meantime—it will be open to him to accept the situation in this case, as he has so often had to do in previous cases.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statement of the hon. the leader of the House is rather an extraordinary one under the circumstances. The hon. the leader has informed the House that it is only newspaper rumour that three of his colleagues are no longer members of the Administration. That, Sir, is rather an extraordinary statement in face of the fact, that here at the closing hours of the session, when Parliament is called upon to consider the appropriations for the support of the various departments which these hon. gentlemen, until the present moment represented, they are not in their places to explain these appropriations, to defend the sums of money for which they ask, or to show for what purposes these sums of money are to be applied. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) thinks it a most unreasonable thing that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) should press upon the attention of the Government the impropriety of proceeding with the Estimates, and with the important business that the House has yet to discharge, in the absence of those of his colleagues who are responsible for the moneys asked for, and for the purposes to

which these moneys are to be applied. The hon. Minister of Finance, it is pretty clear, has not a very high estimation of the accuracy of newspaper statements. In this respect his views correspond with those of his honoured colleague beside him. The hon. Minister of Justice not long ago assured us that not the slightest reliance could be placed upon the statements which from to time appear in the newspapers with regard to his colleagues in office ; and now, although three of his colleagues are reported to have resigned, although this statement is published abroad in newspapers of every shade of political opinion, and although the vacant seats hitherto occupied by those hon. gentlemen bear testimony to the accuracy of that statement, the hon. Minister of Finance says we have no right to attach the slightest importance to it. Yet the hon. gentleman concluded the observations he addressed to the House with the statement that, after advising with His Excellency upon the subject, he will be able at an early period to announce to the House what the facts really are. Here is the statement in the newspapers which the hon. gentleman scouts the idea of attaching any importance to ; here are the vacant seats which until two days ago his colleagues occupied throughout the session. But the hon. gentleman says we are not to heed any of these things ; we are to go on in the face of the inconvenience of dealing with the public estimates in the absence of those who are specially responsible for submitting those estimates to the House ; and we are to attach no importance to this matter—it is all a myth ; there have been no resignations ; there have been no differences in the Cabinet ; but the hon. gentleman will come down at an early day and explain to us fully what is the real situation. Well, Sir, I do not think the hon. gentleman's conclusion very well accords with his statement of the real situation. Then, the hon. gentleman thinks this is rather an unprecedented proceeding. Well, Sir, I think it is one in which the usual precedents applicable to such cases are followed. What is the practice where an Administration is being formed ? Is the business of the House proceeded with ? If the Administration is well nigh filled up, does the House proceed with the public business in the absence of a number of gentlemen who hold important folios in the Cabinet ? I think the hon. gentleman will find some difficulty in showing that it is usual for the Government to proceed under conditions like those which exist at this moment. I think the motion of my hon. friend is a very proper motion under the circumstances ; and when the hon. gentleman—if the rumours are wholly unfounded—is able to induce his colleagues to come into this House and occupy their seats and assume the responsibility of Ministers of the Crown, then my hon. friend will withdraw his motion ; and I dare say he would give the hon. gentleman a few minutes to see how far he can succeed in persuading those gentlemen to take their seats and enable us to get on with the public business. We are all anxious to get away from here as soon as possible—quite as anxious as the hon. gentleman can be to get us away ; but we are anxious at the same time to know whether there is an Administration or not, and we are anxious that this House shall continue its session from time to time until His Excellency is enabled to fill all the various offices of the Government, and until this House discharges the duties that pertain to it as an important part of Parliament.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement made just now by the hon. leader of the Opposition about the composition of a Government in Canada. I agree that the large provinces such as Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, should be represented properly in the Government ; and that is what we have seen for the last twenty years and more. At this moment we see two seats on the treasury benches vacant. The question has been put to the leader of the House, what is the reason of those seats not being occupied ? The leader of the House says he is not in a position to give an answer to that question now. Those seats have been vacant since yesterday ; this is the second sitting ; and the leader of the Opposition says that under these circumstances the Government have no right to proceed with the business of the House, because the province of Quebec, so far as two seats are concerned, is not represented. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is a member of this House who would more than I ask that my province should be represented in the Government. I hope that province is now represented in the Government ; and if it is not now represented, I have no doubt that the leader of the House and the First Minister will see that it shall be represented immediately.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know what the hon. gentlemen would wish if the word immediately is not sufficient for them. I am not disposed, for my part, on a motion to adjourn the House, to vote non-confidence in the Government which I have supported from the beginning of the session. If the leader of the House comes down with a statement about these vacant seats and gives a reason why they are vacant which is not acceptable, I am not the man to say yes to the Government under such circumstances. If a vote of non-confidence is then required, of course I shall give it ; but now I shall certainly not support the motion made by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I have just heard the words that fell from the lips of an experienced political man, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector

Langevin) who stated that until the Governmnet could give the explanations asked from them, it is unreasonable, on the part of those who supported them till now, to vote want of confidence in them without having heard them. For the present, Mr. Speaker, I share the opinion of the hon. member for Three Rivers. I will give my confidence to the Government till we have clear and definite explanations with respect to the fact that two seats on the treasury benches have been unoccupied for over two days. As soon as we have these explanations, should we deem them insufficient, I do not pledge myself to continue my confidence in the Government now in power. As soon as we have the Ministerial explanations, if they should be satisfactory, then I will continue my confidence in the Government. After these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I intend voting against the motion for adjournment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

House divided on motion (Mr. Laurier) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allan,
Bain (Wentworth),
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Borden,
Boston,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Dawson,
Devlin,
Edgar,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Frémont,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Harwood,
Innes,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lépine,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lowell,
Macdonald (Huron),
McCarthy,
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Martin,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mulock,
O'Brien,
Perry,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Vaillancourt, and
Yeo.—72.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adams,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Baker,
Leclair,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Macdowall,
Belley,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Blanchard,
Boyd,
Bryson,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Carscallen,
Chesley,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis (Alberta),
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grant (Sir James),
Haggart,
Haslam,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Jeannotte,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Lachapelle,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton)
McGreevy,
McInerney,
McKay,
McLean (King's),
McLennan,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
Northrup,
Patterson (Colchester),
Patterson (Huron),
Pelletier,
Pridham,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Simard,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Turcotte,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westm'd).—111.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Guillet,	Bourassa,
Ives,	Fauvel,
Pope,	Edwards,
Ryckman,	Préfontaine,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Geoffrion,
McNeill,	Paterson (Brant),
Cochrane,	Welsh,
Temple.	Delisle.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS.

House resolved itself into committee on resolution (p. 3915) respecting the indemnity of members of the Senate and House of Commons.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. A number of the members of this House, who are officers of the Cana-

dian volunteers, have been called from their duties here to serve their country in the field. This particular resolution will, of course, afford relief to those members who, for private reasons, have absented themselves, but those members who have absented themselves for public reasons will not receive any benefit. They will not receive any indemnity during the time that they have spent in the field. The leader of the House will remember that in 1885 we went a great deal further and allowed full pay for three months to all the members of this House who were engaged in active service in the North-west.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is altogether unfortunate that this matter should be brought up in the shape of a resolution every year. If the House is of opinion—and that I am not sure has been fairly challenged yet—that the twelve days should be allowed to members who, for private reasons, choose to absent themselves, well and good. But I think it should be placed beyond the reach of a catch division on a resolution. If the Government come to the resolution that this should be the settled policy of Parliament, let it be embodied in the statutes and not brought up from year to year at the whim of the leader of the Government for the time being. It is altogether undignified that members should sit here and vote themselves by resolution every year $96 or $100 as the case may be.

Mr. HAZEN. I simply rise for the purpose of saying that I agree in the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock). It seems to me only a matter of common fairness that if a member of this House is an officer of the militia force, and, as such, attends the camp of instruction held during the session, he should not be made to suffer by having his sessional indemnity reduced by the amount of $8 per day. Militia officers should be allowed the full time they are absent attending to their duties in the camp and in addition should be allowed the twelve days granted other members for the purpose of attending to their private business.

Resolution reported.

THE MARKLAND MORTGAGE.

Mr. FOSTER moved third reading of Bill (No. 136) respecting the discharge of a mortgage to Her Majesty known as the Markland mortgage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. From inquiries I have made on the matter, I am afraid that the hon. gentleman is proposing to give away a portion of the public property for a quite inadequate consideration, and I doubt extremely the policy of passing any Act whereby we reduce an asset of the Dominion unless we take proper legal formalities to ascertain its value. I think the duty of the Government in this matter is plain enough. They ought to deal with this portion of the public property just as an ordinary mortgagee would deal with it. Let the property be put up to public auction and disposed of, and then no censure can attach to the Government if it does not fetch the full sum; but it is not wise for the Government to take upon themselves the responsibility of practically giving away to certain parties, whoever they may be,—I have not taken the trouble to inquire into that matter—a certain percentage of the money which appears to be legally due. I am bound to say that I believe the great bulk, at any rate, if not all, of the sum which is now due the Government would be received if that course were pursued.

Mr. FOSTER. The only object of the department was to close this thing out from our books. It has been there since 1862, and was dealt with by a committee of this House who recommended that it be got rid of entirely. We must have power to give a title, and the Bill which is introduced simply empowers the Government to do that. I mentioned that we were proceeding on the basis of giving the properties for 50 per cent of the principle due, and the question came up whether that held or not with reference to the Minguay property. I inquired of my officers and I found that they are negotiating in the same way with the holders of that property at present, and that the holders will come in on the same basis. The amount of money is not very large and no prospect of its being paid. It is fairly large if you take the principal and accrued interest from the time interest began to run. It would be as well to let the Bill pass, as it gives power to dispose of the property on the best terms possible, and I will take care that precautions are taken to get the values and dispose of it for as large a sum as possible. The only object is to realize what we can from the property and clear the same from our books. The amount we shall take is not fixed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the hon. gentleman said that about 50 per cent of the principal, without the interest, was the amount the Government calculated upon getting. I am bound to tell him that I believe that, if the properties were put up to auction, they would yield all that is due, according to the information I have received. It would be satisfactory to know if the Government have obtained the assessed values of the properties. That is a piece of information they should have before them.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That, I think, they ought to have and ought to have mentioned to the House. One of these lots is a water lot of very considerable value. The others are of less value, but collectively amount to a very considerable sum.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure no offer has been made absolutely binding us. I do not hold myself bound to take 50 per cent of the valuation, if, after the most minute inquiries, I think more can be obtained. With reference to the special property, which is the most valuable one, I shall take care to have a valuation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The practical way is to put it up to auction.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid we would not get much that way.

Bill read the third time and passed.

SILVER-LEAD SMELTING.

Resolution (p. 3925) reported from committee re providing for the encouragement of silver-lead smelting in Canada, was read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 142) to encourage silver-lead smelting.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved third reading of Bill (No. 68) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We were to hear from the Minister of Justice with respect to my proposition to amend the section relating to the marking of the ballots. I understood the hon. gentleman was to consider whether he would incorporate, with this Bill, the provisions of the Bill I introduced.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I undertake to have the amendments proposed by a member of the Government in the Senate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, no.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It will have to come back here. It is immaterial to me how it is done; I propose this merely as a matter of convenience.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But that commits us to making that provision of the law mandatory instead of directory, as now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is an arguable question whether that should be done. You restrict the freedom of the voter in the marking of his ballot, and I am inclined to think that it is not in the public interest that we should take that course. If the hon. gentleman proposes to make an amendment to the law governing the election of members to this House in the Senate, he is depriving this House of the opportunity it should have of fully considering the matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, the hon. gentleman can move his amendment now. My suggestion was made merely as a matter of convenience. This House would not be debarred in the slightest respect from full discussion by the amendment being made in the Senate, as the amendment would have to come under consideration in this House in any case. I do not object at all to the hon. gentleman moving that the Bill be recommitted to be amended in this respect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That being the case, I will move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by adding the following clause:—

1. The section substituted by section four of chapter thirteen of the Statutes of 1894 for section forty-six of The Dominion Elections Act, chapter eight of the Revised Statutes, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"46. The elector, on receiving the ballot paper, shall forthwith proceed into one of the compartments of the polling station and there mark his ballot paper, making a cross or crosses with a pencil on the white circular space or spaces opposite to the name or names of the candidate or candidates for whom he intends to vote, and shall then fold up such ballot paper so that the initials on the back can be seen without opening it, and hand it to the deputy returning officer, who shall, without unfolding it, ascertain by examining his initials and the number upon the counterfoil that it is the same which he furnished to the elector, and shall first detach and destroy the counterfoil, and shall then immediately, and in the presence of the elector, place the ballot paper in the ballot box."

This is in the words of the Bill I introduced, and the object is that the elector shall mark his ballot in the disc, and not elsewhere.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Chairman, I submit the section to the committee in the form in which I introduced it as a Bill. I think hon. members of the committee are pretty well aware of the object of it. Last session we adopted the ballot paper having a disc opposite the name of the candidate, the object of Parliament being that the ballot should be marked in the disc, and not elsewhere. Judge Andrews has decided that, under the present law, the ballot may be marked in the disc, or it may be marked in the division where the name is. This decision gives rise to so much doubt as to what the law really is that it is apparent to everybody that the question ought to be settled one way or the other. Now, my idea is that it should be settled by making it mandatory that the elector should mark

in the disc, and not elsewhere. But if the majority of the committee hold a different opinion, I still think that some amendment should be made declaring that Judge Andrews was right, and that this portion of the Act is directory, and not mandatory. I move this amendment to test the opinion of the committee.

Mr. BERGIN. I object to that amendment. I think that instead of restricting the voter in his efforts to mark the voting paper properly, we ought to facilitate him. I would like to ask my hon. friend, when the directions for voting are posted up at different places throughout the counties where they are directed by law to be posted, how many of the voters will understand what is meant by the word "disc"? A great many of them will think probably that it is outside of the disc that the vote should be made, and I think where we have so many illiterate people, we ought to avoid confusing the minds of the voters.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It says "circular space."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman forgets that last year we determined to adopt a peculiar form of ballot, which has the name of the candidate on the left hand side of the ballot, and the side of the ballot that formerly was white paper is now made black with a circular white space in the centre. Now, it is apparent that the object of Parliament in adopting that ballot was that the mark should be put in the circular space, and there was no sense in adopting the ballot if you were going to allow the mark to be placed anywhere else. The object of adopting a new ballot paper where it is all black except the space within the circle, was to compel or direct the voter to mark his ballot in that circular space. Any man, whether he is educated or uneducated, will see at once, on looking at the ballot that this is the object. The only result, an unfortunate result, I think, of allowing him to make it elsewhere than in that circular space, would be to render more easy than at present the object of the briber. If the voter is compelled to put it in that space, you minimize the opportunities which are open to those who bribe to ascertain that the bribe has been paid for by the vote, because if the ballot is marked in the circular space, it is impossible for people who mark it there to be identified; whereas, if you allow it to be marked outside, around the name or on top, or underneath one of the letters, as long as it is not in the space, then you increase the possibility of ascertaining whether the bribe has been paid for. I suppose that was the object of Parliament in adopting this ballot paper last year.

Mr. BERGIN. I quite understand what my hon. friend wishes to convey to the House, but at the same time I must say that his proposition is not in the interest of the honest voter. I am not prepared at this moment to admit that it was a proper ballot for the House to have adopted last year; on the contrary, I quite agree with the judgment of the judge who thinks that the illiterate voter, if he marks within the square, is complying with the law, and I think we ought to support that judgment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The law as it stands at present furnishes, not a white disc with a black border around it, but it furnishes a ballot with a square space in which the voter is directed to place his mark, and it has been held, I think, by the courts that if the ballot is marked so as to clearly indicate the intention of the voter, that is, to indicate that he intended to vote for a certain candidate, that ballot must be counted. Now, is it proposed by the hon. member for Queen's that that privilege and advantage should be taken away from the elector altogether, and upon what grounds is it proposed? It is contended, as I understand, by the hon. member for Queen's that unless the ballot is marked in this white disc that appears with a black ground surrounding it, the vote should not be counted, and the voter will lose his vote. Now, the ground upon which the hon. member for Queen's makes that contention is that if the ballot is marked in any other way than within that disc, it may be a mark of identification, that is to say, a mark that will identify the voter by reason of some understanding that may have taken place prior to his going into the compartment to mark his ballot; in other words, that an elector may be bribed and that the fact of marking his ballot in a certain way within the clear space instead of within the round disc, will enable the briber to ascertain whether the bribee has carried out his part of the contract. But if the hon. member wants to carry that out to its legitimate conclusion, he should specify that the mark shall cover the whole, that it should be made on one side or the other of the white disc, or that it should be placed in a particular part of the white disc, because an elector might be identified by marking within the white space if he marked within a particular part of it, at the bottom or at the top, at the right-hand or at the left-hand side, he could then be identified just as effectually as if he marked within the square space that is shown outside the white disc. It seems to me it would be going a great length to say that if the intention of a voter was clearly defined by the manner in which he marked his ballot, he should be deprived of his vote simply because he failed to put it within the white disc. The law at present reads as follows: —

The elector, on receiving the ballot paper, shall forthwith proceed into one of the compartments of the polling station, and shall mark his ballot paper, making a cross with pencil on the white

portion of the ballot paper, opposite to or within the division containing the name or names of the candidate or candidates for whom he intends to vote, and shall then fold up the ballot paper.

It seems to me the object of the Bill is simply to give to the elector a more clear indication than the old ballot gave him of the place in which he ought to mark his ballot, and I do not think the elector ought to be deprived of his vote if his intention is clearly indicated by his having marked within the space containing the name of one of the candidates.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman's amendment lies in the style of the ballot that we have adopted, and a great deal of the argument is directed against that form of the ballot altogether. I understand the hon. gentleman's position to be that so long as you have that form of ballot, more certainty is needed about the place in which this mark is to go, and his argument carries great weight in my mind, though I appreciate the views of other gentlemen, and could understand them better if we were discussing the style of the ballot that is in the statute. I think there is a great deal of force in the remarks in reference to the ease of identifying the voter and destroying the secrecy of the ballot paper, which is possible where much space is afforded to roam about in. The circular space, as it is called in the amendment, is a very large portion of that paper or ballot, in which to make a simple cross, and I think there is no undue circumscription of the space for the making of that mark. In this case, there is a very ample space, which is distinctly marked on that ballot, and I think an amendment of this kind would go well in hand with it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think we are bound to consider what the object of Parliament was in ordering that specific kind of ballot. My own opinion is that it has been rightly interpreted in the decision referred to, and that the instruction has been regarded as directory and not as mandatory. What was the object of Parliament? Was it to prevent fraud or the placing of marks on ballots so that they might be identified? The true object is to enable the voter to mark his ballot in such a way that it will be clear as to the candidate for whom he intended to vote. The object of the white disc is not to compel the voter to place his mark there, but to enable him to mark the ballot very distinctly for one candidate or another. It is to aid the illiterate man in marking the ballot in such a way that his vote shall not be thrown away. We do not help him if we say that he shall place his mark within a certain circle and in a particular way, and if it is not placed within the disc it shall not be counted. The English law requires a simple mark, our law requires a cross, and in that way we have already a greater restriction than prevails in England. We have adopted a special ballot, not for the purpose of restricting the voter, but for the purpose of aiding him so that his vote may be counted. If any hon. member thinks the law has been improperly interpreted, that would be a good reason for amending the section so as to make it perfectly clear. While I agree that it is important to amend the section, I do not agree with the view that because we have adopted this form of ballot every mark must be made within the disc. In my opinion, it would be a mistake to impose such a restriction, and it would lead to many ballots being thrown out which in other respects should be counted. It is important to interpret the law in such a manner as to count every vote if possible in accordance with the intention of the voter. No doubt ballots could be marked so as to show the intention of the voter, such as by marking in certain positions on the disc or outside, or by using a coloured pencil, or in other ways; but to determine that if the mark is between the lines the vote shall not be counted and that such a vote has been improperly or corruptly made, is going too far.

Mr. CURRAN. It is very important we should take the law as it is and amend it so as to determine exactly what it means, because other judges may differ from the judgment rendered by Judge Andrews. They may take it for granted that this clause means or was intended to mean that the mark should be placed within the disc, because the only object we had in accepting this particular form of ballot and paying for it was that the mark should be put there. It would never do to have a certain number of members of Parliament elected on judgments that were contradictory, to have members elected although the cross on certain ballots happened to be without the bull's eye and other candidates defeated by having votes thrown out although marked in the same manner. While it is very important we should not deprive any man of his vote, we should indicate clearly what our intention is. I agree that a voter can mark his ballot inside the disc so as to identify his vote; still it is absolutely necessary to come to a conclusion as to what we do mean and to make our intention clear, so that the judges in deciding election cases may agree in their judgments. That is the first thing to be done, and I think the hon. gentleman's amendment is in the right direction. The people will come to understand that they have to mark the ballots within the disc, and when that is known to be the case there will be very few spoiled ballots.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Since we have gone so far in adopting the ballot we are not going

much further by adopting the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's; but I agree with the hon. member that any one who wishes to give evidence as to the particular way in which he votes can do so by marking it at a certain place within the disc or in other ways, which I need not enumerate.

Mr. CASEY. This is purely a matter of opinion, and I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). It seems to me that the proposal would certainly limit the chance of error on the part of the man who is marking the ballot, and the chance also of indications being given which were intended for the scrutineers. It might be that such indications could be made by placing the mark somewhere else than in the bull's-eye; the mere fact that it was not marked in the bull's-eye might have been previously agreed upon. Different positions around the name of the candidate might be used as a means of indicating the voter, by it being below or above, and so on. If this ballot is to be retained, as to the usefulness of which I confess I have grave doubts, the logical conclusion is to make the bull's-eye the only place for marking the ballot. I cannot agree that there would be any great danger of the voter losing his vote owing to a mistake in placing his mark in some position where he should not place it. The bull's-eye is so evident, apart from the instructions placed on the door of each polling place, that I can hardly imagine a man placing his mark elsewhere, except intentionally, and if he places it elsewhere through stupidity, he is scarcely qualified to exercise the franchise. I, therefore, support the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to make the disc the only place for the mark.

Mr. McCARTHY. It does not appear to me that the clause as drawn would carry out the intention of the hon. mover. I do not exactly see the distinction between the clause as it is in the statute and the clause as proposed. There is a direction in either case as to where the cross is to be placed, and the construction the judges have placed upon it is that in one case it is declaratory and the hon. gentleman wants to make it mandatory. If so, the clause should not stop there, but there should be some words added that unless the ballot was placed within the white space it would not be counted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In one sense it is declaratory, though in another sense it is mandatory. The language in regard to placing the mark within the circular space reads in the statute: "Opposite to, or within the division." This language means that the voter must put his mark within the space.

Mr. McCARTHY. So the proposed amendment makes it more mandatory than the present section. The statute is rather indefinite and misleading, and the language should be made clear and positive. But the judges in counting these ballots would, no doubt, follow the English decision as in the case of Sarsons. That is clearly the intention of the voter to vote for that particular man and ought to be counted. If we are desirous of limiting the place on the ballot we ought to say so distinctly and clearly. For my part I do not think it makes much difference. I think the decisions that we have been following for many years are purely arbitrary. I do not think the public understand them in the least and I do not think many lawyers understand them. I think they are devoid of sense. Nothing could more clearly indicate an arrangement, than a man making two crosses: and yet they hold that two crosses being made do not vitiate a vote. In view of the decisions, without our going a good deal further, I do not think we will gain anything. For my part I think we better leave it "space," adopting the wise change proposed by my hon. friend saying it shall be marked in the circular space. I do not think it would be wise to go further and say that a man shall be disfranchised if he makes it elsewhere.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have seen in my experience, scores of cases in which the cross was made at the top of the name, the voter thinking that was the most certain way he could adopt to indicate the party for whom he intended to vote. There are many old people who are voters, who do not attend the public meetings, who know nothing about the form of a ballot, who do not hear a discussion on a public topic during the canvass. They belong to one party or the other. They are decided in their opinions and when the election day comes, they make their mark on the name of their candidate. They would do so even if the mark was made mandatory in the particular disc. All these parties would be disfranchised, if they did not happen to mark their ballot in a particular place.

Mr. CASEY. The argument of my hon. friend is very strong against this form of ballot paper; and as strong in favour of leaving the ballot paper in the old-fashioned way. The arguments are against this form of ballot, and not against the provision proposed.

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

ROAD AND ROAD ALLOWANCES, MANITOBA.

Bill (No. 114) to amend the Act respecting roads and road allowances in Manitoba (Mr. Daly) was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MULOCK. What is the change here?

Mr. DALY. We want to vest these in the province irrespective of any proof required by section 2; and to bring the old section No. 1 down to the present time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Should not the section read: "Shall be vested in the Crown in right of the province?"

Mr. DALY. We are simply following the words used in the Revised Statutes, but I have no objection to the amendment suggested.

On section 3,

Mr. CHARLTON. Are municipal councils in Manitoba given no authority to close up roads? Must this matter be submitted to the Governor in Council?

Mr. DALY. The municipal councils have all the authority necessary. The change we make is this: Under the provincial law, any municipality that desires to close up a road and open another must, in the first place, appoint a surveyor to have a survey and plan made of the proposed change. Then a by-law is passed providing that the road shall be changed in accordance with the plan. A copy of the by-law and the plan is sent to the provincial secretary, and if the provincial government approve of the proposed change of road, an order of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is passed to that effect. The present law requires, in addition, that the Lieutenant-Governor shall send the by-law and the plan down to Ottawa, and obtain the assent of the Governor General in Council. We are doing away with that, so far as the organized municipalities are concerned. With reference to the unorganized parts of the province, the law will stand as it is.

Mr. McCARTHY. Why not leave the unorganized districts to be also dealt with by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council? Surely that might be trusted to the provincial government.

Mr. DALY. The provincial government does not desire us to do anything further than we are doing. The unorganized districts are at the extreme northern limit of the province, and until they are organized into municipalities, it is not likely that any occasion will ever arise for road allowances to be closed up; and the Government desires to retain in its hand the authority it has at present in reference to road allowances in unorganized districts.

Mr. CHARLTON. It seems to me that it is unnecessary to load on the department here any matters pertaining to roads in the province of Manitoba. Jurisdiction over these matters should be vested in the province, both as to organized municipalities and unorganized localities, as the local authorities are better judges of the circumstances and are more competent to deal with such matters than the authorities of the department here can be.

Mr. DALY. In view of the fact that the possibility of any roads being closed or opened in any unorganized locality is so remote, the provincial government and the Government here prefer that the law should remain as it is at present.

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

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES REPRESENTATION ACT.

Bill (No. 121) further to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act (Mr. Daly) was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. LAURIER. This is the same qualification as for the local legislature, is it not?

Mr. DALY. Exactly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose we may congratulate the Government, then, upon so far adopting the principle of local representation. When we had the present franchise law under consideration, the doctrine of uniformity was preached to us as a sacred doctrine. We were told that we were to be one people, and that to be properly united we must have the same qualifications for elections in every constituency throughout the Dominion. Now the hon. gentleman finds it convenient to adopt in the North-west Territories the qualifications fixed by the local legislature.

Mr. DALY. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Fixed by the Dominion for electors in the local elections. And the hon. gentleman has so far departed from the rule formerly laid down. He is establishing in the North-west Territories a qualification for election to this House different from that established for the province of Ontario or the province of Quebec. So the sacred doctrine of uniformity is not adhered to. We pointed out to the Government at the time that the measure was under discussion, that there were such differences in the circumstances of the people of different provinces, that what was found a convenient qualification for the election of members for the local legislature would also be found a convenient one for the election of members of the House of Commons. The hon. gentleman

has adopted that view, and has made a qualification different from that which exists in the other provinces.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman is a little late in his congratulations, for he has overlooked the fact that the franchise in local elections in the North-west Territories was given by this House; so that we are simply providing for the elections to this House the exact qualifications that this Parliament gave for elections to the local assembly. The principle underlying the contention of gentlemen on this side is that we claim the right to fix the franchise for Dominion elections. And in this case we are not departing from that rule. If you will allow us to fix the franchise in the other provinces, we shall be glad to do so. We are by no means departing from the principle for which we have contended.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The hon. gentleman's predecessors in office and his late leader preached the doctrine that the qualification for election of members of the House of Commons should be the same in every province in the Dominion. Now, is the qualification which the hon. gentleman proposes to fix the same as that established in Ontario or New Brunswick or Nova Scotia?

Mr. DALY. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman knows that it is not. And therefore the rule laid down as the justification for the interference of this Parliament, the necessity for a uniform qualification, is departed from. The hon. gentleman is adopting for the North-west the principle of manhood and residential suffrage. It does not matter that it has been made a qualification for election to the local legislature, it is not the less a departure from the rule of uniformity.

Mr. DALY. The object is not only to make the qualification the same as in elections for the local legislature, but to remove the disabilities that existed in connection with the old franchise. Citizens to be qualified had to become householders and to reside twelve months in the constituency. We provide that they are qualified to vote after they have resided twelve months in the Territories and three months in the electoral district. The hon. gentleman has referred to the opinions expressed by the late leader of the Government last session. I understood that our late leader said he would adopt the franchise as it existed in each of the provinces. We are following on those lines.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am not speaking of what the leader said last session, but of what was said by Sir John Macdonald in 1885 in connection with the Franchise Act.

On section 2.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see that the Government in this has adopted a system which is practically the system of registration in use in the United States. This is so widely at variance with the system adopted for the other provinces, that I desire to call attention to it. Not that I condemn the facilities provided for placing voters on the list at the latest possible moment; but I desire to draw the contrast between this system and the system under the Dominion franchise law, under which cases have often been known of citizens fully qualified and twenty-four years of age, not allowed to vote because there had been no revision of the list for three years after they became of age. Under this system a man can make application to have his name put on the list up to two days before polling day. Under the system in force in the other provinces, no name can be put upon the list after the final revision. We had a revision of the lists last winter, and we have just made provision, so far as this House is concerned, that no revision shall be held this year. We may have an election when the lists are a year old probably, and a citizen who comes of age between the time of the last revision and the holding of the elections will have no vote. In all the American states there is a system of registration. The details differ in different states, but as a rule, the last registration is held within one week of polling day. The registration is managed by the municipal authorities of the cities, towns and townships. The adoption of this principle in the North-west Territories is an indication of progress. But it is scarcely to be defended that this much needed reform should be applied to that small population and denied to the millions of inhabitants of the older provinces of this Dominion. I think no commentary upon the unwise and improper policy of the Government could be stronger than this practical admission on the part of the Government itself that the principle applying to the elective franchise and the placing of names upon the voters' lists in the old provinces is one that is to be repudiated in the North-west Territories in favour of a system more in accordance with the rights of citizens to have their names added to the voters' lists at the latest possible day. I know of cases in 1891 where individuals almost twenty-four years of age were unable to vote, their names not being on the list, because the last revision had taken place before they came of age. This is one among many illustrations of the absurdity of the Dominion election law.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman forgets that this has been the law for a great many years, and we are not applying any new principles at all. The method of making up the voters' lists has obtained since 1886,

when they were given representation. Enumerators were appointed, and these enumerators make up the lists, and all we do here is to make an alteration, which should have been made last session, in the form which is provided for in the Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you think it is wise, the franchise having been made as broad as possible, to give greater facilities for putting parties on the lists than there are in other parts of Canada? Are there any special reasons that apply to the North-west that do not apply elsewhere?

Mr. DALY. Yes; the sparseness of settlement, for one.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Supposing a man has been twelve months in the district, and has not got his name on, either by his own negligence or otherwise; in the other provinces he cannot vote, then why should he have a right to vote in the North-west Territories?

Mr. DALY. They have not the voters' lists there in the same sense that they have in Ontario.

Mr. CHARLTON. What are the duties of the enumerator?

Mr. DALY. The enumerator has to make the list of voters in the district for which he is appointed.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there an appeal from the enumerator?

Mr. DALY. Yes; to the district judge.

Mr. MULOCK. In this particular case, what good will an appeal do unless you keep this appeal separate from the others?

Mr. DALY. What I mean is that an appeal lies in the event of any person on the list having been omitted. By the provision we make here, if any person finds his name is not on the list, he simply applies to the enumerator. The enumerator is not a judicial officer. But there is also an appeal to a judicial officer, as in the older provinces.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) An appeal would be no good as regards any names put on in this section.

Mr. MULOCK. Can you not put in a clause providing that in the case of men who have their names put on under this clause, the appeals shall be kept separate? Under our present Act we have a provision that if, pending the final revision of the voters' lists, an election takes place, all votes that are subject to appeal are put in a separate envelope, which is opened, and the ballots are examined in case of appeal. Now, you must have something like that here, or else you open the door to the enumerators stuffing the lists.

Mr. DALY. It has never been thought necessary.

Mr. MULOCK. It is part of our general system. This clause stands alone, and I do not think it ought to be adopted.

Mr. DALY. We are simply, by this legislation, changing a form that existed amongst the schedules to the Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Under this section 4 that we have passed, women would have the right to register: "Every person shall be qualified to vote who has resided in the North-west Territories for at least six months." Under that clause, women can register as well as men.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman is right. It should be every male person, and that must be changed.

Mr. CHARLTON. The enumerator in this case is an appointee of the Government, one of his functions is to put voters on the voters' list, and I think it is necessary to have some check upon the exercise of that authority. I think this clause had better stand until this very important point can be considered further. Suppose the enumerator stuffs the list of voters, and puts on persons who are not qualified, the result of the election may be varied materially by the action of that enumerator.

Mr. DALY. If the hon. gentleman wants it to stand, I have no objection. But there is nothing new about it, it has been the law for years.

Committee rose and reported progress.

THE RAILWAY BELT, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. DALY moved second reading of Bill (No. 141) for the settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and British Columbia, relating to lands in the railway belt, British Columbia. He said: At the time British Columbia entered confederation the Dominion Government had undertaken the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway and had obtained from the British Columbia Government a promise to grant land for a distance of 20 miles on each side of the line of railway. The object of this Bill is to enable the Government to carry out an arrangement with British Columbia for delimiting the lands to the limit of 20 miles on each side of the road. Negotiations have been in progress for a number of years and they have almost been consummated, but the authority of the Dominion Parliament is required to make the final arrangement. An Act was passed by the British Columbia legislature during its last session permitting the government of the province to enter into negotiations with the Dominion Government in order to fix the boundary. Two modes of making the boundary have been suggested. One, is to take the centre of the line of railway and follow the sinuosities of the road; the other

is—and this is the more feasible plan and it is the one more agreeable to both parties now—that we should take the nearest township boundary within 20 miles of the line as the boundary in question. By the latter plan we make sometimes and lose sometimes, but it seems to be the only feasible arrangement that can be carried out. All the land grant along the line of railway from the western boundary of the Northwest Territories through to the coast has been surveyed. We are in a position now to make the boundaries upon that plan.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the territory all been surveyed ?

Mr. DALY. It has all been surveyed : it has not been laid out in townships, but the 20-mile line has been surveyed. Under a clause of the Bill it is provided that when this arrangement is concluded the British Columbia Government will provide for the registration of the patents. Considerable trouble has arisen as to the registration of patents issued by this Government for lands within the 20-mile belt. Hon. gentlemen will remember that at about the time of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway several patents had been issued by the British Columbia Government to certain persons for land along the line of the railway, and they registered those patents in the provincial office. Hon. members will remember the suit of the Queen vs. Farwell. This action was brought to set aside patents for certain lands at or near Revelstoke. The decision of the Exchequer Court, which was affirmed by the Supreme Court, was that the patents were improperly issued by the British Columbia Government as regards conveying land from the Crown to Farwell.

Mr. LAURIER. What was the reason of the decision ?

Mr. DALY. It was that the Canadian Pacific Railway had been located before the patent had been issued, and in view of that fact the British Columbia Government had no right to issue the patent. The court having so decided, an arrangement has been come to between British Columbia and the Dominion Government that Mr. Farwell shall convey to this Government the interest in lands given to him by the local government and that in turn we will convey such interests back to Mr. Farwell for the same consideration, $1 per acre, which the local government charged him. By the Act passed last session, which came into force by proclamation, the provincial government undertook to provide for all patents we issued for lands within the railway belt.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. In the case of Mr. Farwell, which has been cited by the Minister, may I ask who claimed possession against Mr. Farwell ?

Mr. DALY. The Dominion Government.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there not a possibility that this Act will interfere with vested rights ? At the present time the land twenty miles on each side of the railway belongs to Canada.

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Then patents have been issued under that law. Now you make an agreement between the Government of British Columbia and the Government of Canada to change the conditions.

Mr. DALY. They have to be settled by law.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago they did not know how to proceed. He said there are two ways in which it could be done. He could start a line from the centre of the railway and extend it on each side. Suppose there were twenty miles of fencing, he could follow that, but the hon. gentleman does not propose to do so, although that is the law, as I understand it.

Mr. DALY. That is not the law. That is a suggestion. There is no law at the present time.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes. The law is that you have twenty miles on each side of the railway.

Mr. DALY. We want to delimitate that.

Mr. LAURIER. You are changing the law. I do not say it is wrong, but what I am afraid of is that a man who has got his patent from the Dominion Government may find himself denied of his property as a result of this agreement, and he may find that the patent from the Government of Canada conveyed lands which, by this agreement belongs to British Columbia.

Mr. MARA. There have been no disputes as to the boundary. The only disputes that have arisen are in cases where the provincial government issued patents that the Dominion Government would not recognize, and the provincial government, on the other hand, issued Crown grants that were not recognized by the Dominion Government. There have been no disputes as to the boundaries of the delimitations.

Mr. DALY. Where there has been any controversy at all, it is in connection with the lands that immediately adjoin the railway, and the question of boundary cannot affect them in the slightest. There was a desire on the part of some enterprising people to get hold of town sites. Our action to-day is to permit of an agreement being arrived at between the British Columbia Government and this Government to delimitate the boundaries of the twenty miles. Ac-

cording to the original agreement between British Columbia and Canada they simply gave twenty miles on each side of the railway. I think we have arrived at a basis of agreement.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman referred a moment ago to the case of a Mr. Farwell who had obtained a concession of land at Revelstoke from the British Columbia Government. Revelstoke is certainly within the twenty miles, and does the Government claim that land from him?

Mr. DALY. Yes. The contention was that the line of railway had not been located at the time, and that, consequently, the twenty miles on each side had not been vested in Canada, and the contention of Canada was that when the line was located ipso facto, Canada was entitled to twenty miles on each side.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that, but this Bill does not affect that at all.

Mr. DALY. It does. In the Farwell case they refused to register our patents, and that is the reason we are asking for this legislation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The claim of the British Columbia Government to the minerals has been decided in their favour. Is there any modus vivendi agreed upon between the Dominion Government and the provincial government as to that?

Mr. DALY. We have a tentative arrangement by which if they grant licenses to prospect on the lands, we give a license to go on the land.

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

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

After Recess.

THE COPYRIGHT ACT.

Bill (No. 103) to amend the Copyright Act (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The amendment in the Bill is simply to provide for a copy being deposited in the British Museum, in compliance with the desire of the Imperial authorities.

On section 2,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have had submitted to me two or three formal amendments to the Act, chap. 29 of the statutes of 1889. They are mere matters of form, but they supply what apparently has been an obvious omission in the drafting of the Act; they involve no substantial change. The law provides for the case where no copyright is taken out, and also for the case of importation from foreign countries; but certain contingencies have been overlooked, and the officers of my department have pointed out that this is an opportune time to correct these omissions. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), who has taken considerable interest in this subject, has been good enough to look over these amendments, and has intimated to me that he thinks they should be made. Therefore, I beg to move that the following clauses be added to the Bill:—

3. Subsection 1 of section 3 of the said Act is hereby amended by substituting therefor the following:—"If any person, entitled to copyright under the said Act, as hereby amended, neglects or fails to take advantage of its provisions, or, if having obtained copyright thereunder, at any time, after the first publication in Canada of the work for which copyright has been so obtained, fails to publish in Canada the work for which copyright might have been, or has been, so obtained as aforesaid, in sufficient numbers, printed in Canada and in such manner as to meet the demand in Canada for such work, any person or persons domiciled in Canada may obtain from the Minister of Agriculture a license or licenses to print and publish or to reproduce such work in Canada, but no license shall convey exclusive right to print and publish or produce any work.

Section 5 of the said Act is hereby amended by adding after the word "force," in the ninth line thereof, the words: "or would have been in force had copyright for the work been obtained in Canada under the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of the Act as hereby amended."

And by adding the following proviso to the said section 5:—"Provided, however, that as to any work for which copyright shall have been obtained in Canada, the Governor in Council may, upon its being established to his satisfaction that the holder of such copyright is prepared and bona fide intends during the remaining period of his term of copyright to publish such work in Canada in sufficient numbers printed in Canada in such manner as to supply the demand for such work in Canada, revoke all licenses for the printing and publication of such work then in force, but such revocation shall not render unlawful the subsequent sale and disposal in Canada of all or any of the copies of such work then printed under the authority of the license so revoked."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The amendments are the principal parts of the Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, they simply carry out the objects of these clauses, which are insufficient without them.

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

CRIMINAL CODE, 1892.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 51) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 133,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before you put that, I would ask the permission of the committee to let that section stand. That, I may say, is a section from a Bill introduced by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Edgar) with regard to contributions to elections by subsidized contractors, and it involves an important question. The hon. gentleman has taken considerable interest in it. I do not see him in his seat at present. There is considerable difference of opinion upon the question, and I do not propose to ask the House to deal with it now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In what respect is there difference of opinion ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In various respects—whether the principle of the clause should be adopted at all, and if so, whether we have gone too far or not far enough.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that is part of the law now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Part of it is ; the hon. gentleman is quite right. I ventured to say, when the Bill was under consideration in the committee, that we had gone to a great length in the direction of the hon. gentleman's Bill. The question then which suggested itself was whether we had gone far enough or should carry this to the conclusion the hon. gentleman desired. No doubt there will be considerable discussion and I prefer to take what I really believe to be the non-contentious portions and get through with them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman does not intend to repeal the law ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, Sir ; this is an additional section. I move that the clause be allowed to stand.

Motion agreed to.

Section 173A.—By adding the following section at the end of Part XII., respecting offences against religion :—

"173A. Every one is guilty of an offence and liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars and costs for the first offence, and not exceeding one hundred dollars and costs for each subsequent offence and in default of payment to one month's imprisonment, who—

"(a.) Being the proprietor, publisher or manager of any newspaper, publishes or issues, or prepares for publication or issue, any copy or number of such newspaper for sale on Sunday, or with the intent that such copy or number shall be sold on Sunday ; or

"(b.) Sells or employs or procures any person to sell any newspaper on Sunday :

"Provided, that the publishing or issuing, or preparing for publication or issue of any copy or number of a religious newspaper, for distribution on Sunday, or with the intent that it shall be distributed on Sunday, shall not be an offence under this section.

"2. The word 'newspaper' in this section has the same meaning as it has, under paragraph (p-1) of section 3, in the sections relating to defamatory libel."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is the much talked of Sunday legislation. I have already explained my own position with regard to that. Perhaps, as Minister of Justice, it would be well to state under what circumstances I ventured to attach this clause to the Criminal Code Bill. The hon. gentleman who is in charge of a similar measure on the Order paper, will recollect that when the House had reached committee stage on the principle of Sunday legislation, it was agreed that I should take that Bill as adopted in committee, put it in such shape as I thought proper, as an amendment to the Criminal Code, and not as a separate and substantive law, that then that should be considered again by the special committee afterwards appointed by the House to look into all these amendments carefully, and that, when that clause came up, the House would understand it was not exactly in the same position as it was in when the section left the House. I stated then frankly, as I do now, that whilst strongly sympathetic with the motives which actuate those who favour that legislation, I infinitely prefer that the local legislature should deal with that subject, and that we should not attempt to incorporate this into the criminal laws of this country. I am one of those who believe that we should hesitate and carefully consider before we drag subjects which are properly within the scope of the local legislation, into this Parliament simply by making them crimes. For instance, this House is well aware that in that procedure there is involved this difficulty, that a question which was properly within our jurisdiction and which would be dealt with by us, not as a crime, but on a different principle altogether, becomes a crime here simply because we cannot deal with it on any other ground. I think that is a very dangerous system of legislation, and my views have been strengthened by the opinions of many hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, particularly those hon. gentlemen who are acquainted with the importance of criminal legislation and also with the administration of the criminal laws. Holding those views, I was careful, when I said that the Government to that extent would take the clause under its consideration, to say that no one was to be bound to that action, and I reserved my own freedom of action. And I propose in the committee to-night, to give my vote against this clause which stands here as section 173. I recognize that the House last year adopted the principle of that section. This House may be said to have adopted it, though only by carrying a second reading, and so on. But we know the Bill disappeared from the Order paper and was restored. However, I need

not take up time by calling attention—as that is all I wish to do—to the fact that practically when we considered this last we agreed that when the clause reappeared, it would reappear for full and fair consideration by the House. The hon. gentleman who promotes the Bill may think that in this form his measure in some respects, has been mutilated. The principle, however, is there. It is only fair for me to say—and I think I can say this with the authority of the Government—that according to that understanding, should this House and should Parliament adopt that legislation, should it be passed into law without any reference of the clause of the hon. gentleman's Bill, the Government would undertake, under the Revised Statutes where they have ample power, to make a regulation concerning the closing of the canals on Sunday. But that depends upon the action that Parliament takes. I have had a friendly understanding, I think, with the hon. gentleman that, so far as the question of canals is concerned, we could not incorporate that in the Criminal Code. But if this Parliament sees fit to adopt legislation contrary to the views I have expressed, the Government would feel bound to follow the legislation in that line, and, by regulations under Order in Council, provide what the hon. gentleman desires to provide, that is the closing of the traffic on the canals.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Have you defined "newspaper"?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have defined "newspaper." We have left the definition the same as that in the general definition clauses of the Act. The word "newspaper" has the same meaning as under paragraph P-1 of section 3, under the sections relating to defamatory libel.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That only covers the terms "newspaper."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes; we have not grappled with the word "religious."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems to me that the proviso is calculated to defeat the section. It is provided here that it shall be a penal offence to issue or prepare for issue any newspaper for sale, and a substantive offence to sell. Then you go on with the proviso that it shall be lawful, notwithstanding your prohibition, to publish, issue and distribute a religious newspaper. Well, everybody knows that if this passes in the present form, any person who wishes to distribute a newspaper will put religious matter on one page and call it a religious newspaper. Besides, what does "distribution" mean? Does it mean sale or gratuitous distribution? If you mean gratuitous distribution you should say so. The Bill of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) contained a proviso that the gratuitous distribution of newspapers under certain circumstances is not a violation of the Act. But you leave that out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Perhaps I may be pardoned if I refer to what took place in the special committee. I am satisfied that this clause would not have appeared if the committee had not felt that the House desired that it should be brought back for its consideration. There were amendments made there, and perhaps, not altogether for the best purpose. Nevertheless, the clause as it stands is sent back with that feeling on the committee's part—that the House expected to have this clause back, even it were to be killed in the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. The statement made by the hon. Minister of Justice with regard to the understanding between himself and the promoter of the Bill, pursuant to which understanding this first section of the Bill has been incorporated in the Criminal Code, is correct. The understanding was that the first section should be incorporated in this Bill and should be submitted to the House. But the Minister of Justice refrains from giving any promise that he would support it and says in fact that he merely granted its being inserted in the Criminal Code as a courtesy and for the purpose of securing its consideration in connection with the amendments of the Criminal Code. I am unable to refrain from expressing regret that the Minister of Justice has seen fit to inform the House that he is opposed to the principle of this provision, and while permitting it to appear with the Criminal Code, will throw his influence, as Minister of Justice, against it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Individually only—I speak for myself, and not for the Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sorry to contrast the position taken by my hon. friend in this matter with the position taken by his predecessor, the late Sir John Thompson, who gave this provision his hearty assent and support. The criticism made by the Minister of Justice, with regard to the propriety of leaving this matter to be dealt with by the local government, is one that was fully considered by the special committee to which this Bill was originally referred. The Bill was introduced in this House with provisions covering nearly all the grounds of infraction of the Sabbath. That Bill contained some thirteen or fourteen sections dealing with infractions of Sunday rest. The ground taken by that committee was that everything contained in the Bill coming under provincial jurisdiction should be eliminated; and some ten of the fourteen sections contained in the Bill were dropped in pursuance of the determination arrived at by this

special committee. The committee dealing with the question of Sunday newspapers, spent a good deal of time upon it; the matter was fully discussed. The ground was taken in that committee that has been taken by the Minister of Justice to-night, that this was a matter that pertained properly to provincial legislation. Those opposed to this view of the case held that the regulation of the issuing of newspapers was actually a matter of Dominion concern, and properly a matter coming within Dominion control. It was pointed out that the Dominion Government had jurisdiction in the matter of copyright, that it had jurisdiction in the matter of prohibiting the importation of certain classes of literature, that it had power to define what classes of literature should be prohibited, that it had power to regulate the transmission of literature within the country, that it controlled the mails of the country, that, in fact, it exercised general supervision in all matters relating to the distribution of literature; and it was held that this clause would come more properly within the province of the Dominion Government than within the jurisdiction of the provinces. I hold that position was a correct one, and the House has, upon several occasions, held that that position was a correct one. My hon. friend's predecessor in office held that that position was a correct one, and the public sentiment of the country unmistakably asks from this House that this provision shall be made the law of Canada. The Bill, as my hon. friend says, has received the assent of this House. This feature of the Bill received the assent of the House last session, and it received the support of the Minister of Justice. It has received the assent of the House this session, and, having received the assent of the House, it was then taken from the Committee of the Whole, where it has received the sanction of that committee, and was placed in my hon. friend's Bill. Now, my hon. friend presents the Bill to the House, and although this section has received the sanction of the House on more than one occasion, although the committee has placed it in this Bill that it might be made a part of the Criminal Code, where it properly belongs, yet the hon. gentleman now informs us that he will throw his influence against the measure. I am sorry to hear it. However, that was a privilege that he expressly reserved to himself when the section was placed in this Bill, where we find it to-night. I am sorry, moreover, to find that this section does not appear here in the form that it passed this House. This special committee have taken liberties with the Bill. I do not know whether the provision made with regard to the distribution of religious newspapers, will vitiate, and render nugatory and worthless, the provision of the Bill; I am afraid it will have a tendency to do that. I see that it meets with the approval of a gentleman who is a publisher of a Sunday newspaper, as well as of other members of this House, and that approval leads me to suspect that the character of the provision is one not favourable to the actual carrying out of the intention of this Bill. However, we will consider that when we come to the consideration of the details of the measure.

Mr. TISDALE. I see that the clause I object to principally is still there, that rendering newsboys liable to punishment for selling newspapers on Sunday. I protested against it before, and I protest against it again: because I think it is not consistent with the feeling of the majority of this House that we should render a newsboy liable to a month's imprisonment if he sells a paper on Sunday, when there is no provincial law against it. I think this legislation should all be relegated to the provinces. I do not propose to enter into any argument about it, because I think the House is seized with the nature and extent of that objection. In the first place, I object entirely to the principle of our taking from the provinces matters of this sort, and forcing this legislation upon them if they have a different view. I know they have jurisdiction in my own province, and there is a very full and extensive measure in regard to Sabbath observance upon the provincial statute-book. I think it is quite as strong as the majority of the people of Ontario believe in, otherwise the provincial legislature would have taken cognizance of it. I think a good deal of the agitation that my hon. friend has stirred up in Ontario has been based upon a misunderstanding of this fact. They think that this is legislation over which the province has not control, and I think that the petitions that have been sent here in favour of this legislation, have been procured under that mistaken view.

Mr. MASSON. I do not think it is at all necessary to discuss the principle of this clause. We have already spent a good deal of time discussing it in the House and in committee, when the original Bill was before us. I will only say a few words upon the measure in its present form. Objection has been taken that the proviso will interfere with the working of the Bill. That I admit, and I have no doubt that it was the intention of those who pared the proviso down to its present shape, that it should have that effect. However, I would be disposed to accept it in its present form, proviso and all; and if, in the operation of the Act, it is found that the proviso interferes with the practical working out of the clause, then at some future time an amendment will perhaps be better received by the House than it would be now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I put it to the hon. gentleman as a lawyer, if he is prepared to vote for the clause as it is now, without

a definition of what a religious newspaper is.

Mr. MASSON. I should prefer to have the definition that was placed in the Bill in committee, only allowing the distribution at public meetings, at religious meetings, and in churches and Sunday schools.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The gratuitous distribution, that is left out here.

Mr. MASSON. I would prefer seeing it in that way. But I do not propose asking for that amendment now. I would prefer taking it in its present form, trusting to experience in the operation of the measure to enlighten the House and the country on its effect. With respect to the punishment of newsboys, the hon. gentleman who has taken that objection must recollect that that was the only portion of the Bill that passed the House a year ago. That clause was sanctioned by this House one year ago, and it certainly is no objection to say that it provides for the punishment of newsboys who sell papers on the streets. That is one of the principal offences aimed at, the hawking and selling of these papers on the streets and other public places upon the Lord's day. That is one of the principal grievances that it is sought by this Act to put down. In doing so, we have not confined it to the newsboy, but we extend the provision to the party who employs the newsboy to sell. I trust that after the long discussion we have had upon this clause, and after it has received the repeated sanction of the House and of the committee, it will again be favourably received.

Mr. FLINT. I think the objection taken by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) is one that should be seriously considered by this committee. We have here a proviso that pro tanto knocks out that which is the strength of the offence, that is, the selling or trafficking in newspapers on the Sabbath day. I think that before we exclude from the penalty of that offence, we should make that exclusion so clear and definite that there can be no doubt as to what class of papers are excluded. Now, a religious paper here may mean anything or nothing at all. I know papers that are called religious, and which, to ninety-nine one-hundredths of the community, would be most offensive, and would even be considered as blasphemous papers, while to the few who take those papers and believe them, they are religious. But I can conceive of the selling upon the streets of the city upon the Lord's day of a paper which, by ninety-nine one-hundredths of the community, would be considered an offence against morals, and yet, under the vague term, "religious," that paper would be protected. I think that unless this committee comes to the conclusion to define the meaning of the term, "religious," and also to insist that these papers shall not be sold at all on the Sabbath day, but shall be given away, this proviso should be struck out. I therefore move that the proviso be struck out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The adoption of the whole clause has been moved, and that carries the proviso with it.

Mr. LANGELIER. I agree with the Minister of Justice that this subject should be left entirely to the local legislatures. I will not go at length into the question, but I will simply mention one fact to show the impropriety of this House taking up this subject at all. In the province of Quebec we have a law on Sunday observance, which has been in existence for over sixty years, and there has never been any complaint against it. Now, if this Bill is passed in its present shape, it would punish a newsboy for selling a paper on Sunday in the province of Quebec, but it will not punish a man for selling a horse or an ox in that province. Our law on Sunday observance, I think, is much more sensible than this Bill; it forbids the selling goods, or merchandise, or cattle, on Sunday, while this Bill punishes a poor fellow who sells a newspaper for a cent, and sends him to jail for a month. Under this Bill, he may sell a horse, or he may sell $1,000 worth of goods without being punished, but he cannot sell a newspaper. He may even sell whisky on Sunday, as my hon. friend says, under this Bill. We have always in the province of Quebec strictly prohibited the sale of liquor on Sunday. Moreover, the sale of goods and merchandise is strictly forbidden. In this Bill we are going to punish as a crime the selling of a newspaper for one or two cents, and we are not going to treat as crime the sale of a horse or cattle or a parcel of goods for any amount. This shows the absurdity of the Bill. I shall vote for the amendment to strike out this clause.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee at any length, but I rise for the purpose of saying that I entirely fail to see what good purpose will be accomplished by passing this provision of the Bill. I entirely agree with the position taken by the hon. member for South Norfolk, who has pointed out on several occasions when this subject has been up for consideration, that this is a matter which should be fairly met by the legislatures of the different provinces of the Dominion, and that it is not wise legislation for this Federal Parliament to pass an Act regarding Sunday observance over the country at large, for the reason that the different provinces which form the confederacy are made up of different elements. In different provinces one religion largely predominates and in another another religion; the people of one province look at the observance of the Sabbath from a different standpoint entirely

from the people of another province, and it is not wise legislation for this Parliament to attempt to pass a law regarding these matters which shall apply to all the provinces of the Dominion alike. I do not think it is necessary for another reason, and that is that the different provinces of Canada have jurisdiction in matters pertaining to the Sabbath day and the observance of the Sabbath day. They have on the statute-book laws regarding Sabbath observance, and if in any one province there is a feeling generally prevailing among the people that the Sabbath day is not properly observed and that a class of work is being done on that day which should not be performed, then in that province itself the legislature will have such pressure brought to bear on it that laws will be passed that will, though I think those at present in existence are sufficient for the purpose, ensure in any province the proper and right observance of the Sabbath day. In making these observations I do not wish to be misunderstood. I do not think there is a single member who desires to see license, or who wishes to see anything but the proper observance of the Sabbath day, but at the same time I think it is a matter that should be left absolutely to the people of the different provinces themselves to determine. Coming to the Bill under discussion, apart altogether from the principle governing the question, I fail to see how the passing of this particular Bill can secure the object which those hon. gentlemen have in view who honestly desire to have a law unfairly enforced throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. In the first place, subsection A provides :

> Every one is guilty of an offence and liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars and costs for the first offence, and not exceeding one hundred dollars and costs for each subsequent offence, and in default of payment to one month's imprisonment, who—
>
> (a.) Being the proprietor, publisher or manager of any newspaper, publishes or issues, or prepares for publication or issue, any copy or number of such newspaper for sale on Sunday, or with the intent that such copy or number shall be sold on Sunday.

I respectfully submit for the consideration of this committee that it will be utterly impossible to convict any one under this section. How is it possible under this section to prove intent? Yet in order to convict any one, it will have to be proved that the work on that paper is done and that the paper is published with intent that a copy or a number of copies of the paper shall be sold on Sunday. The very moment any information is laid against any one under that provision and efforts are made to enforce it the prosecution will be met with the necessity of proving intention on the part of the proprietors of the newspaper to publish the paper for sale on Sunday, and it will be absolutely impossible to do so, and so it will be the easiest matter possible to evade the law under the section as drawn. In the second place, as has been pointed out, under subsection B there is no explanation as to what is a religious newspaper. It seems to me that it is a matter of the utmost difficulty to define what a religious newspaper is. Suppose a newspaper, calling itself a religious newspaper, publishes a sermon of some distinguished preacher, as very many of the newspapers do on Saturday, and the rest of the paper is made up of the ordinary news such as is found in an ordinary newspaper, is that a religious newspaper? Unless there is some clear definition as to what constitutes a religious newspaper it will be most difficult, if complaint is made against such a newspaper, to prove it is not a religious newspaper within the meaning of that paragraph, as the newspaper contains a certain amount of matter which might be fairly called religious matter. These considerations are worthy of the careful attention of this committee, because there is no object to be served, there is no good purpose to be gained by this committee considering and Parliament passing a law that will be ineffective, for the effect of such a course is rather to bring into contempt the legislation of this Parliament, and that result is one which every hon. member in this House wishes to avoid.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should like to ask the Minister of Justice as to the precise meaning of this proviso. It says :

> Provided that the publishing or issuing, or preparing for publication or issue of any copy or number of a religious newspaper, for distribution on Sunday, or with the intent that it shall be distributed on Sunday, shall not be an offence under this section.

It is not the distribution or the delivery of the paper as a Sunday paper that is exempted ; it is the publishing, issuing or preparing for publication or issue. The type-setting for a religious newspaper on Sunday is exempted, but there is no exemption as regards the publication or issuing of a newspaper.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is bringing out clearly the answer to the hon. member who pointed out that we had dropped the word "gratuitous." From the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell the hon. gentleman will see that this proviso only applies to the case of religious papers gratuitously distributed. There is no sale of religious newspapers allowed on Sunday.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The printing and publishing will be allowed on Sunday.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, of Sunday religious papers ; but not for sale.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a very extraordinary proposition.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not going to defend that clause; I am not responsible for it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So a man may go on and set up type and print the newspaper without creating an offence.

Mr. HAZEN. If the printing and publishing of a religious newspaper is allowed on the Sabbath, then, so far as my province is concerned, this House in adopting this provision will be taking a step which those in favour of Sabbath observance will not thank Parliament for adopting, because under our local laws in force every sort of servile labour is prohibited on the Sabbath day. Under that statute there is every now and then some prosecution against servile labour on Sunday being carried on. So if this proposition were passed, and it was construed according to the construction placed upon it by the hon. member for Bothwell, and the Minister of Justice did not differ from him entirely, then printing and publishing would be allowed on the Sabbath day. If that is done it is a blow aimed at one of the principles of this Bill, because I understood the hon. mover who has taken so much interest from session to session in pressing action in the direction of the Bill, to say that one of the great objects to be gained by a Sabbath observance Bill was that every labouring man and mechanic would have secured to him by law the right to enjoy repose and quiet on the Sabbath day. What is the sense in this committee passing a clause setting forth that a newspaper can be printed and published on the Sabbath day when the securing of a quiet Sabbath to the working people was one of the reasons given by the hon. member for North Norfolk for bringing this subject before Parliament.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to correct the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hazen) in ascribing to me certain views. I do not admit that this Bill interferes in the slightest respect with what is prohibited in New Brunswick or elsewhere, nor do I think it can fairly be read in that direction. The promoter (Mr. Charlton) of the Bill, himself understood that. Neither his Bill as introduced nor any argument of his attacks the printing on Sunday. That always struck me as part of the weakness of his case. If I understood him aright he does not object to the printing on Sunday for the Monday distribution. The evil that he wishes to get at and make a crime, is the printing, the publication and the selling of papers on Sunday or for Sunday. So far as that is concerned, and notwithstanding the criticisms that have been made, I think this clause fairly meets the case. It does not legalize anything.

Mr. SCRIVER. I would remind the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen), that if a so-called religious paper were printed and published on Sunday it would hardly be a religious newspaper, and as a matter of fact no religious newspaper in the country is published or printed on Sunday, or is likely to be published or printed on that day. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) said that if a secular newspaper contained a paragraph or two of religious matter it would be a religious paper. That is not the case. I think the definition of a religious paper is well understood in the country, and it would not be the fact that if a paragraph or two of religious matter were in a newspaper it could be called or would be called a religious newspaper, or would be considered as such in the eye of the law. I desire to say a word or two in reply to what the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) said, as to the absurdity, as he called it, of constituting it a crime for a boy to sell a newspaper for a cent; while a man might sell a cow, or an ox, or a horse for a large sum of money and it would not be a crime. I would remind the hon. gentleman that there is this distinction: that in the one case the boy is selling an article which is supposed to do great injury to the community, whereas in the other case it is not so.

Mr. LANGELIER. There is no distinction made between a bad newspaper and a good newspaper. If it is a bad newspaper I contend that it is just as wrong to sell it on week days as on Sundays, and that the sale of a bad newspaper should be prohibited every day in the year. I say any one can see the absurdity of this Bill prosecuting a little boy who sells a good paper for a cent, while a man can sell other articles for large sums of money without committing an offence.

Mr. CASEY. I have not taken up much of the time of the House in discussing this measure, from the time of its initial stage in the hands of the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), to its higher development now as a Government measure.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not a Government measure.

Mr. CASEY. Well, a quasi Government measure. I have waited to see what form it would take and it seems to me to be rather amorphous, and instead of developing from the pollywog stage I find it is a very amorphous production still.

I quite agree with my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale)—who I am happy to see is a convert to the doctrine of provincial rights—that this is a matter of civil rights which should be within the control of the different provinces. It is a matter also which in the province of Ontario has already been fully and efficiently dealt with, by quite as good constitutional authorities as anybody in this House, and by persons quite as anxious to see the Sab-

bath duty observed as any member of this House could be. It has been dealt with in Ontario in sympathy with the feelings of that province. I am not familiar with the law in the province of Quebec, but from what my hon. friend (Mr. Langelier) has stated, the question appears to have been dealt with in harmony with the feelings of that province.

My first objection to this measure is, that this Parliament should not attempt to deal with the question of Sunday observance at all. But it seems that the member for North Norfolk while admitting that we should not go into the whole question of Sunday observance, thinks we have a special reason for meddling with the sale of newspapers on Sunday. I cannot see that he has shown any reason for that contention. He says that we have to deal with copyright, and with the distribution of literature through the mails, and for this reason he infers that we have a general supervision over the distribution of literature. I do not see the connection there. The fact that we carry the mails and regulate imports and so forth, does not give us anything like a general censorship over what kind of literature should be published in Canada.

I will lay down my opinion clearly, and it is, that we have no more right to deal with the sale of newspapers on Sunday than we have to deal with the sale of whisky on Sunday. It has been clearly held by the Privy Council, against a former decision of this House, that we have no right to deal with the sale of whisky on Sundays, and I think my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will admit that whisky is perhaps a more deleterious article to sell on Sunday than even the Sunday newspaper. My hon. friend from North Norfolk is one of those who, in the first place voted in this House, that we had no right to prohibit the selling of whisky on Sundays, and voted against the assumption of the then Government that we had the right. Notwithstanding that he now thinks that we have the right to prevent the sale of newspapers on Sunday.

But apart from the question as to whether newspapers should be sold on Sunday or not —which I am not discussing at the present time—it is quite clear now that the jurisdiction in regard to the sale does not rest with this House. I think also it is proper that it should not rest with this House. This is a matter that should be settled according to the conscience of each community, and what will suit the conscience of Quebec may not suit the conscience of Ontario, and vice versa.

Then, if the interpretation put upon the present measure by the hon. Minister of Justice, and which was not disowned by the hon. member for North Norfolk, is correct, namely, that it is to prohibit, not Sunday work, but merely the Sunday sale of papers or the preparation of papers for Sunday sale, this Act, looked at as an Act for the enforcement of the higher morality, is a farce. If its object is merely to prevent the sale of a special edition of a paper on Sunday, and if it does not prevent and is not meant to prevent the doing of work on Sunday for the publication of a paper on Monday, for example, there is no moral reform in it at all.

The hon. member for North Norfolk says that public opinion demands this reform. I think that if public opinion understood that the hon. gentleman was willing to let compositors and editors work all Sunday night to secure the publication of Monday's edition, but would not let them work on Saturday night in order that an edition of their paper should be distributed on Sunday, they would have a different opinion of the morality of this Act from that which the hon. gentleman appears to entertain. If we have any right to meddle with this matter at all, it should be for the purpose, and the purpose alone, of preventing people from being forced to work on Sunday against their will—to secure them their day's rest—to prevent the scandal of the public sale and hawking of papers about the streets, if that be considered a scandal. But that we should interfere simply to catch the newsboy and let off the publisher who works his men on Sunday afternoons and evenings for the purpose of getting out the Monday edition would be absurd.

Then, with regard to the question of the religious newspapers, this Act as it stands pretends to establish a censorship—to say that only newspapers which are religious can be distributed on Sunday, even gratuitously. I do not think there are many papers of any kind distributed gratuitously. What I suppose is meant by this is that regular subscribers of these papers, who have subscribed for them by the year, may receive them on Sunday. If papers are distributed on Sunday, whether gratuitously or otherwise, the distribution involves work for somebody. It is as much Sunday work to distribute one paper as another.

Some of my hon. friends wish to have the word "religious" defined in this case. I do not wish to have it defined; I do not think the word religious should be here at all. We should not presume to discriminate between different classes of papers. What has my opinion or your opinion as to what constitutes a religious paper to do with the making of a newsboy punishable for distributing a paper on Sunday? The character of the paper has nothing whatever to do with the sin of compelling somebody to work on Sunday to distribute that paper to the subscribers. It is as much a sin to send a newsboy out with a so-called religious paper as with any other.

I do not see what definition of a religious paper we could make which

could not be evaded. If you make it a church paper, I would like to tell the hon. member for North Norfolk that there is in Ontario a sect of considerable size already, and constantly increasing, called the Seventh Day Adventists, who do not believe that the day we celebrate as the Sabbath should be observed as such at all; who believe that it is a sin to work on Saturday, and a rather creditable thing than otherwise to work on the day we call Sunday. This sect in Ontario has churches, preachers and an organization. It has also an official organ. I do not know whether printed in Canada or not; and the object of that paper is to prove that we should not observe Sunday at all. Under my hon. friend's Bill it would be perfectly legal to distribute that paper on Sunday throughout the length and breadth of Canada—a paper intended to prove that Sunday, as a holy day, is a human invention, a humbug and a farce, and that we should not keep that day at all. I do not know any definition of a religious newspaper we could invent which would not allow that church organ to be distributed on Sunday.

My position, therefore, is that this is a subject which we cannot constitutionally deal with, and that if we could constitutionally deal with it, the provisions in this proposed law were not in the interest of morality nor in the interest of the good keeping of the Sabbath or Sunday in the sense in which I, as well as most of the hon. gentlemen around me, understand it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I do not know whether to sympathize with the hon. Minister of Justice in having failed to earn, as he has by his declaration to-night, those various resolutions of thanks which were passed to him and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) for the stand they have taken on this question, or to congratulate him on having escaped so questionable an alliance; but if the hon. member for North Norfolk is anxious to undertake the moral supervision of the people of this country, I think he might begin with his own province, and if he finds the Sunday law in Ontario not equal to what is required of it, then I think he is bound to go to his great friend, Sir Oliver Mowat, and have that law improved. But, as a matter of fact, we have a substantial Sunday law in Ontario, and it meets the case. They have a substantial Sunday law in the maritime provinces, we have been told to-night, and it meets the case. In the province of British Columbia they are somewhat differently situated; they do publish newspapers there on Sunday and avoid publishing them on Monday; and surely there are sufficient judges whether they wish them or not, and the matter ought to be left to them. The people of the province of Quebec take a different view of many religious questions from what we do in the province of Ontario. Surely a man who has taken the stand the hon. member for North Norfolk has taken on behalf of provincial rights, and who is allied with the party who have always upheld the doctrine of provincial rights—which doctrine I hope they will uphold at the present time—ought to content himself with trying to introduce any measure he wishes for the moral improvement of the people, in his own province. Therefore, I hope the committee will drop the whole proposal contained in this Bill with regard to Sunday observance.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very singular how anxious hon. gentlemen opposite are to make a political football of provincial rights when it suits them. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) was very loud in defending provincial rights to-night; but I notice that very often when we are dealing with charters granted by this Parliament for railways, and these railways six or seven miles long, are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, the hon. gentleman is ready to over-rule provincial rights. I confess that it is a pity that in the Confederation Act a clear and distinct line was not drawn between those measures which come properly under the jurisdiction of the provinces and those which come properly under the jurisdiction of the Dominion. However, I think my esteemed friend the hon. member for North Norfolk deserves credit for having pressed the consideration of this Bill on the House so often as he has. I believe he has a very large portion of the moral sense of this country at his back in this movement to stop the use and sale of newspapers on the Lord's day. I am quite satisfied that the majority of the provinces, the better classes of our people, are prepared to support the movement he has made in that direction. However, it appears that there are in this House, as well as in the country, a great many people who may be called cranks as regards the observance of the Lord's day. Some people think it perfectly right to buy papers and periodicals of a secular character and read them; a great, and I am glad to know, many people think it is not right. I believe, and I hope the majority of the people believe, that it is not right. I am strongly in favour of the Bill, and am prepared to support it, believing that in so doing I am backing up a movement in the right direction, and confident that it is supported by the better classes of our people who are strongly opposed to discourage the introduction of a system into this country which prevails to such an enormous extent on the American side, and which sets an example that does not tend to improve the morals of the people, and their respect for the Lord's Day.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the question is put, I presume I may be permitted to spend

a few minutes in reviewing some of the points made by hon. gentlemen upon my own side of the House and the opposite side, who are opposed to this Bill, and the principle contained in it. I was sorry to see that opposition in some quarters, and have seen it with some degree of surprise. The hon. Minister of Justice informs the committee that I have been guilty of inconsistency in advocating the passage of a Bill with regard to the publication and sale of Sunday newspapers, and have not dealt with the evil of setting type on Sunday, and preparing for the publication of a paper on Monday morning. Well, I have not attempted to deal with all branches of infractions of the fourth commandment. I was necessarily obliged to confine my attention to certain leading features of Sabbath desecration, which came properly within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and have followed the advice given by various members with regard to provincial jurisdicton, leaving matters pertaining exclusively to the jurisdiction of the provinces to be dealt with by them. The hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) says he would have no objection to the prohibition of the sale of bad papers. I would ask my hon. friend what constitutes a bad paper. Is it not the influence produced by a paper which settles the question whether it is a bad paper or not? If it can be shown that the influence of a Sunday newspaper is detrimental to the morals of the public, if it can be shown that it is a great social and public evil, that it gradually drags down society from a higher to a lower plane and imperils the continuance of good morals and high Christian sentiment, that newspaper is a bad paper. There is not a Sunday newspaper in the United States which is not a bad paper—bad in the influence it exercises upon the public; and it is because this is a great question, because this Dominion Parliament is charged with the duty of laying the foundations of a nation here and of laying down rules and regulations and laws conducive to the welfare of the people, that we are justified in taking the course I ask this House to take with regard to that great evil—the publication of the Sunday newspaper. We have seen nothing in Canada yet of the evils produced by the Sunday newspaper. That evil is here in embryo. We have but two or three paltry little Sunday newspaper sheets as yet, but they are an indication of the evil to come. If we take the United States, however, where the evil had once the same insignificant beginning, and see to what proportion that evil has grown, if we look at this question candidly and dispassionately, we must realize that the future of this country largely depends upon the course we shall take in laying down laws for the future guidance of the people with regard to this matter. It is not an infringement of provincial rights for the Dominion to lay down laws and regulations likely to be conducive to public health, and to promote public morality. This is not a light question. It is a question whether we shall strangle, in its infancy, a system which will become a menace to the public life of the country, if we allow it to obtain foothold here. When hon. gentlemen talk about provincial rights, and human liberty, and all that being interfered with by the laying down of rules and regulations, which we know, in the light of the experience of other countries, to be an essential to our future well-being, these men are losing sight of their duty to their constituents and country. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) told us that the Dominion Parliament has no more power to deal with this question than it has with the question of the sale of whisky. I would ask him if this House has no power to prohibit the sale of whisky?

Mr. CASEY. Not on Sunday.

Mr. CHARLTON. The importation of whisky on Saturday, Sunday, and all other days—we have the power to put an end to anything of that character which threatens the welfare of the people. This House has the power, under its duty to supervise public morals, and to do whatever is in the interests of the people of Canada, to deal with the liquor question, to put an end to the sale of liquor, to put an end to Sunday newspapers or any other evils which may be deemed evils that should be dealt with by the Parliament of this country. I am told in a sneering way by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) that I am assuming the moral supervision of this country. I have sat in the Opposition, and have not had much influence to promote laws that I thought would be beneficial to Canada, but I desire to see this country grow up a great nation, to see its foundations laid solidly in the principle of eternal justice, laid in such a way as to promote the social, moral and religious well-being of the people. I can appreciate, and every hon. member can, the importance of good homes, the importance of good citizens, the importance of good principles, and anything which can conduce to the securing of these things is a matter of more importance than half the question we deal with to-day. I repudiate the idea that I am a meddlesome man, or that, in the demand I have made to secure moral legislation I have done that which I had no right to do. I believe the measure is highly important. I believe that it comes within the purview of this Parliament. I believe that this Sunday newspaper prohibition law, to be efficient, must be a national law, and that we can deal with it just as thoroughly as other questions. I do not wish to detain the committee. I may say, with regard to the provisions of this Bill, that I disclaim responsibility for the exact manner in which they appear here, just as the hon. Minister of

Justice did. I will accept this cheerfully rather than take nothing. I do not know but that it will work; and, at all events, if we had it on the statute-book, we would have the light of experience before another session to show us the defects of the measure. I would prefer if the committee would permit the substitution of this proviso of the following words:—"Provided that the gratuitous distribution of religious newspapers shall not be an offence under this section."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the meaning of the section as it stands.

Mr. CHARLTON. But it is made clearer here and the words are fewer. If my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will accept this form, I would prefer it. But if not I would be glad to get the Bill as it stands.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If that is the hon. gentleman's only object, I think he would do better to leave it as it stands.

Mr. CHARLTON. I leave myself in the hands of the Minister.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that the introduction of the word "gratuitous" will prevent the distribution of a class of papers that are sought to be distributed on Sunday—papers which are not sold on Sunday but are paid for by yearly subscriptions by congregations or Sunday schools. This could not be called a gratuitous distribution; and if you prohibit the sale or distribution of these papers on Sunday, you interfere with something that this House, I believe, has no desire to interfere with. If I remember rightly that word "gratuitous" was struck out when we had this Bill before the committee on a former occasion. I think it a pity to bring it in again when it was found to be objectionable.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) appeals to me and asks if the House has not the right to prohibit the sale and importation of whisky. Of course it has. But there is no proposition here to prohibit the importation or sale of anything. But I will tell the hon. gentleman what the House has not the right to do, what the hon. member himself has voted we have not the right to do, and that is to regulate the sale of whisky or prevent its sale on Sunday. We have the highest authority in the Empire for saying that we have no right to do this, that it is a matter of police regulation and belongs to the provinces. So the Privy Council would say with this Bill if it were sent there. There is not the slightest reason to doubt that if this Bill were appealed in the same way the Privy Council would decide that the hon. member for North Norfolk has been meddling with matters that do not concern this House.

But my hon. friend thinks it quite right to make the sale of newspapers on Sunday a Dominion matter. And then he goes off into generalities about morality and protecting the people of the country from the sale of the Sunday newspaper and gives a lot of material—I was going to call it by another name—that has nothing to do with the question. The hon. gentleman completely begs the question, and in a way that shows little respect for this House if he assumes that those who are opposed to this section are opposed to the observance of the Sabbath in a Christian way. The hon. gentleman cannot be allowed to assume that he alone is the judge of what is sound Christian doctrine, as regards keeping the Sabbath.

If he did not mean that he did not mean anything, because he has attacked those who oppose this Bill as if they were unchristian in their views and unchristian in their practice. He says he is sorry to notice opposition to his Bill from friends on his own side of the House as well as from the other side, and he holds that he has the moral sentiment of the country at his back, in relation to the principle of the Bill. There is no question of morality in the Bill before us. The question is whether we have the right to deal with this question or not. My belief—and I have the opinion of the Privy Council in support of it—is that we have not that right. But even if we have, I think this Bill is a most lame and impotent attempt in the direction of the morality of the question. This Bill does not prevent Sunday work even in regard to Sunday newspapers. It appears to prevent no Sunday work at all, but only to prevent the distribution and reading of Sunday newspapers.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I heartily approve of the principle of the Bill. It is quite true it does not go so far as I could wish; but still it is a step in the right direction. If anything can be done to prevent the printing and publishing of newspapers on the Lord's day, it certainly would be a very great boon. We all know that the issue of Sunday newspapers in the United States has had a most demoralizing effect. The best men in the United States have long been struggling to get rid of that evil. But they have not yet succeeded. If anything can be done to prevent that state of things here it is certainly most desirable that it should be done.

Mr. MASSON. I do not think it necessary to attempt to change any vote on this question now. But I do wish to ask those who are about to vote to consider the Bill upon its merits and not upon what it does not contain and what it does not pretend to deal with. As to the objection that this may be covered by provincial legislation that is no objection to the Bill. That does not interfere with our jurisdiction. No person who has given the matter consideration as a legal question will for a moment dispute the juris-

diction of this House to pass the Bill. Local legislatures might deal with the subject in a partial manner ; but that is no reason why we should not deal with it in a more perfect and complete manner. Now, the scope of this section is very narrow. It purports to deal with one evil and with one evil only. It is no objection to the Bill to say that it allows certain other evils to continue. It is no objection to a Bill intended to prevent the sale of Sunday newspapers to say that bad newspapers should not be allowed to be published at all. The hon. gentleman who took that objection, knows full well that, under section 179, these bad newspapers he speaks of are prohibited not only on Sunday but on every day of the week. But even if that were not so it would be no objection to this Bill to show that it did not deal with every crime in the calender. I ask, therefore, those who believe that Sunday newspapers are an evil, who believe that it is desirable that Sunday newspapers should be put down in this country, to vote for the best measure we can get for that purpose. It is imperfect, I admit. A great many of the changes made when the Criminal Code was under consideration in committee were open to objection. But such as they were they were the best we could hope to pass in this House. The same is true of this Bill, and for that reason I ask those who believe in the object to support it. And I ask those who are favourable to the principle not to be led away by any question as to what a province has done or will have the power to do. As to the question that this Parliament has no power to deal with this subject because the Privy Council has decided that we have not the power to deal with the Sunday sale of liquor, what kind of interpretation is this to put upon the Hodge case, to which, I suppose, the hon. member refers ? No person giving this section a thought, will say but that this House certainly has power to make it a crime to see whisky or anything else, for that matter, on Sunday. I ask, therefore, that this section be considered upon its merits, as dealing with what it contains, and not with what it does not contain.

Section 173 negatived on division : yeas, 26 ; nays, 55.

On section 196,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to amend subsection B by substituting the following instead of what appears :—

" Or (d) opened, kept or used for the purpose of facilitating or encouraging or assisting in the making of bets upon any contingency or event, horse race or other race, fight, game or sport, by announcing the betting upon, or announcing or displaying the results of, horse races or other races, fights, games or sports, or in any other manner whatsoever, whether such contingency or event, horse race or other race, fight, game or sport, occurs or takes place in Canada or elsewhere.

On section 205,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This section in the printing has been changed a little from the report of the committee. At the end of paragraph " C." I want to add after the words " as aforesaid," as was added by the committee, " for determining the winner in any such lottery."

On section 362,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I propose to ask the committee to drop this section for reasons which I will state. The sub-committee reported this section with an amendment including the words street railway. Since then at the request of the Electric Railway Company of Toronto, I have received a deputation from the city council of Toronto, and to my mind they made out such a case that I think it unwise to proceed with this amendment. In the first place, it is very questionable whether the amendment has any effect whatever. It is not an amendment that the electric railway asks for, but it is the addition of the words " street railway " to the words which are in the code already, and those words include tramways. Now, the object that the Electric Railway Company had in view was in connection with the transfer of tickets. They complain that a great deal of fraud is practiced on their company, and they wished to have this section made so plain that it could be used, as undoubtedly it was the intention, as a sort of advertisement to hold over the public for the purpose of deterring from the commission of those offences. But it has been argued with considerable force by the city council that when it is considered that an enormous number of women and children and others who have transfer tickets given to them in times of confusion and in crowds, on which occasion it is almost impossible for the conductors to punch them correctly, it is wrong that innocent women and children should be punished for improperly using tickets that have been incorrectly punched. It has been argued that when electric railway companies have so much business they should appoint more officers and see that this transfer work is properly done, and not quickly resort to Parliament for special legislation. Under these circumstances, and particularly in view of the fact that the addition of the words " street railway " may have no other effect than to assist the companies in their advertising, I propose to drop this section.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The argument of the Minister of Justice goes the length of urging the repeal of section 362 of the code altogether, and with his general argument I largely agree. The only safeguard in the section is the word " fradulent." The punishment provided by this section is six months' imprisonment. The idea of sending a person to prison for six months for tra-

velling on a street railway ticket without any desire to act fradulently is dreadful.

Mr. EDGAR. If this clause of the Bill is struck out it will still leave the original clause 362 in the code, which applies to railways and steam vessels.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As there has been no injustice shown to have taken place under that section, it might be as well to leave it. It was law even before 1892.

Mr. EDGAR. If there is any force in the arguments of the Minister of Justice, and I think there is, against allowing street railway companies to have this power for the purpose of advertising or alarming the people, or perhaps prosecuting women and children, we certainly should rescind the clause under consideration, and I would be even willing to leave out the whole section.

Mr. COCKBURN. The word "railway" covers street railway. We have a street railway going from Toronto to Mimico, nearly half way to Hamilton. If we retain the word railway, as suggested, it will cover the case of street railways, and women and children may be made the victims of carelessness on the part of conductors. The only safe course to pursue is to omit the whole section.

Mr. McCARTHY. The committee should take advantage of the fact that it has now this clause before it for consideration to make the necessary amendments. I think we should change the punishment from six months to one month. It is a most preposterous penalty for travelling, say, on a street railway from Toronto to Mimico, for which the fare is 5 or 10 cents, that an offender should be sent to prison for six months. I move that the clause be amended by substituting one month for six months and by omitting the words "street railway."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I prefer to leave the law as it at present stands on the statute-book, which has been there for years and may have served a good purpose. At all events, we have not heard of any cases of injustice under it. I move to drop section 362.

Mr. EDGAR. I venture to suggest that this will be an akward way of arriving at the conclusion at which we desire. But if they amend this clause by changing "six months" into "one month" and by striking out "tramway" and "street railway," then we get at it in a shorter way than by striking out this amendment and introducing another. I think most hon. members in this House would object as much to an imprisonment of one month as six months for using a mistaken ticket on a street railway. When the very trivial offence is taken into consideration, the length of the imprisonment is not so very material.

Mr. McCARTHY. My idea is to reduce the "six months" to "one month" on any railway.

Mr. DICKEY. I think there is a good deal more to be said for the original clause than has yet been said. It comes under the section for obtaining property under false pretenses, but the stealing of a ride in a railway train is not a species of property under the common law. This section was introduced a good many years ago to prevent people from criminally stealing rides upon the railway. One branch of the offence is using a false ticket, and everyone will admit that is a very serious offence. It means, of course, fraudulently and unlawfully using a ticket to which a person is not entitled. Suppose one man steals a ticket from another, he would be punished for that, and why should he not be punished for obtaining wrongfully the value of that ticket from a railway company. It is a very difficult offence to prove that a person illegally and fraudulently intended to obtain the ride, and it does not seem to me that six months is an undue maximum.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) May it not be fraudulent without being wilful?

Mr. DICKEY. I do not think so. Extreme cases may be conceived for which six months would not be too severe a punishment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The punishment should have some relevancy to the value of the ticket taken. You would not send a man to jail for six months for stealing a ten-cent piece, nor should you send him to jail for six months for stealing a ten-cent ride.

Mr. DICKEY. Suppose he steals a ticket across the continent, worth one hundred dollars?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the punishment should be relevant to the value of the ticket.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have a very strong objection to interfering with the law on the statute-book. If we get into theories as to what is adequate punishment for these offences, we will have a very difficult, though interesting field, because one hundred offences of this character can be picked out of the statute-book in which the punishment is equally severe. The law was put there for some good purpose. It has been in force for years, and there has not been a case mentioned tonight to show that that law has not had a salutory effect. If one change is made, there would have to be several others. Under these circumstances I would ask the House to consent, for the present, to leave the law as it stands.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will you promise to consider it ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Oh, most carefully.

Mr. EDGAR. A few moments ago, the Minister of Justice told us in very touching terms, the evils which would arise from applying this clause to a street railway, and he said a deputation had come all the way from Toronto and had convinced him that it was improper to use the word "street railway" in this clause. Therefore, in agreeing with the Minister of Justice, I would move that the present clause be amended by striking out the words, "carriage, tramway, and street railways." That would prevent a law remaining upon our statute-book which would render a person who used a 4-cent ticket, wrongly punched, from being liable to six months' imprisonment. If there is anything whatever in the arguments urged by the deputation from Toronto about a street railway, I think it applies to tramways, also.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a sub-amendment to my amendment.

Sub-amendment (Mr. Edgar) negatived.

Amendment (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) agreed to.

On section 512,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The words added are suggested by the Montreal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals : "Or any wild animal or bird in captivity."

Mr. EDGAR. What does that particularly apply to ?

Mr. CURRAN. There were a couple of cases tried in Montreal in which birds or wild animals were cruelly treated, and the magistrate held that being wild animals they did not come under the law.

On section 552,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This has been carefully examined by the committee. The object of it is to supply what was obviously an omission in the passage of the Act. A number of offences of the nature of theft or resembling theft, and as to which it was deemed proper that the persons committing them should be liable to arrest without warrant were left out of the list enumerated in the original section. Subsection 2 of the section provides for arrest by peace officers without warrant of persons found committing certain offences. Under subsection 1 it is only persons found committing the offences mentioned who could be arrested without a warrant by a peace officer or any one else. A doubt was expressed whether subsection 2 would apply so as to justify a constable in arresting a person whom, on reasonable and probable grounds, he believed to be guilty of any of those offences ; and this change is to remove this doubt. Subsection 3 at present is confined to offences against the code. There are offences against the common law not covered by the code, and the provisions of this subsection it was deemed necessary to apply to these as well as to the others. The amendment of subsection 5 is for a similar purpose. It is at present confined to offences against the code. These are purely technical, and have been carefully examined.

On section 557a,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is an amendment suggested by the Attorney General of Quebec. It is a local matter ; it is proposed on account of the large amount of criminal business arising in the city of Montreal, and is for the purpose of preventing the congestion of business there. It follows other sections dealing with the same subject.

On section 575,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is in connection with prosecutions that have arisen under the gambling sections of the code, for which the Bill was primarily and mainly introduced. This provides for more effective search than could be carried on before. Under the Act as it stood, in the case of gaming and betting houses and lotteries, the only authority for searching was in cities and towns. Consequently, in the case I have referred to, at Fort Erie, the officers of the law were greatly handicapped, and were unable effectively to put the law in force. This extends these powers of search, and with cities and towns includes incorporated villages or other municipalities or districts organized or unorganized—practically everywhere in the country.

On section 673,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The object of this amendment is to remove a doubt in connection with the power of a court to adjourn a criminal trial. It was shown to the committee that a similar question had arisen in England, and a Bill had been introduced there to make this power clear. So in this case the section in regard to the adjournment of trials is made more definite, and it is now put beyond a doubt that the court may adjourn a criminal trial after it has been once given to the jury otherwise than from day to day or over Sunday. This section gives power of adjournment to any other day in the same sitting, if the court is of the opinion that the ends of justice require it.

On section 683,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A question whether evidence taken in pre-

liminary investigations or before the grand jury could be used on the trial came up in one case in Nova Scotia and in another case in Ontario. In Ontario the court was divided upon the question. It is assumed that the intention was that these questions could be used as evidence, and the amendment here is to make that clear.

Section 763.—By repealing sub-paragraph (i) of paragraph (a) thereof, and substituting the following therefor :—

"(i.) In the province of Ontario any judge of a county or district court, junior judge or deputy judge authorized to act as chairman of the general sessions of the place."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is necessary to provide for the case of the divisional district of Nipissing, which was created by the legislature of Ontario last year, and as there may be new districts created from time to time, the provision is made general :

Section 782.—By adding the following sub-paragraph after sub-paragraph (iv.) of paragraph (a) :

"(v.) In all the provinces, where the defendant is charged with any of the offences mentioned in paragraphs (a) and (f) of section 783, any two justices of the peace sitting together ; provided, that when any offence is tried by virtue of this sub-paragraph, an appeal shall lie from a conviction in the same manner as from summary convictions under Part LVIII., and that sections 879 and the following sections relating to appeals from such summary convictions shall apply to such appeal."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is a suggestion from the judge of the county court of York, in Ontario. It gives jurisdiction, under the Summary Trials Act, subject to the consent of the accused, and an appeal as well as in summary conviction cases, in certain petty cases. It is to relieve the court there, and in case of consent to enable certain petty cases to be disposed of by two justices of the peace. For instance, that obtaining money or property by false pretenses or receiving stolen goods, to an extent not exceeding $10 ; being the inmate or habitual frequenter of disorderly houses ; also attempting to commit theft—the last case the special committee did not include, but the other cases they have included in the section, and this will enable, if the accused consents, these matters to be disposed of without waiting for the next term of the court :

Section 784.—By repealing subsection three thereof, and substituting the following therefor:—

"3. The jurisdiction of the magistrate in the provinces of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, and in the district of Keewatin, under this part, is absolute, without the consent of the person charged."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This subject was brought up by the Government of British Columbia in connection with the code as it stood. Before the enactment of this code, the jurisdiction of the magistrate, under the Summary Trials Act in British Columbia, was absolute, without the consent of the person charged, and in the original Bill, as introduced in 1891, it was not proposed to make any change in this respect. During the recess, however, between the sessions of 1891 and 1892, the late chief justice of the province objected that the ordinary justices of the peace of British Columbia were not fit, in some cases, to exercise this jurisdiction. Consequently in the Bill of 1882 the section was amended so as to make the consent of the accused necessary to a trial. The provincial government subsequently called attention to the matter, and suggested the restoring of the law to what it was before the enactment of the code. I have the minute of council passed by the government of British Columbia, and the consideration in it I can give the committee, if it think necessary, but the special committee examined the report and made this change.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not see any change.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It restores British Columbia as it was before the code.

Mr. CASEY. Before this Bill is reported, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to what I consider a very important matter, with regard to the procedure before coroners in criminal cases. Section 642 of the Criminal Code provides that no one shall be tried on any coroners' inquisition. In consequence of that provision, it has, since the enactment of the Code, been necessary to hold a double preliminary inquiry in every case of alleged murder or manslaughter. My attention has been specially called to this by events occurring in my own neighbourhood with which the hon. Minister is familiar, and I have since noticed it in the case of several trials and investigations in connecton with alleged murders which have taken place elsewhere in Ontario. The result of this provision is that whenever a suspicious death occurs and an inquest is held, everybody who is supposed to know anything about the case is called in and a general inquiry instituted. If the coroner's jury bring a verdict against some person or persons, this whole business has to be gone over again before two justices of the peace, and the witnesses are bound over, in case of commitment, to appear again at the trial, so that all possible witnesses—and a great many are included in the list who are never examined—are put to the trouble and expense of appearing three times before the case is concluded.

I am not aware why that proviso was put in the Criminal Code and why the old practice of indicting on the verdict of the coroner's jury was done away with, but I want to call the attention of the Minister to the extreme inconvenience to every one concerned of this double investigation. In the case

to which I refer, the result of it was to keep a whole neighbourhood, consisting of several townships and a considerable city, in a perfect ferment of excitement for several weeks, and to keep people's thoughts dwelling on nothing but possibilities of crime during that period. I am not going to make a motion in committee with regard to this matter; but I wish to ask the Minister just to take it into his very serious consideration, before this Bill comes up for third reading, whether he should not introduce something corresponding to the English practice. As the House may not know what this is, I will read the clause of the British Coroner's Act of 1887 bearing upon this point. Section 5, subsection 1. reads as follows :—

> Where a corner's inquisition charges a person with the offence of murder or of manslaughter, or of being accessory before the fact to a murder (which latter offence is in this Act included in the expression "murder"), the coroner shall issue his warrant for arresting or detaining such person (if such warrant has not previously been issued), and shall bind by recognizance all such persons examined before him as know or declare anything material touching the said offence, to appear at the next court of oyer and terminer or jail delivery at which the trial is to be, then and there to prosecute or give evidence against the person so charged.

It goes on to provide that if the offence is manslaughter, the person may be bailed by recognizances with sufficient securities and so on. Now, Sir, I do not think the ends of justice would be frustrated or the protection of the accused lessened in any degree by the adoption of this practice here. I believe that the protection given by the coroner's jury would be sufficient on the case of a man who was so innocent that a prima facie case could not be made out before a magistrate. I hardly know how to express this in legal language, but what I mean is that if the coroner's jury finds a man guilty, he will be almost surely committed by the magistrate on the hearing of the case. The British practice is such as I have stated, and we all know that the British law and practice is sufficiently favourable to the accused.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Three clauses remain, so I will now move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I would ask the Minister just to consider section 785, which gives to certain magistrates in the province of Ontario the same jurisdiction as is given to a judge of a court of general sessions of the peace. I have been asked by several magistrates and judges that this should be extended to the province of Quebec. It would be a great advantage and would in several instances avoid jury trials, and consequently greatly reduce the expense in many cases. It is true we have in the province of Quebec a court of general sessions of the peace, which is to be presided over by a judge of the superior court or two justices of the peace; but, as a matter of fact, we never have sittings of that court in our rural districts. If our district magistrates and our police magistrates had the same power to try certain offences which come under the jurisdiction of the court of general sessions of the peace, as well as in summary matters, it would be a great advantage. I do not see any good reason why this clause has not been applied to the province of Quebec as well as the province of Ontario.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No doubt there will be an opportunity of discussing that subject again. The committee threw it out, if I remember well, on the ground that the only reason why the Ontario practice had obtained was in connection with some special qualification of the officer to whom the power was given. And as the officers had authority at the time the code was adopted, it was deemed well to continue the practice as regards Ontario. But the committee took strong ground as to extending such jurisdiction outside Ontario.

Mr. CURRAN. My hon. friend will remember, also, that the suggestion was made in the special committee with regard to the province of Quebec, that county court judges should have this jurisdiction. But county court judges we have not got. Neither would the term "circuit court judge" apply, because, in the country districts the circuit court judge is also a judge of the Superior Court, and, consequently, the application of the term there would mean more than the circuit court judges we have in the city of Montreal, whose duties are confined to small cases. I think that, on that account, the application would be improperly made to the officers mentioned.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to strike out these officers, the county court judge and the circuit judge, leaving it to the district magistrate and the police magistrate, which would be quite sufficient.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let us know to-morrow whether the fatted calf is to be killed, or otherwise.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Justice that it would be very convenient if the answer to the remedial order were brought down. I think it has not yet been brought down.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will bring that to the attention of the Government to-morrow.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 10th July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE RAILWAY COMMITTEE.

Mr. TISDALE. I move, seconded by Mr. Hazen :

That leave be granted the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines to sit during the time the House is in session, according to the recommendation contained in the twelfth report of the said committee.

Motion agreed to.

LAKE MANITOBA RAILWAY AND CANAL COMPANY.

Mr. MARTIN moved :

That so much of the twelfth report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines as relates to Bill No. 75, to revive and amend the Act respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company, be referred back to the said committee for further consideration.

He said : This Bill is to revive certain Acts which have from time to time been passed by this House, chartering a railway to run from Portage la Prairie up into what is known as the Lake Dauphin district. These Acts have expired and this is a short Bill to revive the charter. It also takes power to change the terminus of the road from Portage la Prairie to Arden on the Manitoba and North-western line, which is fifty or sixty miles west of Portage la Prairie. The Lake Dauphin country is one of the finest parts in the North-west. In natural fertility of soil it is not excelled by any portion of Manitoba, except, perhaps, the Portage district. The correctness of that statement is shown by the fact that although that country is at present from 80 to 100 miles away from any line of railway, a large number of people have gone there, have taken up nearly all the available homesteads, and it has become quite a large and prosperous settlement. There is a range of hills called the Riding Mountains, which separates that country from the country to the south, through which the Manitoba and North-western Railway line runs. Now, this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is opposed by the Hudson Bay Railway Company. They claim that this line interferes with their charter, because it runs for some distance parallel to their line ; but, Sir, the two railways have nothing whatever in common. The Hudson Bay Railway Company's line runs from Winnipeg to the Hudson Bay, the portion of it as to which negotiations have been carried on at present, being from Winnipeg to the Saskatchewan River. The Lake Manitoba and Canal Company's line is intended to open up and develop the Lake Dauphin settlement. The Hudson Bay Company have located a line, which does not run to the Lake Dauphin district, which is of no benefit whatever in any possible way to the settlers there, which runs through a country lying east of Lake Dauphin, and with which the settlers of Lake Dauphin have no connection. The House will understand that Lake Dauphin is a smaller lake lying west of Lake Manitoba, that the settlement to which I referred lies entirely west of Lake Dauphin, that the country lying to the east between Lake Manitoba and Lake Dauphin, is of a very different character indeed, from the country to which I refer, and has no population whatever in it. When you get 25 or 30 miles north of Gladstone, at which it is now proposed to commence the Hudson Bay Railway, the country is low and swampy and is unpopulated. I cannot understand how the House can be justified, at the instance of the Hudson Bay Railway, in preventing this railway from being built. The only suggestion made is that because for a certain distance, thirty or forty or fifty miles, the two roads are somewhat parallel to each other, and that the floating of the bonds of the Hudson Bay Railway Company might be affected by a line being chartered to some extent parallel to it. Is that any reason whatever why the settlers to whom I have referred should be deprived of a railway, and should be compelled to carry their produce from 80 to 100 miles to market ? The fact that one railway company should be able for purposes of its own to block the construction of another railway promoted for an entirely different purpose and running into an entirely different country, would be an outrage upon this large number of settlers who have at great hardship to themselves gone into this choice section of country and established their homes. I would like the House to understand thoroughly the responsibility they are taking in this matter. It is suggested that there are some difficulties of construction connected with the route laid out for this Lake Dauphin Railway. Surely it is no objection to a railway charter that the country over which the railway is proposed to be built is one of some difficulty. But I do not believe that is true. From the information I have been able to obtain, a railway running from Arden, the place selected as the terminus of the Lake Dauphin Railway, and going northward into the Lake Dauphin country, would be very easy of construction, because there are natural gravel ridges running northerly across the Riding Mountain which seem almost to have been placed there for the purposes of a railway line. Under these circumstances, I think I should be very neglectful indeed of the interests of those

hardy settlers in the Lake Dauphin district who have gone there knowing the value of the country, who are attempting to make a home for themselves, and to whom a railway is an absolute necessity, if I did not make this motion.

Mr. CASEY. I have only two words to say on this subject. I am quite in accord with the motion of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin). I believe this road will not cause any unfair competition with the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway; and it would be my interest as well as my duty to defend that railway from any unfair competition. But, considering the distance of the two roads apart, as I am informed, and the short hauls that are possible in a prairie country, I believe no unfair competition will be caused by the construction of this road. I may be allowed also to urge that at the time the vote was taken in the committee, it was about the lunch hour when many members were absent, and it was impossible to obtain a fair decision of the question, and the Bill was rejected by a very close majority.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHENIER MONUMENT.

Mr. BRODEUR asked, Were the monuments erected to Maisonneuve and Sir John A. Macdonald, at Montreal, entered at the customs; or were they delivered to the committees of management before an Order in Council admitting them free of duty was passed? In the latter case, did the Government take security from any persons for the payment of customs duty, in case the same shall be required? What is the nature of such security, and who are the persons? Do the Government intend to allow the Chenier Monument Committee to take possession in the same manner and on the same conditions, as in the case of the Maisonneuve and Macdonald monuments?

Mr. WALLACE. The monuments of Maisonneuve and Sir John A. Macdonald were delivered after arrangements had been made for passing Orders in Council authorizing free admission. In this case, which is different from the others, so far no decision has been arrived at, and therefore the department has no power to authorize free entry.

SEIZURES OF STILL AT L'ISLET.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Has the Government found out who is the owner of the still seized some time ago at L'Islet station on the Intercolonial Railway? If so, what is his name, and is he to be prosecuted?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The Government have been informed that one Napoléon Dussault is the owner of the still seized some time ago at L'Islet station on the Intercolonial Railway. He is to be prosecuted, a case now being in the hands of the agent of the Department of Justice.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked, Is it true that a large number of Civil Service employees have been superannuated? If so, what are their names? In what departments were they employed? What was the salary in each case? How many years had they been in the service of the Government? What is the age of each of the said employees? How much did each of them contribute to the superannuation fund? What is the amount of the yearly allowance to be received by each of the said retired employees? What are the reasons which caused the superannuation of the said employees?

Mr. MONTAGUE. This question asks for an amount of information which it would take a very great deal of time to prepare, as the Superannuation Act has been in force for a number of years. The information asked for, I think, might very properly be made the subject of a motion for a return, but not the subject of a question.

SOUTHAMPTON CUSTOMS OFFICER.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Who is the customs officer at Southampton? When was he appointed? What was his salary when first appointed? What is it now? Who was his predecessor in office, and what was his salary?

Mr. WALLACE. We have no collector there; the acting officer at present is Mr. William Johnston. He has not been appointed to that position, but was placed temporarily in charge on the 1st of March, 1894, after the death of the late sub-collector. His salary at that time was $1.50 per day. It is $50 per month now. Mr. James Fleming was his predecessor in office; salary, $400 per annum. I may add that the name of Mr. George Smith is now before the Council for permanent appointment, and I understand has passed the Treasury Board, at the same salary as the former occupant of the office, namely, $400 per annum.

RUMOURED RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the day are called, I would ask the Minister of Finance whether he can give any information to the House with regard to the resignation of three prominent members of the Administration.

Mr. FOSTER. I will have to ask my hon. friend to cultivate the virtue of patience for a little while longer. To-morrow when the

House meets we shall make a positive statement with regard to that matter.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend has asked me so often this session to cultivate that virtue that I think I have it in perfection now. As an evidence of it, I will wait until to-morrow.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES REPRESENTATION ACT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 121) further to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. Daly.)

(In the Committee.)

2. The second paragraph of the form substituted for form L of the said Act by section thirteen of chapter fifteen of the Statutes of 1894, is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor :—

"If any elector finds that his name is not on the voters' list of the polling division to which he belongs, he may apply to the enumerator, not later than two days from the polling day, to have his name added to the said list."

(2.) The words "Here insert oath No. 1. See form P," which follow the said second paragraph, are hereby struck out.

Mr. CHARLTON. Hon. gentlemen on this side asked, when we were last in committee on this Bill, that consideration of this clause should be deferred in order to provide against the consequence that might result from the stuffing of the lists by an enumerator who is, in a sense, an irresponsible officer. The ground was taken that a provision should be made to provide for keeping separate the ballots cast by voters placed upon the lists by the enumerators within two days of an election. If an appeal were taken against the decision of the enumerator in putting certain names upon the lists, and if the court of appeal held that he had put them wrongly on the lists, there should be some way of tracing these ballots in order to prevent their deciding an election. The enumerator is here clothed with more arbitrary power than the revising barrister, because he may put on names of his own motion, and without any restriction, and it might be found out afterwards, on appeal, that the persons whose names he had added had no right to vote at all.

Mr. DALY. The law is exactly as it has stood ever since 1886 when representation was given the North-west Territories, with the exception that a change was made in the law providing that the enumerator should not put names on the list the day before the election, but only two days before the election. The clause reads as follows :—

If any enumerator, at any time after posting up any voters' list, and two days before the polling day, is fully satisfied, from representations made to him by any credible persons, that the name of any qualified voter has been omitted from the voters' lists of the polling division to which such voter belongs, he shall add such name to the copy of the list in his possession, below his own signature, and shall attest such addition by his initials ; if the enumerator, in like manner, is fully satisfied that there is on the list the name of any person who is not qualified as a voter in such polling division, he may draw erasing lines through such names, and write his own initials opposite thereto in the column for remarks ; and, if the enumerator finds the occupation, addition or residence of any voter to be inaccurately stated in the list, he may make the necessary alterations and affix his initials thereto in like manner.

The next clause provides :—

Every enumerator, having revised and corrected such retained copy of each voters' list compiled by him, if he deems such correction necessary, as provided in the next preceding section, shall write at the foot of such copy and close to the last name thereon, two days immediately preceding the polling day, a certificate in the form of the second certificate contained in form K of the schedules of this Act.

Form K simply cites the number, name, occupation or addition, residence and remarks, certified to by the enumerator as a true copy of the voters' lists in polling division No. — of the electoral district of —, as prepared by me for use in the election of the member of the House of Commons for the said electoral district. Then there is the following note : "Here the enumerator shall make any addition to the list which he finds necessary," after which he certifies as follows :—

I certify that the foregoing is a correct list of the voters in polling district No. in the district of , as revised or as finally approved by me.

The enumerator takes an oath to act faithfully as such without partiality, fear, favour or affection ; and up to the present we have never heard the fairness of the enumerators being called into question. Under the old law the enumerator was permitted to add names on the list on the very polling day, but now we provide that he can only do so two days before the polling day. We are surrounding it with a safeguard it had not before and are prejudicing no class of electors.

Mr. CHARLTON. In my opinion it is a matter of very little importance whether the names are put on the list one or two days before the polling day. The point I make is that if, on appeal, the action of the enumerator is not upheld——

Mr. DALY. There is no appeal. I was under the impression that there was one, but I find there is not.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is there no appellant jurisdiction ? Is the enumerator master of the situation ?

Mr. DALY. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it is high time that we should provide for an appeal from

the decision of the enumerator in placing names upon the list. We have a condition of things in the North-west that is most extraordinary. The enumerator has free license to put names upon the lists, and there is no provision whatever for an appeal. The elections in the North-west are placed in the hands of a single man, who is the appointee of the Government and who may work any mischief he pleases without any remedy against his conduct.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to say that these enumerators provided for in the Territories are simply a farce and their voters' lists worth nothing. It is simply an expenditure of Government money for no purpose whatever. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is not aware that a man can vote there, whether he is on the list or not? Any person can come up on election day and vote, and the only way to prevent his voting is to offer him the oath. But bad and crude as are the arrangements there, so much do they excel the outrageous Franchise Act in force in the rest of the Dominion that I have offered heretofore no objections to them.

Mr. DAVIN. We have found in the North-west that our plan works well, and have had no complaint from any quarter. I am very glad my hon. friend thinks it better than any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. McCARTHY. It appears to me very extraordinary that, without notice of any kind a man can go to the enumerator and have his name put upon the list; and also, if I understood the section as read by the hon. Minister, that if the enumerator thinks the name ought not to be there he can, without notice, strike it off. It does appear to me that that is a most outrageous state of affairs.

Mr. MARTIN. The list is no good. What is the use of it?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know as to that; I have not had an opportunity of looking at the law.

Mr. MACDOWALL. The object is to make the franchise in the North-west as wide as possible.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are making it wider than the country.

Mr. MACDOWALL. A great many people are constantly coming into the North-west, and the object is to provide that if they have been there three months and are British subjects, they may be entitled to vote. The enumerator prepares the list, and there are very few additions to it. This establishes practically manhood suffrage, and almost everybody of 21 years and upwards has the right to vote.

Mr. MARTIN. He does not even need to be on the list.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. MULOCK. I observe that the amendment speaks of an "elector," not a "person." It would appear from this that this clause is intended to authorize the transfer of names from one list to another. Is that the object, or is it to put names on that have not been on before?

Mr. DALY. It is intended to put names on that were not on before. If the hon. gentleman will look at the clause he will see that it is really not an amendment at all. Last session we amended clause 31, which I read to the House, by requiring any enumerator, after posting up the voters' list, to add to the list the name of any elector who applied within two days before the date of polling. All the clause does is to include this change in form L, of the Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. What legal penalties are there if the enumerator does not discharge his duties properly?

Mr. DALY. I do not know that there are any legal penalties except such as attach to a breach of his oath.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not see that there is any adequate provision for checking of the addition to the list of the names of parties who are not residents of the country, and even of parties who are not British subjects. It seems to me that where you have so loose a method of preparing the voters' list, it should be provided that affidavits may be put to the parties upon presenting themselves to vote which would cover all the requisite qualifications; so that you could test their right to vote even after the vote has been recorded. The list ought to be conclusive where it is prepared so loosely as it is in the North-west Territories.

Bill reported.

Mr. DALY moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. gentleman had better not press the third reading to-day. We would like to have an opportunity of comparing this Bill with the original, and see how it gives protection in the preparation of the lists, or in the qualifications that are set out. My impression is, speaking only from my recollection of the original Bill, that there is no adequate provision for excluding from the list the names of those who are not British subjects, or those who have not resided the requisite time in the Territories. With the lists prepared in such a loose way, it seems to me that the oath which may be put to the elector when he presents himself for the purpose of voting should be one under which he would affirm that he possesses the qualifications which the law requires. The list ought not to be a finality where special legislation of this kind is necessary. For this reason, I would like the hon. gen-

tleman not to press the third reading today.

Mr. DALY. I will read, for the information of the hon. gentleman, the law as it stands. This matter was before the House last session, and no objection was raised at that time. All that this Bill does is to correct the error in last year's legislation, by changing the form "L" in the schedule. The duties of the enumerator are as follows:—

Each such enumerator, upon his appointment, and having first taken the oath of office, shall immediately thereafter compile a list of the persons qualified as electors to vote at the election then pending, for the polling division or each of the polling divisions for which he has been appointed; and he shall make three plainly-written copies of the same, with the names of the voters alphabetically arranged, giving the occupation and residence of each voter, in the form K, in the schedule to this Act.

The oath taken by the voter is to the effect that he is of the full age of twenty-one years, is not an alien or an Indian, and has resided three months in the electoral district, and twelve months in the Territories.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that no man is deprived of his vote by not being on the list. That being so, no one would care to take the trouble of having his name put on the list, unless there was some reason why he could not take the oath before the returning officer. It seems to me, that this provision is wholly unnecessary.

Mr. MACDOWALL. If there are voters in the district and their names are not on the list, the only protection you can have is to make them take the oath. But if the oath is provided and there are no lists, it would take more than a day to get through, for the oath would have to be put to all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It will not delay the Bill five minutes to postpone the third reading.

Mr. DALY. I have no objections.

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Resolution (p. 3915) reported from committee respecting the indemnity of members of the Senate and House of Commons, was read the first time.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of the resolution.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not object to the provisions of the resolution, but I would ask the leader of the House why the Government should adopt the policy of coming to the House yearly for the last three sessions to have this principle, already admitted, allowed by the House? If this is a proper provision, why not make it permanent by statute?

Mr. McCARTHY. I was going to draw attention to the fact that there are a few gentlemen in the House who are connected with the militia service who have been obliged to attend during the session, and also to attend to their militia duties. It appears to me that an exception should be made in their case. If, in order to attend to a public duty, they are necessarily obliged to absent themselves, they should not have been penalized like the rest of us who, perhaps, sometimes absent themselves for other purposes than attending to public duties.

Mr. FOSTER. The question was mooted yesterday as to whether it would not be better to make this a permanent Act. I think the first occasion of the addition was on account of a long session, and for that there was a particular reason, although the addition was in a different manner from this. It was special legislation, and for that year alone. Afterwards the very question that my hon. friend has just now mentioned came up, and certain gentlemen who were attached to the militia, and who, while the House was in session, were absent for some ten or twelve days, thought it is somewhat unfair that they should lose their sessional allowance by so much for those days of absence when they were on militia service. If I mistake not, this arrangement was assented to at the time, and a special Bill was put through, granting this number of days in addition, so as to cover the time spent at drill. In that respect, gentlemen who go away do not lose anything for that reason. Of course, it may be argued that other members who do not attend drill, may have a similar advantage, as they have twelve days to come and go upon with reference to their private business; whereas the twelve days are entirely taken out with respect to those gentlemen who attend drill on account of the public service which they are engaged upon. That is true so far as it goes, but I think it was pretty well understood that the twelve days should be considered as an arrangement which would at least not mulct these gentlemen in any penalty in the way of loss for the time that they were engaged in militia service. As this Bill has now passed the House for three successive sessions, I think there is a good deal to be said in favour of its being made part of a permanent Bill, and next year——

Mr. McCARTHY. Next January.

Mr. CHARLTON. "Deo volente."

Mr. FOSTER—or the session thereafter; I shall move in that direction.

Mr. O'BRIEN. As one of the persons interested, I do not care to say very much

upon this question; but I may say this, however, that I certainly did understand from the gentleman at the head of the department with which I was concerned, that an exception would be made for those officers who attend drill—since this session the order for the drill was not issued until some time after the session had been in progress—and there was an understanding certainly among the members of the House that the usual allowance would be made to such members in their absence. I think the House will admit that it is manifestly unfair that gentlemen who, for twelve days, attend to their private business should be in a much better position than those who are necessarily absent in the discharge of a public duty; and I would put it to the House whether it is not exceedingly unfair that they should be so dealt with. With regard to the general question, I think it may fairly be argued that the system which has been in vogue for several sessions, operates very fairly to gentlemen who are at a distance from the capital. It is well known that many members of this House can go home every week and attend to their business without loss, whereas gentlemen who live at a greater distance are unable to do the same thing without loss. Therefore, I think the allowance of twelve days has the effect of placing gentlemen in this House who live at a distance from the capital on the same footing as those who live near it, and who can more easily absent themselves from their private business.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest to my hon. friend, as there appears to be a universal expression of sentiment in this House in that direction, that this resolution should extend also to officers of the militia.

Mr. FOSTER. It does extend to officers of the militia.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As I understand it, some of those who are officers of the militia and members of this House, may have taken a few days from their private business before they were aware that they would be called out for drill; so that they are in a disadvantageous position in that respect as compared with other members of the House.

Resolution read the second time, and concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 143) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SILVER-LEAD SMELTING.

Bill (No. 142) to encourage silver-lead smelting (Mr. Foster) was read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MARA. I am afraid that the words used here, "silver-lead," will exclude some of the ores that it is desired to assist as well as silver-lead. For instance, in the Toad Mountain district, in Kootenay, the ores are silver and copper. Then, again, in the Trail Creek district, the ores are gold and iron. With the clause as it now reads, I am afraid that these ores would be excluded, whereas I think it is not the intention of the Government to exclude any ores that are smelted within the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to that, I have taken what information I could get from experts, and according to that information, the signification put on the word "smelting" would take in all the classes of ores that ought really to be included under the encouragement given to this industry. They will not take in any ores which are not fit for smelting, such as those which are produced by other processes outside of the real smelting process; but this will take in the very ores in that district of which the hon. gentleman has spoken.

Mr. MARA. The leader of the House is correct, if these ores were all smelted together. The Slocan ores are argentiferous galena, the Toad Mountain ores carry silver and copper, and the Trail Creek carry gold and iron. If all were smelted they would come within the clause under the head of silver-lead ores; but if treated separately at each different mining camp, I am afraid that the clause as it now stands will not cover them. That is the point I want to be distinctly understood. It will take a little time to frame an amendment to cover the point.

Mr. FOSTER. This will take in the ores that we want to take in, those for which the bounty is to be given, namely, silver-lead smelting ores. It includes all the lead ores, all that class of dry siliceous ores of which I spoke the other day, it will also take in the sulphides which are found in the district referred to. The ores there I am told carry a small proportion of copper, but the copper in the smelting is recovered as a side product. What we particularly want to do is to encourage the industry of lead smelting, the production of lead bullion, and the information I have is that this term will include those ores.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The usual galena ores.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. We can pass the Bill through committee and defer the third reading.

Mr. MASSON. Is this ton to be weighed as the ore goes in or comes out?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a ton of ore.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it a long ton or two thousand pounds ?

Mr. FOSTER. Two thousand pounds.

On section 7,

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I do not object to this Bill, but I desire to know if the Government intend to give a bounty in favour of glass works which it is intended to establish in Rivière du Loup, in Temiscouata ? A petition has been sent to the Government from Capt. Prince and Mr. Pender asking for a bounty. I should like to know what the Government propose to do with respect to this petition.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has received a petition as stated with respect to making glass. It has also received a petition for a bounty for that and for other different industries. The Government is not in a position to go any further this year than it is going with respect to silver-lead smelting. As I said the other night with respect to experiments and granting aid in different departments of horticulture, when speaking on the subject of fruit farms, all we can do is to take the most important branches of industry and aid them to the extent we can do so, having in view the condition of the revenue at the time.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. May I hope that next year something may be done for this industry ?

Mr. FOSTER. We do not know.

Bill reported.

THE CUSTOMS ACT.

Mr. WALLACE moved second reading of Bill (No. 140) further to amend the Customs Act.

Mr. LAURIER. Please explain.

Mr. WALLACE. I think I explained the nature of the Bill when it was introduced the other day. The first important object of the Bill is to provide that meetings of the Board of Customs shall be legal without the presence of an assistant commissioner, the law at present providing that the board shall consist of the commissioner, and assistant commissioner and certain other officers. We have no assistant commissioner, and this Bill is to make the meetings of the board legal whether an assistant commissioner is present or not. Another object of the Bill is to declare what shall constitute a quorum of the board. The third object is to explain the class of men who may be appointed on the Board of Customs, so that we may have advantage of the services of men of wide experience in the Customs Department on the board. These are the objects sought to be attained by the proposed amendments contained in the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. When this Bill was introduced the other day, I called the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact—indeed, I did not call his attention, but he himself told the House—that the Bill was, as he said, to constitute a board without the presence of the assistant commissioner. The hon. gentleman told us at that time that he had made no provision this year for the salary of the assistant commissioner, but the hon. gentleman was reminded by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the law provides for an assistant commissioner, and that it was altogether illegal on the part of the hon. gentleman not to provide for his salary. The office is wanted, or not wanted. If the office is wanted, there should be an appointment, and a salary voted. If the office is not wanted, it should be dispensed with by law. But so long as the law exists, it is the duty of the hon. gentleman to have an assistant commissioner appointed, and to have a salary provided for. As I understand from the action of the Controller, he considers that the office is not wanted, and if that is the case, his clear duty is, not to evade the law in this way, but rather to have the law amended.

Mr. WALLACE. Where does the hon. gentleman get his authority that the law provides for an assistant commissioner ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The words are these :

> There shall be a Commissioner of Customs, who shall be the Deputy of the Minister of Customs, and an Assistant Commissioner, appointed by the Governor General in Council.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the date of that Act ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). 1886.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Act constituting the Controllership repealed that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The statutes were revised in 1886, and that Act was passed in 1887.

Mr. McCARTHY. If that is so, the language of this clause is not right. It refers to the "Assistant Commissioner of Customs, if there is one appointed."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the Controller objects to striking that out.

Mr. McCARTHY. I call the attention of the House to the fact that this is not at all in compliance with the desire of those interested in trade. The Board of Trade of Montreal—and I think their action has been approved of by most of the boards of trade, if not all of them—are desirous that not custom-house officers, but experts—and they name the class—should be appointed to constitute this board. That is a question that ought to be determined on the second reading of the Bill. It is quite clear that a very great deal of dissatisfaction exists amongst

the importers throughout the whole country, with regard to the way the customs law is interpreted, and the Montreal Board of Trade, which is by no means unfavourable to the Government, has taken the matter up and sent a petition which we have all received, and in that they set out very clearly the grievances under which the importing trade has been labouring. I, for my part, until I hear something to the contrary, am quite willing to accept the conclusions of the board of trade, and to say that this Act should not be passed in its present shape.

Bill read the second time and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have before me the statute creating this department in 1887, and I do not find any alteration whatever in the constitution of the Customs branch, nor do I find any provision by which the Assistant Commissioner of Customs is dispensed with. If the Controller of Customs has the statute before him, perhaps he will point out the provision which he thinks gives him the right to dispense with the appointment of an officer whose duties and salaries are provided for by law. The statute of 1886 clearly provides for an Assistant Commissioner of Customs. Where the law provides for the appointment of an officer, and where Parliament assumes that such an officer is necessary, and entrusted the Governor in Council with the duty of defining what the duties of that officer shall be, it seems to me that there is no discretionary power left to them in the matter. On the contrary, Parliament having provided for that officer, the discretion of the Governor in Council extends only to a definition of what the duties and functions of that officer shall be. That he shall exist, and that he shall have functions is decided by Parliament. That being so, I think there has been a dereliction of duty. If, in the opinion of the Ministers, there is no necessity for such an office and the salary for the office can be saved to the public, they should come down to the House and propose to amend the law so as to dispense with the office in a regular and constitutional way. The hon. Controller proposes here that there shall be a Board of Customs, which shall consist of the Commissioner of Customs, or any officer for the time being acting as such, the Assistant Commissioner of Customs, if there is one appointed, and so forth. I think that assumption of the dispensing power would be a monstrous power for the Government to take. There should either be or not be an Assistant Commissioner of Customs; the law as it stands provides for one, and here the hon. member proposes incidentally to dispense with that officer if the Government think proper. I do not think that is a proper mode of procedure at all. It is giving to the Government a very much wider discretion than any Government ought to have. Where a government is making a new departure and constituting a new set of offices, where their proceedings are altogether tentative, because there has not been adequate experience to guide them, there may be some reason for giving them for a limited time a discretionary power on which legislation may ultimately be based. But that is not the position of the Government, surely, after the existence of a Customs Department ever since the union—to come down to the House and ask for power which they have not possessed up to this moment. Their experience is surely sufficiently wide to enable them to determine how the department should be constituted, and that being so they ought to state definitely in the law what offices they think necessary in the public interest. Then, there is the further consideration—the appointment of appraisers, which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has referred to. It is obvious that the commercial classes of this country are appraised by the Customs Department. The circulars which I suppose have been addressed to every member of this House are a sufficient indication of that fact. The persons called upon to discharge these duties ought to be persons of high standing, in whom the commercial classes of the country have the utmost confidence. It is well known that at one time all the consular service of England was in the hands of the mercantile classes of London ; and, although the Government have taken charge of that service, they have appointed men whom the commercial classes of the country regard as eminently well fitted for the discharge of the duties. It seems to me that is the rule that ought to be adopted in the appointment of appraisers in Canada, so that the commercial classes will not be dealt with unequally or unsatisfactorily, and will not be put in a worse position than Parliament intended to put them in by the imposition of the duties provided for in our tariff.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the difficulty as to the Assistant Commissioner of Customs might be understood if I were to mention the sequence of the legislation. The hon. gentleman refers to the provision in the statutes of 1886, relating to the office of assistant commissioner. That section was repealed by the statute of 1888. Then, the Controller of Customs has this Bill with these words in it. If I understood the hon. Controller, he has no objection to dropping the words, "the Assistant Commissioner of Customs if there is one appointed," and I think that will cause this point in the discussion to disappear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No. There is no Assistant Commissioner at the present time, although the law requires one to be appointed, and there is no provision in the Estimates

for the salary of such officer, and my point is that that is a discretion not entrusted to the Government.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I apprehended the hon. gentleman correctly. I say the discussion as to what the state of things should be will disappear if that office disappears, and this Bill amends the statute of 1888 in that direction.

Mr. McCARTHY. It still leaves the part relating to the Assistant Commissioner unaffected.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the words, "the Assistant Commissioner of Customs, if there is one appointed," are dropped in this Bill, you will have a Board of Customs consisting of the Commissioner of Customs or any officer for the time being acting as such, and the other officers named other than the Assistant Commissioner of Customs.

Mr. LAURIER. You have a Board of Customs without the Assistant Commissioner of Customs, but you have still an Assistant Commissioner of Customs according to the law.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It only requires another clause and that office can be abolished.

Mr. LAURIER. The Controller of Customs told us the other day, when his Bill was introduced, that there was no such office as the Commissioner of Customs existing by law.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know the difficulty and I simply said that we would avoid all discussion because the Controller was willing, as I understood him, that the office of Assistant Commissioner should be abolished, and I propose by amendment to abolish it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not understand that we do it in that way. My point is this, that the law requires that an Assistant Commissioner shall exist to be a member of this board. The hon. gentleman has no Assistant Commissioner and he is taking no appropriation for the office; yet in the Bill before us he proposes to continue the office with the discretionary power of the Government to dispense with the appointment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He does not propose to do that, though the Bill does.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see the point I am taking. I am calling attention to the actual condition of things, under the law as it stands, and to the fact that the hon. gentleman is exercising a discretion above the law in dispensing with the office and the salary.

Mr. WALLACE. The leader of the Opposition must have quite misunderstood what I said, because I expressed no opinion whatever as to whether the office had been abolished or not. I simply said that no salary had been voted for the Assistant Commissioner, and that, because men are not likely to work for nothing, no Assistant Commissioner was appointed.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me that the Commissioner of Customs had been virtually ignorant of the Act under which he is called upon to take action. The Act of itself is mandatory in character. "There shall be an Assistant Commissioner." I do not think, therefore, that the mere neglect of the Government to provide for the salary has the effect of abolishing the office. If the Government do not want an Assistant Commissioner, let them ask to have the Act amended.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand the Minister of Justice proposes to abolish the office, and that ought to be satisfactory. It is, at all events, to me. I do not know that the Controller should be so much blamed when the Ministers of Justice and Finance are equally ignorant.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We take it altogether.

Mr. LAURIER. Better to have a general execution.

Mr. McCARTHY. With regard to the other matter, which I desire to press now in committee, I would like to have some answer given by a member of the Government. Before we went into committee I pointed out that the mercantile community of the country are very much dissatisfied with the present law and are equally dissatisfied, as far as we can judge by their petitions, with this proposed amendment. Montreal is certainly an important city. I have here a copy of a petition from the Board of Trade, signed by all the leading merchants apparently of this city. The members of the city do not seem to be here to say a word in its behalf, and I look round for the members from Toronto.

Mr. COCKBURN. We are all here.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the hon. gentleman will say something on behalf of the merchants of his city.

Mr. FOSTER. They are often here when you are not.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is so, but I am here now.

Mr. FOSTER. How long will you stay?

Mr. McCARTHY. Until the session is over, and I daresay the hon. gentleman would be very glad if I were away. Petitions largely signed have been presented to the House from nearly all the boards of trade of the Dominion, and it is hardly possible the Government can ignore the

weight of public opinion shown by these petitions. What has been the habit of the customs authorities of this country? They have practically treated all the importers as smugglers; they have treated them prima facie as trying to evade the customs laws. These laws are, no doubt, difficult to interpret. Some of these difficulties are indicated in a correspondence published in the "Pharmaceutical Journal," which shows that most extraordinary decisions have been arrived at by the customs authorities. Take, for instance, this provision of the tariff:

Surgical instruments of all kinds, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Now splints used by surgeons for setting broken bones might surely be considered as covered by "instruments of all kinds." Yet, what does the department say?

		Per cent.
Splints made of	wood.....	25
do	iron and steel.....	27½
do	copper or plate.....	30
do	paper	35

So we have the department interpreting this statute as applying to splints no less than four different qualifications, and there are certainly some equally ridiculous classifications or rulings of the department given in other portions of the correspondence. Now, the proposition seems to me an eminently fair one which the petitioners submit, namely, that a board of experts be established to consist of five members, being one for each of the principal branches of trade —dry goods, hardware, oils and paints, drugs and chemicals, fancy goods, stationery, jewellery, groceries, provisions, leather and shoe bindings. The appointments to be made on the basis of competence for the office, and sufficient remuneration to be given in order to secure men technically competent, and with business experience, so that the board may enjoy the confidence of the merchants. The board to have power to administer the oath and subpoena witnesses. Its decisions to be sent to the collectors of customs and boards of trade throughout the country, so as to promote uniformity in the classification of duties. And the right of appeal to the Exchequer Court to be given. That scheme seems to me eminently right and fair, and I would like to know why the Government has not adopted it.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for North Simcoe has told the House that the Department of Customs has treated the importers as a body of smugglers. Sir, I deny the statement, and I challenge him to produce any reputable merchant who will endorse it. I can show the hon. gentleman numerous letters from the leading importers in Canada expressing satisfaction with the course of the Customs Department in fairly and impartially carrying out the law. These gentlemen are not treated as smugglers; they are treated as honest, reputable citizens of Canada by the Department of Customs. With reference to the classification according to the material of certain articles, which the hon. gentleman assumes to call absurd and ridiculous, our officers have simply been carrying out the law enacted many years ago and re-enacted at different times by the Parliament of Canada. Section 13 of the Customs Act says:

On each and every non-enumerated article which bears a similitude, either in material or quality, or the use to which it may be applied, to any enumerated article chargeable with duty, the same rate of duty shall be payable which is charged on the enumerated article which it most resembles in any of the particulars before-mentioned.

That is, articles of wood come under the classification of manufactures of wood, articles of iron come under the classification of manufactures of iron, in accordance with the customs law. As to this cry that has been raised by the Montreal Board of Trade, asking for the appointment of a number of appraisers, which the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would lead the House to infer was the universal wish of the boards of trade and of commercial men throughout Canada, I deny the inference altogether. It is quite true that that letter was sent to all the boards of trade in Canada, and that that private circular was sent to the leading merchants—I have copies of them here—asking them to do their utmost to promote the change, particularly in the city of Toronto. Those boards of trade that have taken the trouble to investigate these matters have declined to concur in the proposal of the Montreal Board of Trade. Sir, what does the Ottawa Board of Trade say? They have passed a resolution, which I have here—and I may say that it was passed without my knowledge and was proposed by a leading member of the Liberal party, a gentleman who is also one of the leading business men of the city of Ottawa—Mr. C. Ross, of Messrs. C. Ross & Co. The resolution is as follows:—

Resolved, that in relation to the subject-matter of a petition of the Montreal Board of Trade, this council is of opinion that, while some action toward improving the present system may be necessary, that the proposal to appoint a permanent board of five experts for the whole Dominion for the principal branches of trade is not advisable, and would not fully meet the requirements, for the following reasons:—

It would add $25,000 or $30,000 to the expense of the administration of customs for a doubtful benefit.

The department has already officers in almost every port of entry, also an organization which has at its disposal the best expert opinion of the Dominion.

There is an exchequer court of appeal, which would still be a resort from expert decisions.

Decisions would be those of a single expert, and could not gain satisfaction at all times.

It would not bring uniformity of appraisement, as, unless classification is appealed against, differ-

ences might not be known to the Board of Experts, and if appeals are made from local decisions and classifications, the present organization has every facility for correct decisions.

It would not render more expeditious service; the single expert in each or any branch might be simultaneously called upon to act in cases at many different ports, e.g., at Halifax, at Winnipeg or Vancouver.

This council is, therefore, of the opinion that the remedy lies in the improvement of the present organization, i.e., by the appointment only of efficient officers in each port of entry, or the principal ports of entry in each district, who should be required to qualify by examination for the office.

Copies of this resolution were forwarded to the Montreal and Toronto Boards of Trade, and will be brought up at the next full meeting of the board.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the date?

Mr. WALLACE. I have not the date. This was taken from one of the Ottawa papers. And what does the Toronto Board of Trade say? They have looked into this proposition made by the Montreal Board of Trade, and have refused to acquiesce in it. So far as I have seen, they have passed no resolution on the subject. But I was informed by the secretary of the Toronto Board of Trade that they were making exhaustive examination into the whole question, and had decided that the proposals of the Montreal Board of Trade are most unwise and most unsatisfactory, and they could not agree with them. That is the opinion, so far as I have learned, though not yet adopted by formal resolution of the Toronto Board of Trade. Now, Sir, these gentlemen tell us to adopt the system prevailing in the United States? What is that system? They have a board of nine experts in the city of New York. I myself had several long interviews with these gentlemen. Some gentlemen in the city of Montreal appear to have a clearer knowledge and a higher appreciation of the system in use in the United States than the Americans themselves. I have the resolution passed by the Merchants' Association of the city of Boston on 10th May, 1895, concerning this United States board of experts:

Whereas, the question of undervaluation of imported merchandise at the chief ports of this country has become so alarming to the mercantile community,

Resolved, that the directors of the Boston Merchants' Association support the Treasury officials in their efforts to prosecute undervaluation, to the end that whatever the rates of duty may be, and the penalties following, violations of the law shall be impartially and effectually prosecuted; and we recommend to the State Department at Washington that a circular letter of instructions be sent to the consuls at the different ports of exportation, setting forth the magnitude of this evil of undervaluation, requesting them to inform themselves as to the question of market value, to the end that honest importers and honest American manufacturers may be protected and that the treasury of the United States receive its just due,

Also, that the corps of special agents of the Treasury stationed abroad be placed upon such a basis of efficiency as will insure reliable investigation in regard to the conditions of cost of manufacture and sale in all foreign exporting centres as will assist the local appraisers and United States Board of General Appraisers in the performance of their important duties.

That is the way this matter is viewed by those who have had actual experience of the state of affairs in the United States. We are told: Follow the American plan, and appoint an appraiser for every branch. But that is not the American plan. They have appointed nine appraisers. Of these, six were lawyers before their appointment. Of the other three, one was a hotel-keeper, one was in some other business, and the third was engaged in the United States service, in the Treasury Board at Washington. The Montreal Board of Trade propose to appoint a dry goods man, a grocer, a hardware man, a druggist, and so on. I know where the inspiration in the Montreal Board of Trade in this matter came from. What would be the effect of adopting that course, Mr. Chairman? Suppose we had these men sitting here at the city of Ottawa, and a question came up. What does the hardware man know about dry goods; what does the grocery man know about drugs and medicine? In the end, the decision would be left to the one having knowledge of the trade in question. And so, in reality, the decision would be given upon the opinion of only one man. I say that proposal of the Montreal Board of Trade, which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has endorsed, without examination, would be a total failure. What is the plan to-day? When a question comes up before us, suppose it is a question of dry goods appraisement or classification, it is referred immediately, with the samples, to the dry goods appraisers in Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal, Halifax, Quebec or St. John, to the appraisers in four or five ports, and in that way I have the opinions, as to the classification and appraisement of the most competent and experienced appraisers we have in the Dominion. I have the opinions of these five or six gentlemen in a few days, and then we are in the best position, with the evidence of these experts before us, to form a just conclusion, and these conclusions are generally found to be satisfactory. Then we have an advantage over the American method, which these gentlemen want us to copy, in this fact, that the decisions in the United States are scarcely ever final. There is a decision of the board of appraisers, which can be appealed against to a circuit court, the decision of the circuit court can be carried to another court, and thence to the Supreme Court of the United States, and there is no final decision until it has run the gauntlet of all these courts. Here we have the decision of the department, which can be appealed against as to

the value. If a merchant says: You have put a value of $100 upon that article, and we appeal from your decision because we think the article should only be valued at $75—the matter may immediately go to a board of arbitration under sections 70 and 72 of the Customs Act with only the smallest cost and trouble, and a decision is arrived at after evidence has been heard from both sides, and the decision of the board of arbitration is final. Then, with reference to all other questions coming before the department, the decisions are prompt, and they are final, except appeal may be made to the Governor in Council. In the United States, as I have been informed, in one case alone, a case of caps and hat linings, which has been appealed from one court to another, a decision was given against the United States involving seven or eight million dollars. In the first place, the importers were not entitled to any benefit because they sold the goods on the basis of the duties they had paid, and received their profits on that basis. Then the lawyers took the case up and carried it from court to court, and the judgment stands to-day against the United States for seven and a half million dollars. I say that our system here which we are proposing to amend, and the amendment to which gives more extensive powers, and gives us the opportunity of getting better evidence and more experienced men in our department, will render impossible all the evils that exist to-day in the Department of Customs, and will make it more efficient than the proposal made by the Montreal Board of Trade, and which proposal, as I have before stated, was repudiated by the Ottawa Board of Trade, and failed to be endorsed by any board of trade which took the trouble to examine thoroughly into the matter.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman attempts to show how very advantageous the system in Canada is compared with that of the United States. He tries to show the House and the country that the Customs Act has worked, and is working with perfect smoothness and satisfaction to the people of the country. He denies the statement made by an hon. member of this House, that the department treats the importers of the country as a band of scoundrels. Now, Sir, whether the hon. gentleman is correct or not in his statement, it is very unfortunate indeed that the importers, the business people, the private citizens of Canada, from one end of it to the other, should be irritated beyond expression at the administration of the Customs Department in this country. It is a monstrous thing to place in the hands of one man the power to appoint his spies to visit places of business in the various towns, and without showing any authority, simply to demand from the people who may be in business, their invoices, not only for one year, but for years back, and threatening these persons that unless they submit to their demands, their places will be closed up. It is all very well for my hon. friend to talk of the administration of his department when these same spies knock at doors when the men of the house are not at home, and terrify the women on a charge of having smuggled goods, and demanding, in many cases, large sums of money for settling these cases, and always, I believe, putting at least half of that money into their own pockets, and probably a much larger proportion. It is, Sir, unfortunate indeed for the position of the hon. gentleman when we find that all over the country, from Montreal and every other city except Ottawa, complaints are made against the department on account of inefficient administration.

Mr. WALLACE. Where are these complaints made?

Mr. LISTER. I will tell you presently. I cannot better express the feeling of the country than by quoting a few words from a journal which I hold in my hand, dated June, 1895:

> Who has not had some grievance with the present system of customs administration? The current mismanagement in this department affords the strongest possible invitation for general attack, and a change must take place or the Government itself will fall under a weight it cannot carry. The governing of Canada cannot be estimated as an easy task. It requires the best men of the country to conduct the ordinary business features of administration, and, while we will not attempt to criticise the ability or efficiency in any of the other departments of the Government, and while we might go so far as to admit the existence of every requirement in all other directions, we voice the feelings and convictions of the business men of the Dominion in saying that the Department of Customs is mismanaged, and that incompetency is current from the head down.

Further down, he goes on to say:

> The system, as well as the detail, of administration is wrong, and no government can thrive and stand, bearing upon its back, as it were, the load involved in a maladministered customs department. Rulings are issued—one at variance with another. No fixed principle is current in the issuance of decisions—one decision contradicts another. The expression "at sixes and sevens" covers the position within the walls of the department, and business men cannot get replies for weeks and months in hundreds of cases from the officers of the department.

Sir, that article thoroughly voices the feeling of the people of this country who have to do with the Customs Department, and I do not believe that in any other country can be found where cases involving thousands and thousands of dollars are left to a single Minister to decide, without precedent, as he does probably. Perhaps influences are brought to bear; perhaps in some cases the head of that department may feel that it is a case that should not be strictly dealt with; in other cases, perhaps,

he thinks that, by reason of the want of influence with the department, that person should be severely dealt with. Now, the hon. gentleman talks about the way the department is administered. I challenge him to show me any country to-day, where the head of a department would employ a man engaged in a particular business to go into the United States and find out the prices there, and come back here and find his report accepted by the Government. What do we find? A man in the trade is chosen for that purpose, a man whose whole interest is to prevent imports, a man whose interest it is to fix such a price upon the articles which he produces as to prevent importations, and thus allow him to have the full benefit of the Canadian market at the expense of the Canadian consumers. I challenge my hon. friend to produce such a case in any other country. I say, moreover, that there is no Government that sends its spies throughout the country, who go into the retailers' establishments, who go into the wholesale dealers' establishments, who go into private residences throughout the country in the way I have attempted to describe, and who are paid in the way that officers in this department are paid. It is insolent, it is invading every private right, every privilege, when a man can walk into your house and make a charge against you or some member of your family, and extort from some person, it may be, who may have bought a shilling's worth of stuff from over the river without paying duty, any such sum that he is able to pay. The law which permits such a system is monstrous in the extreme, and the sooner it is done away with the better. My hon. friend has talked about the board of experts in the United States, and he has told us that six of them are lawyers, one is a hotel-keeper, and two follow some other occupation. My hon. friend knows that the board, as constituted in Canada is thoroughly reliable, reputable, and competent. The hon. gentleman would not follow the United States in that regard, but our people would feet that, having an independent board, one competent to deal with these questions, after a decision had been given by that board the matter had been fairly dealt with, and they would be satisfied. There is anything but satisfaction in the country to-day. In the words of the article quoted, the decisions are at variance, they are not in harmony with each other, they consist of the ipse dixit of the head of the department, and the importers have to submit or to appeal to the courts of the land, involving very heavy costs indeed. Is the department managed properly? Is the statement made in this pamphlet correct? Let us see. No doubt my hon. friend will remember, when I mention it, that there have been very great frauds committed on the department. The public has never heard anything about the matter. Perjury has been indulged in, perjury over and over again; frauds have been committed on the country; false and forged invoices have been sent to the department; false oaths have been made and attached to those invoices. The country has never heard anything about them. If those cases were tried in a public way, such as other cases are tried, the fact of the trial would be a deterrent. But it is all settled up in the little office of the head of the department for the time being. He and his assistants sit in judgment; they hear evidence, it may be by affidavit, or it may be some word is whispered in the ear of the head of the department, which may, or may not, be true. Perhaps my hon. friend has heard of the firm of Ryrie & Campbell?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Yes, I thought so. Ryrie & Campbell carried on business in the city of Montreal. Ryrie & Campbell for years defrauded the revenue of this country. They imported goods, or were supposed to have imported goods from a firm called J. Stuart & Co., in the old country. As a matter of fact, they imported no goods from J. Stuart & Co., but they forged the invoices of J. Stuart & Co., in their office in Montreal. Boyd, Ryrie & Co.'s affidavits, I am told, were sworn to by Boyd, the head of the firm. The invoices were in the pigeon-holes of the department, the affidavits were also in those pigeon-holes, the invoices were fictitious, the Government or country have been defrauded out of thousands of dollars. The parties have gone on with their operations for a long time. There were many forged invoices, there were many false affidavits; there were many cases in which Boyd swore to what was not true. The Controller of Customs knew it. Sir, Montreal is a large city, the largest in this Dominion; but it was necessary for Boyd, Ryrie & Co. to go, not to a lawyer in the city of Montreal to defend them before the Customs Department, but they had to go to Toronto and get Mr. Fullerton, my hon. friend's lawyer. Mr. Fullerton defended the case before my hon. friend. Mr. Fullerton is his lawyer, Mr. Fullerton is his friend, and he acted for Boyd, Ryrie & Co. in the little office at the block. Were those men ever prosecuted, were they ever tried for perjury, were they ever tried for forgery? No. Were all the moneys they had defrauded this country out of extracted from them? I venture to say, no.

Mr. WALLACE. You do not know about it.

Mr. LISTER. I know a good deal about it. Was the decision ever published? Did the world at large know that this supposed to be reputable firm of Montreal had been defrauding the Government year after year? No. And why? Because it was tried in

the little office on the hill. The door was shut. My hon. friend's friend was the counsel for Boyd, Ryrie & Co., and the case was argued and decision given. How was it decided ? It would not do for the hon. gentleman to say that no punishment had been inflicted. Some punishment was inflicted. But is it true that the affidavits which would incriminate and convict Boyd of perjury were kept in the department, or were they given back to him so that every trace of his crime could be destroyed, and he should escape the punishment to which his crime entitled him ? Let my hon. friend answer ; let my hon. friend demand a commission if he will. Sir, is that the only case ? Is the poor fellow who has defrauded the revenue out of $10, or $15, or $20 to be punished, and the rich importer rolling in his hundreds of thousands, to get off scot free, and his reputation to be unimpaired because of Fullerton's plea—for what reason, perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us. But is that all ? My hon. friend knows W. W. Ogilvie, of the city of Montreal. I think we have all heard of Mr. Ogilvie, and nobody would dare to say that Ogilvie is not a friend of the Administration. Let us look at this for a few moments. Let us see how this department is managed ; let us see what a perfect system is in vogue in this country. W. W. Ogilvie, miller, of the city of Montreal, I say, has defrauded this country out of thousands of dollars. I asked my hon. friend to ask for a committee. W. W. Ogilvie of Montreal, miller, politician, rich man generally, what do we find about him ? Why, Sir, he imported corn into this country free of duty. He represented, or his man Friday did for him, that the corn had been exported ; that it was imported for export, and in that way he paid no duty upon it. The duty that would have been payable to this country runs up into thousands of dollars. Affidavits were on file in the department that this corn had been imported and exported. The statement that it was exported is false. The corn had not been exported, and the revenue of this country had been defrauded. What did my hon. friend the Controller do with him ? Did he put him into jail as he did poor McGreevy and Arnoldi, and where some others ought to be placed.

An hon. MEMBER. And Watters.

Mr. LISTER. And Watters, the poor fellow, who for four or five hundred dollars is punished and sent to jail for a year or two and is there now. What was done with Ogilvie ? Did he pay any fine ? I know not, but I believe it was very little, if anything. He walked into the little office on the hill. I do not know whether he had a lawyer or not, or if he had who his lawyer was. But I ask my hon. friend the Controller of Customs this : Did he give back the affidavits ? Was the proof of the terrible perjury that had been committed surrendered. Have the men who have committed that perjury been prosecuted, or has the evidence of the crime been destroyed ? These are two cases, and only two. I have more in reserve if my hon. friend wants them.

Mr. FOSTER. Better bring them out, if you have them.

Mr. LISTER. I will bring them out at the proper time. I think that is enough for the present moment. Now, Sir, I say here in the presence of this House : The statements I have made are grave statements. I appreciate my responsibility in making them, and if my hon. friend thinks proper to demand a committee I undertake to give evidence in my possession establishing the statements I have made. These being the facts, is it to be wondered at that the people of this country have no faith in the administration of the Customs Department. Entrusted with the tremendous powers which Parliament has given to the Controller or to the head of that department ; is it any wonder, I say, that influences may be brought to bear which may cause a partial judgment to be rendered ? The Controller may have punished them. He may have inflicted fines, but I say that under the circumstances he had no right to inflict fines. In the face of the fact that wilful and corrupt perjury had been committed his duty was to have prosecuted them before the courts of this country. I say that in taking a fine he compounded the offence. He made himself a party to the crime, because compounding a felony is a felony, and compounding a misdemeanour is a misdemeanour. And if the hon. gentleman knew that these affidavits were false, and if he knew that these invoices were forged, he should have retained possession of the documents and he should have prosecuted the offenders before the courts. Sir, this country is not satisfied with the administration of that department. It is not right that the powers which the law gives to one man should be invested in the head of the department. I care not what the expense is to the country, justice should be done, and our people should feel that they are being dealt with justly in open court where all can see and all can hear. I deprecate as strongly as any man can do, the Star Chamber business which characterizes the judgments of the head of the department and the administration of that department in connection with offences committed against the law. Mr. Chairman, this Bill does not go far enough. There should be a radical reform. The power given to the head of that department should not be continued, either in fairness to him or in justice to the community at large.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the reply which I know my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) is ready to make, I just wish to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) if he is kind enough, to

answer two questions which I will put to him. I do it because he made such statements, that notice must be taken of them. Has he given the Controller of Customs, who is the responsible head of that department, any notice at all, that he was going to bring up these specific charges to-day in order that the Controller of Customs might be ready to give that which the House is certainly fair-minded enough to ask, namely, a reply adequate at the time the charge is made. The second question is, as to whether my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) has lately come into possession of this information, and so late that it was impossible for him to bring such an important matter before the House until within a few days of its prorogation. I simply ask for information, because as I said, notice should be taken of the charges.

Mr. LISTER. I should have thought that the Controller of Customs would have been the proper person to have taken any objection on account of the want of notice. I may say to the leader of the House that the information has lately come into my possession. Moreover, I did not think it was such a case as justified a charge in Parliament against the Controller of Customs, because it cannot be said that the Controller of Customs acted corruptly, and it could only be for corrupt conduct that he could be arraigned by Parliament. In inflicting fines, according to his judgment he may have been perfectly honest in doing that, and yet it may have been not adequate punishment at all for the offences that have been committed. I did not know until a few moments before I came into the House that this matter was before the House. I intended to have brought it up in Committee of Supply, but as it was so close to the end of the session, I thought there might be no further opportunity of doing it, and I made up my mind to make the statement I did to-day.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) has made statements which he has attempted in his later remarks to minimize, and which if true would unfit me for being a member of this House, or associating with honest men. He got that information, and he has got it, from a man who is to-day a convict in the public institutions of this country. It bears every evidence of that, and I think I shall demonstrate it to the satisfaction of this House before I sit down. I shall demonstrate also that so far as those remarks apply to me, or to any alleged corrupt or improper act on my part, that there is not a particle of foundation for them, and that every statement the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) has made in that respect is a slander against me. Sir, what are the facts? Information was communicated to the department that some wrong-doing had been going on in connection with the firm of Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell, stationers, of Montreal, and an investigation was made. The hon. gentleman only a few moments before spoke of this arbitrary, despotic Department of Customs going into men's houses without authority, and looking over their invoices and books. If he had taken the trouble to look at the law, which he has not done, he would have seen that we have no such authority, and that no such authority can be legally exercised.

Mr. LISTER. Then it was done without authority?

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman can tell of a single case——

Mr. LISTER. I can tell of twenty cases.

Mr. WALLACE. Then he would be only too glad, as a lawyer, to criminally prosecute them. What is the law?

> Whenever information has been given under oath to any officer of customs that goods or other things have been unlawfully imported or entered, or whenever any goods have been seized or detained, under any of the provisions of this Act, or of any law relating to customs, the importer or exporter thereof, or the owner or claimant thereof, shall immediately, upon being required so to do by a collector or other proper officer of customs, produce and hand over all invoices, bills, accounts and statements of the goods so imported, entered, seized or detained, and of all other goods imported into Canada by him at any time within six years.

A writ is given only to responsible officers, and they must have the oath of a reputable citizen of Canada that such has been done.

Mr. LISTER. That is not done.

Mr. WALLACE. Then the hon. gentleman, as a lawyer, should know what the law is, and should secure the punishment of those who break the law. After a most diligent investigation, we found that Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell had been committing frauds upon the revenue for a series of years—as the hon. gentleman stated, both by fictitious invoices, and by false affidavits. The hon. gentleman said that we let them go scot free.

Mr. LISTER. I did not.

Mr. WALLACE. That statement is false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman said in one place that we let them go scot free, and, in another place, he said: "Were they punished? No." I say, yes, and the man who says no does not know what he is talking about. We went into a full and most exhaustive investigation, occupying days and weeks, carried on by competent and responsible men, and we found that that firm had been extensively defrauding the revenue. We are satisfied that the whole responsibility of the wrong-doing was with Boyd. Ryrie was a traveller in the west, and Campbell a traveller in Montreal. I do not believe that Campbell—who, unfortunately, committed suicide just at the

time the investigation was made—had any knowledge whatever of the wrongs perpetrated by Boyd; neither had Ryrie; and I think the evidence will justify that statement. We were not able to place our hand upon a line that would indicate that either of these men had personal knowledge of the wrong-doing. In every step of the investigation I was guided by the advice of the late Premier and Minister of Justice, Sir John Thompson. Every step was taken under his direct advice. We ascertained that the Government had been defrauded to the amount of $4,844.

Mr. LISTER. As far as you could find out?

Mr. WALLACE. As far as we could find out, and as far as any one could find out; for we made a most exhaustive investigation. The men trying to get at the facts were men who were to have a share of the proceeds—but not as great a share as they would like—and who were anxious to find out every dollar of which the Government had been defrauded. And what was the penalty? The hon. gentleman said: "How much did the Government get? Was all the money of which these men defrauded the Government returned? No." I say yes; and the penalty I imposed—a penalty equal to three times the amount of unpaid duty—was $14,448: and every dollar of that money was collected and paid to the Government. Therefore, I say it is a slander to say that we were acting in collusion with any one, or doing anything improper. I was told that the penalty bankrupted the firm; but we did not care for that. The hon. gentleman said this firm defrauded the Government, made false invoices, and false affidavits; and I believe they did. He said they had lawyers in Montreal, but the lawyers in Montreal were not consulted—they went to my friend, Mr. Fullerton, of Toronto. Well, Sir, Mr. Fullerton is a friend of mine, both politically and personally, and there is no lawyer in this country who has a cleaner or straighter record; and if the hon. member for West Lambton has as good a record as Mr. Fullerton, he may consider himself a happy and fortunate man. Mr. Fullerton was recently appointed solicitor of the corporation of Toronto, and he is a gentleman who stands high in the estimation of the men who know him. I invite the hon. gentleman to go over the correspondence, private and public—I will not keep back a line—and if he finds a word there which an honourable man should not have written, or a single thing done by me which a man, acting judicially, as I was, should not have done, I will step out, not only from my position as Controller of Customs but from my seat in the House of Commons. A report was made by my commissioner, pointing out the wrong-doing of this firm; and what was my action:

Ottawa, 30th January, 1894.

Right Hon. Sir John S. D. Thompson,
Premier, Minister of Justice, &c., Ottawa.

Dear Sir John,—I inclose you customs file No. 4386 of 1893, covering the documents submitted in connection with the seizure made from Messrs. Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell, of Montreal. Attached to the same is the report of my Acting Commissioner, Mr. Watters. I submit the whole matter for whatever action you may consider advisable to take.

That is in regard to a criminal prosecution, for here is the report of Mr. Watters, in which he sets out all the information which the hon. gentleman has been so well able to give.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman read shortly the substance of that report?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is impossible to try the case here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In order to understand the hon. gentleman's statement, we ought to know just what the frauds of this firm were, as stated by the commissioner.

Mr. WALLACE. The report was the charge stated by the hon. member for West Lambton—forgeries, fictitious invoices, and false affidavits. I submitted the whole matter to the Department of Justice for whatever action they may consider it advisable to take. In this letter it is further stated:

It seems to be clear that Andrew Boyd, the senior partner of the firm, has been guilty of defrauding the revenue by writing out false invoices, making false declarations, and possibly of forgery. I might add that, in my opinion, these acts were not known to the junior members of the firm, Messrs. Ryrie and Campbell. From the evidence, it appears that Mr. Ryrie was travelling through the country, and Mr. Campbell was apparently doing the travelling for the city of Montreal. Therefore, no blame would attach to them personally for the various illegal acts committed.

Does that bear out the statement of the hon. gentleman that I let that man go off scot free or that I did not retain possession of some documents which would have proved the guilt of those men? Well, Sir, every document that I received, every document that had reference to this matter, so far as I know, is in the possession of the Customs Department to-day. I challenge the hon. gentleman to make a single document that ever was returned, with my knowledge, or sent to anybody not entitled to receive it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the date of the letter from the hon. gentleman to the Minister of Justice?

Mr. WALLACE. 30th January, 1894.

Mr. MULOCK. Was Boyd prosecuted?

Mr. WALLACE. Not that I know.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was anybody prosecuted ?

Mr. WALLACE. Not that I know of. So far as I am concerned, my duty began and ended there. I submitted to the Department of Justice this letter and all the documents, I submitted this report made by the Commissioner of Customs, and gave all the reasons why I thought criminal prosecution should be made in this case.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was there any report of the Justice Department ?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not see any.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman know of any ? It is inconceivable that a matter of this importance should be dropped.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must remember that this charge has been brought up without any notice at all to my hon. friend, and he cannot be expected to have everything.

Mr. CASEY. He seems to have pretty nearly everything.

Mr. WALLACE. No thanks to the hon. gentleman on the other side.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman did not object to my question, and the documents are under his hands.

Mr. WALLACE. I have not had the opportunity of looking through every document.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman had said he could not say whether there was a report or not, that would have been quite satisfactory.

Mr. WALLACE. I stated that I had not seen anything. I repeat, first, that a penalty was imposed of three times the amount of the unpaid duty ; secondly, that I placed the full facts before the Department of Justice for whatever action the department might think proper to take on the premises ; and thirdly, that there is not one word of truth in the statement with reference to Mr. Fullerton. Mr. Fullerton was here yesterday, and I asked him about that case, as a notice was given on the Order paper. And the hon. gentleman, when his motion came up, was not man enough to move it and have it discussed in proper time.

Mr. LISTER. I never had the opportunity.

Mr. WALLACE. It was called in my notice, and the Speaker ordered it to be dropped, but the hon. gentleman had it again put on the paper, and then was not man enough to take it up.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman knows that I was not in the House or in the city.

Mr. WALLACE. I was authorized by Mr. Fullerton yesterday to say that he never saw Mr. Boyd, that he never knew Mr. Boyd, that he never had been communicated with by Mr. Boyd in any legal capacity whatever, that he had nothing to do with Mr. Boyd, and, so far as this matter is concerned, he never had any transaction with Mr. Boyd.

Mr. McCARTHY. Who was Mr. Fullerton acting for ?

Mr. WALLACE. For Mr. Ryrie, who was a Toronto man, whose centre of business is in Toronto, and whose legal business Mr. Fullerton had been doing for years. But notwithstanding all that, hon. gentlemen opposite can repeat their slanders in this House, and without giving notice attempt to defame men's characters. Mr. Fullerton told me yesterday that he never saw Boyd, never knew him, never acted for him legally, but was acting for Mr. Ryrie, an old friend of his living in Toronto, which is the centre of his business. These are the facts of the case and the correspondence with Mr. Fullerton is there. He never referred to Mr. Boyd, never asked that anything should be settled or done for or against Mr. Boyd that I know of, but wrote certain facts to the department, which he had a perfect right to do on behalf of his client ; but notwithstanding that, the penalty imposed was not changed, but a penalty amounting to three times the amount of unpaid duties was imposed. I think I have disposed of all the statements made by Mr. Campbell with reference to the case of Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I asked a question a moment ago, and the leader of the House suggested it was hardly fair to expect the Controller to answer, as he had not been given notice, but I find that my hon. friend from Lambton has had his notice on the Order paper since the 11th of June, asking for copies of all the papers. The hon. Controller therefore cannot complain that he has not had ample notice, and I would ask him again whether after he communicated the facts to Sir John Thompson, in January, 1894, the hon. gentleman or his department took any steps to ascertain whether prosecutions were instituted against anybody for these frauds ?

Mr. WALLACE. I can recollect conversations with the department, but I do not think there is anything here with reference to that. So far as my department is concerned, we gave a full representation of the criminal side of the question to the Department of Justice, in order that the Department of Justice might take any action they thought proper. Now, the hon. gentleman was not satisfied with this case, but brought up another one in which he says Mr. Ogilvie, a miller, defrauded the Government of thousands of dollars. He says that affida-

vits were made that certain flour was imported and exported in order that drawback might be paid. No such affidavits were received, and none such were required. The hon. gentleman has not read the law. The law is that when corn is manufactured into cornmeal for human use, there shall be a rebate of 90 per cent of the duty.

Mr. LISTER. What about cattle feed for export ?

Mr. WALLACE. The affidavits required are that this corn was used for human food. I must say that this rebate given is not a very satisfactory one, and recently I appointed a corn inspector, a portion of whose duties it is to go round to those cornmeal mills and make investigations into their operations. That inspector is to-day investigating in this locality. That is done in order to prevent public money being improperly paid out. I have taken every precaution possible to secure the revenue of this country against improper payments, and the statement that I have given any concessions to Messrs. Ogilvie & Co. is not true. No concessions have been given at all.

Mr. LISTER. What are the facts ?

Mr. WALLACE. I would not give the facts in a case upon which I have not come to a conclusion, but the hon. gentleman is quite willing to make statements concerning matters of which he knows nothing. Mr. Ogilvie, so far as I can remember, has never been in my office since I came into it.

Mr. LISTER. When was the charge made ?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know. This afternoon is the first time I have heard of it.

Mr. CASEY. You say you are investigating it. When was it made?

Mr. WALLACE. How can I tell ? I have not a single paper here with reference to it.

Mr. CASEY. You have plenty of papers there.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes ; and it is a good thing I have, or those slanders might have gone unanswered. The hon. gentleman says that we have the power to appoint spies ; to go into business houses. We do not appoint spies ; we do not send men into business houses, but with proper authority to go into those houses—with the oath of a reputable citizen of Canada detailing some wrong against the customs of Canada, some wrong against the revenue of the country. Then, and then only can we go into a business house and demand an investigation. And we only give that work into the hands of men who are competent to make an investigation, men who will do their duty as gentlemen—do their duty to the men accused and their duty to their country. The hon. gentleman says that business men cannot get replies to their letters for weeks and months.

Mr. LISTER. That is what the papers say.

Mr. WALLACE. What paper ?

Mr. LISTER. The Montreal "Pharmaceutical Journal."

Mr. WALLACE. There is not one word of truth in that statement, so far as I know, We have a staff there to attend to the business of the department ; and as I have said, I have scores of letters from the leading business men of this country expressing satisfaction with the prompt way in which the business of the Department of Customs is conducted. The hon. gentleman says further that we sent men to the United States to harass and oppress these poor innocent American manufacturers.

Mr. LISTER. No ; I said you sent men to the United States in order to be able to harass the Canadian dealer.

Mr. WALLACE. Not a bit of it. These men selling American goods deliver them in Canada duty free ; so it makes no difference to the Canadian dealer whether the duty is 20 or 30 per cent, or, as far as the duty is concerned, whether the price is $4 or $6 a dozen. These gentlemen are very solicitous about this matter. I do not say that they have fees from the American manufacturers in their pockets, because I have not full evidence on that point. But when you see men earning a fee from American manufacturers, you may pretty safely come to some conclusion in the matter. These men come here and say the American manufacturers are harassed.

Mr. LISTER. I did not say so.

Mr. WALLACE. We say that these American manufacturers have come to Canada with invoices showing a less price than the goods are selling for in the open market in the United States, prices, therefore, that should not and cannot be the prices fixed for customs duty. We object to these prices. We have taken every proper means to ascertain the correct prices. The hon. gentleman says we employ men in the same line of business. That is the only way we can get men for this service.

Mr. MULOCK. Are there no experts who are not in business ?

Mr. WALLACE. No ; not that I know of. If a man has made his fortune and retired from business, he has ceased to be an expert, because he has got out of touch with the business. I do not know of any man who is an expert in these matter who is not in the business. I repeat what I said at the beginning, that the Department of Customs will challenge investigation into all their management and conduct of the

customs business of the country. Upon any charge that has been made or any charge that these hon. gentlemen can make, I am ready at any time to meet them.

Mr. HUGHES. I have one word to say in connection with this matter, in justice to my friend Mr. Fullerton. A statement was made by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) which impugns the honour of Mr. Fullerton and of the Controller of Customs. The statement was made by the hon. member for West Lambton that he had no knowledge of these transactions of Boyd, Ryrie and Campbell until recently. It is almost two months——

Mr. LISTER. No.

Mr. HUGHES—it is at least several weeks since, in my presence, the hon. member for West Lambton was told by Mr. Fullerton that he had been Mr. Ryrie's solicitor long anterior to this case coming up. Mr. Fullerton not only told the hon. gentleman that, but he informed him what fee he had received. I am satisfied that the hon. member for West Lambton, standing in his place to-day, has not conducted himself as he should as a member of this Parliament.

Mr. LISTER. So far as the Controller of Customs is concerned, he does not seem to have been taken very much at a disadvantage on account of want of notice, for he evidently has the full file of papers connected with the Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell matter.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him ?

Mr. LISTER. Certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. These papers were in my office until the hon. gentleman brought this matter up in the House ; and I did not look at them until I rose to speak.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Fullerton told me at the time of the conversation in Osgoode Hall to which my hon. friend refers, that he had received a letter from the Controller of Customs in regard to this very matter. So it appears that, so far back as that, notice was given to the hon. gentleman. Is it true that Mr. Fullerton had this letter ? If it is, the hon. gentleman could hardly say that he has not had notice that some sort of investigation would take place in connection with this matter. Now, my hon. friend talks about Mr. Fullerton. I have said nothing against Mr. Fullerton. He is an acquaintance and, I hope, a friend of mine. He is a lawyer in practice in Toronto ; and if Boyd, Ryrie & Co. like to go to Toronto and employ Mr. Fullerton, or Mr. McCarthy or anybody else, they have a perfect right to do so. And Mr. Fullerton is justified in taking their money, and if he can win his case, he is doing what his clients want him to do. But here is an extraordinary thing : My hon. friend says that Boyd is the guilty party ; that he is satisfied that Ryrie and Campbell were innocent men. But Ryrie and Campbell profited by the transaction, and Ryrie was the man who employed the counsel. Were they made to suffer any penalty ? The hon. gentleman may say, as he has said, that he imposed a fine to the amount of three times the estimated loss to the revenue. But does he think he has got to the bottom of it ? The hon. gentleman says that I asserted that these men went scot free. Does he intend to say that I said no penalty was inflicted by the Customs Department ? What I said was that they went scot free of criminal prosecution ; and so they did. The hon. Controller states that he does not know that these affidavits were returned.

Mr. WALLACE. What affidavits ?

Mr. LISTER. The false affidavits sworn to by Boyd. Will he pledge himself to this House that those affidavits were not returned——

Mr. WALLACE. I will.

Mr. LISTER—by somebody in his department ?

Mr. WALLACE. I will. Unless they were stolen from the department.

Mr. LISTER. Are they now in the department ?

Mr. WALLACE. I think so. They are in the department unless they have been stolen.

An hon. MEMBER. Who would steal them ?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman's friends most likely.

Mr. LISTER. These affidavits, these forged invoices, were in the department.

Mr. WALLACE. And are there yet. Does the hon. gentleman say they are not there yet ?

Mr. LISTER. Ah, the hon. gentleman does not know.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. member (Mr. Lister) know ?

Mr. LISTER. I know nothing about it, except from the information I have received.

Mr. WALLACE. Those which have not been stolen by the hon. gentleman's friends are there yet.

Mr. LISTER. It is only from the information I have received that I know anything about it at all, and my information, I think, is reasonably correct. These men have defrauded the Government of this country, and my hon. friend himself says that three times the amount of revenue which they found had been lost to the country. But he did not prosecute the man who had committed perjury over and over again for years. Why is it, if he had stolen, accord-

ing to the story of my hon. friend, over $4,000, and had sworn to false affidavits, and had committed perjury, and forgery, and fraud—how is it that he has allowed this man to go on for all these years without any prosecution? He says the matter was handed over to the Department of Justice. It is very strange. Usually in the dealings between the Department of Justice and the other departments, there is a correspondence about the cases which have been transferred from one department to the other; but remarkable as it may appear, there is no correspondence here except the one letter transferring it to the department. What took place after that was in the way of conversation and not by correspondence. My hon. friend says that this Government do not appoint spies. I say they do. I say that in my own town they went into nearly every store and demanded the invoices; I say that in Windsor they went into nearly every store and demanded the invoices; and yet, according to the story of my hon. friend, it was necessary that these officers should have a warrant from the department for every one of the places they visited.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you call a spy?

Mr. LISTER. I say they went to private houses without number, and demanded from the women of the house, large and small, sums of money for alleged infractions of the customs law—in Windsor and other places along the border. Now, my hon. friend tells us that so far as Mr. Ogilvie was concerned, his case was under investigation. How long has it been under investigation? How long is it since my hon. friend commenced to investigate the alleged fraud committed by Ogilvie upon the country? Was it a year ago? Was it two years ago? Was it three years ago? I would like to know, because I am somewhat curious to find out how far this investigation has gone. Has the hon. gentleman yet satisfied himself that W. W. Ogilvie has defrauded the revenue to any extent at all? Has he yet satisfied himself that false affidavits were put into his department on file? Is he satisfied that these affidavits are false? These are all questions which my hon. friend ought to be prepared to answer.

Mr. WALLACE. So far as the Ogilvies are concerned, it was a case where they made application for a refund, that the law allows in certain cases.

Mr. LISTER. Had they to make an affidavit?

Mr. WALLACE. They had applied for that money, and I presume they made affidavits. He refused to pay the money, and the Government is protected by having the money in the hands of the Receiver General?

Mr. LISTER. Are the affidavits on file?

Mr. WALLACE. Why, of course. Does the hon. gentleman, in asking me if the affidavits are on file, mean to say that there is a parcel of thieves around the Customs Department stealing everything they can find? Since his friend went away, I think there is no danger of anything of that kind.

Mr. LISTER. If these men are entitled to a refund, how is it that my hon. friend puts it into the hands of the Receiver General? Why does he not pay it back to the Ogilvies?

Mr. FOSTER. Does he have the money in his pocket?

Mr. LISTER. Who?

Mr. FOSTER. One of your friends, as you call him?

Mr. LISTER. What do you mean?

Mr. FOSTER. And he paid it over to the Receiver General.

Mr. LISTER. The Controller of Customs can take care of himself. My hon. friend stated that the charge against Mr. Ogilvie was being investigated. I asked him how far that investigation had proceeded, and whether any affidavits were put into his department from Mr. Ogilvie, or from any man in his employ, which he has reason to think were not true. These are questions in regard to which the hon. gentleman ought to inform the House. If he does not, of course he is at liberty to refuse.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend a question? If he made any charge at all, or implied any charge with reference to the second case, it was that Mr. Ogilvie was guilty of fraud.

Mr. LISTER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, that he stole what he should not have got from the public revenue. When the hon. gentleman comes to rawl out at the small end of the horn, toward which he has been diligently moving during the last half hour, he now bases a charge on a matter of rebate for which application has been made by Mr. Ogilvie. The money, which, if it be proved to be payable, will be paid, has never been in the Controller's hands, has never been in Mr. Ogilvie's hands, has never been proved due Mr. Ogilvie, but is money that belongs to the consolidated revenue fund, and stays there until Mr. Ogilvie's claim is substantiated, and the order is made for its payment. That is fraud! that is perjury! and my hon. friend is guilty of everything else than what is becoming of a public officer because, for instance, he has abetted alleged fraud in the case of Mr. Ogilvie. My hon. friend's (Mr. Lister) position needs no comment other than his own actions and his own words here this afternoon.

Mr. KENNY. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister), during the course of the very violent attack which he has made upon the Controller of Customs, had to admit that the Controller of Customs was very well able to take care of himself. I think we have had ample evidence this afternoon that the Controller of Customs is very well able to take care of the revenue of Canada. Those amongst us who have any experience in business matters, and who live in commercial communities, know that the relations between importers and the Department of Customs are not always of a satisfactory character; and I think that the embarrassment is largely due to the fact that the rulings of the appraisers at the different ports conflict sometimes with the facts of the case. That fact must have come under the notice of every man who represents a commercial community—I mean that the appraisers at these different ports sometimes impose a rate of duty which would seem to me to be indicative of their want of knowledge of the business in which they are engaged. But I must say this, that to my knowledge, when appeals have been made from the local appraisers to the Department of Customs, the decision has been, I won't say always, but generally, a fair and just decision, which has met the approval of the importers. During the course of the attack which the hon. member for Lambton made upon the Controller of Customs, he says that importers, in their visit to the little office on the hill, whispered to the hon. Controller of Customs, and that certain extraordinary results were thereby obtained. I must say that I myself have had to visit the little office on the hill, and I never went there but that I was very courteously received, and that immediate attention was not given to any public business which I had to place before the Controller of Customs. Considering the onerous duties which he has to discharge in administering a Customs Department whose business stretches from one side of this great country to the other, I have been surprised at the amount of information which the Controller possessed of the different cases, which was absolute proof of the great attention and the great industry and vigilance with which he discharges the duties of his office. I must say that if I had ever had any political ambition, I think the last position I would care to occupy would be that of Controller of Customs of the Dominion of Canada, because that hon. gentleman is necessarily, from the faithful discharge of his duties, brought into unpleasant relations frequently with importers. That is not his individual fault, but it is due to the fact that over a country of this vast extent he has a number of officers all of whom are not always au fait with their duties, and the whole responsibility and blame fall upon the Minister for the administration of the department. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) seemed to make a strong point of the fact that there had not been more correspondence between the Department of Customs and the Department of Justice. That hon. gentleman has heard no doubt that in the case of Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell, a penalty amounting to three times the amount of which the customs were defrauded had been collected from that firm. So far the Department of Customs, no doubt, thought they discharged their duty when they secured the payment of this large penalty, and further proceedings were left to be initiated by the Department of Justice. The Controller of Customs is known throughout Canada as a most useful and efficient officer.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 139) for the relief of Julia Ethel Chute (on a division).—(Mr. Taylor.)

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RAILWAY.

Mr. COATSWORTH moved second reading of amendments made to Bill (No. 34) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved that the amendments be not now read a second time, but that the Bill be referred back to Committee with instructions to strike out clause 12 of the last section of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill re-committed, amended, and reported.

Mr. COATSWORTH moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee for the purpose of adding the following clause:—

That nothing in this Act contained, or in the Railway Act or amendments thereof, shall allow any rate of fare for way passengers greater than 2 cents a mile to be charged over the track or tracks of the said Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.

He said: I propose to divide the House to-night on this question, and I hope the discussion will not be long, so that the Bill may get through, and at the same time that we may have an expression of opinion with regard to the issue which I have read. My reason for proposing to insert this clause in the Bill, is in the first place, because this is a New York Central line, or in other words a Vanderbilt line, and the Vanderbilt lines in the state of New York have a two-

cent a mile clause governing them. The clause regulating traffic on the New York Central lines in the state of New York, reads as follows :—

But nothing in this Act shall allow any rate of fare for way passengers greater than 2 cents per mile to be charged over the track or tracks of that railroad now known as the New York Central Railway Company. And the rate of fare for way passengers, over the track or tracks now operated by the New York Central Railway Company, shall be 2 cents per mile, and no more whatever.

In proof of the fact that this railway to which we are now giving this franchise is a Vanderbilt line, I purpose reading an extract from an interview with Mr. Beckley, who is one of the promoters of this Bill. Mr. Beckley informed the Hamilton "Spectator" on 26th May, as follows :—

Mr. Beckley corroborated the rumour that an agreement had been made whereby the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway becomes part of the Vanderbilt system. "When the by-law was before the people, said Mr. Beckley to the reporter, I could tell them that the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo, when completed, would be a part of the Vanderbilt system."

If the Vanderbilt system can give the people of the state of New York a two-cent a mile railway fare, why can they not give it to the people of Ontario when they come over to that province, and ask to share the business. The proposition that I make is a fair one, and I believe that Canadians are justified in demanding from the Vanderbilt line equal treatment to that which they give their patrons in New York State. There is no reason why the Vanderbilt people should discriminate against Ontario, but there is every reason why this Parliament should see that a great corporation, such as that, should at least do equal justice to our people. Another reason why this railway should give the people a cheaper rate than has been given heretofore, is the fact that this road runs through the most populous portion of Ontario, and that there is little or no competition against it. Not only does it run through a flourishing part of the country, but it is between the two great cities of Toronto and Buffalo, and passes the flourishing city of Hamilton and along the Niagara Falls, which is the greatest tourist centre in America. Then, it runs through a country where railroad construction can be very cheaply carried out. The company got for nothing an entrance into the city of Toronto, which otherwise would have cost them several millions of dollars perhaps. They have a bonus given them by the city of Hamilton, and they have free right of way all around the Falls, and free right of way into the city of Buffalo. The road, therefore, will cost them comparatively a very small amount. Again, railway construction is very much less expensive than it was forty years ago when the three-cent per mile rate came into force. Railroads can be built for half, perhaps, one-third of what they cost thirty years ago or twenty years ago, and if the cost of railway construction has come down, why should not the tolls that the railways take from passengers be correspondingly reduced. Another proof of the value of this franchise is the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway Company have double tracked their road between Hamilton and Toronto. They have found it profitable, and there are more trains running on that piece of road than on any other portion of the system in Canada. The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo realize that this is a very valuable franchise, because they have already stated that they propose to double track the entire road between Toronto and Buffalo. The best instance of the success of a two-cent a mile rate is in the case of the New York Central road itself. It has now four tracks. It has any amount of competition, but it is able to overcome that competition. It is the best railroad in America, perhaps in the world. It is a railroad that pays its dividends with the greatest regularity, a railroad that has the best future before it, and a railroad that is earning more and more every year and getting in better condition.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) the statistics for two or three cents before the introduction of a two-cent a mile rate, and the statistics of passenger traffic since the rate ?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I have already read it to the House, and it shows that the New York Central people are eminently satisfied with the two-cent rate. They have never sought to have it reduced, and they have forced all other railways to adopt that rate.

Mr. COCKBURN. On what part of the New York Central does the two-cent a mile rate obtain ?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). On all that portion of the road in the State of New York.

Mr. COCKBURN. I beg your pardon——

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I have already read the clause of their Act which provides for that. I will now read a telegram from a prominent official of the New York Central Railway, which says :

Answering your telegram of this date (26th June), New York State law fixes local rate on New York Central main line, 2 cents per mile. No other trunk line in New York State has this rate locally, but, of course, they make the same rate to competing points.

I wish to read another extract which proves the success of cheap railway travel and which was published in one of the leading railroad papers the other day. It concerns a railway system which I have cited before this House, viz. : the State Railways of Austria. The extract is short and I hope the House will listen to me while I read it :

The Austrian state railroads comprise 5,238 miles, which is a little more than one-half the total railway mileage of that country. A few years ago the government introduced a so-called zone system for governing passenger rates. Under this system the rate to any place within a given district is the same, whether the distance travelled be 5 miles or 20. The rate advances according to the number of zones through which the passenger travels. The average rate charged per passenger per mile in 1894 was ·997 cent, a fraction less than 1 cent. In spite of this low rate, the business of the government railways continues to increase. The gross earnings for 1894 were 9·3 per cent greater than 1893, and the net earnings 15·7 per cent greater. The profits were at the rate of 2·7 per cent on the capital invested, against 2·52 per cent in 1893. It should also be mentioned that the freight rate that prevailed in 1894 was the lowest on record in the history of the country, being nearly 6 per cent below that of 1893. Here we have pretty strong evidence that low passenger rates do not necessarily mean diminished income for the railway. On the contrary, the evidence of the Austrian lines goes to prove that the receipts have increased in proportion to the reduction of the rate.

Now, this franchise which these gentlemen seek in this Act of incorporation, is the most valuable franchise which we have granted to any railway company for a long time, and if it is, it is our duty to impose such conditions in that franchise as will be for the benefit of the people who use the railroad. Why should we give away so valuable a franchise without getting something for it? In the various cities of this continent, very valuable franchises exist in connection with street railway traffic, and the municipal corporations which control these franchises regulate them. The corporation fixes the rates of fare to be charged on the railway, and then puts up the franchise at public competition. The result is that the municipal corporation not only receives money for the franchise, but insists upon the company which obtains it giving the people reduced rates of travel. People ask, why should the Government interfere to compel the companies to reduce their rates? The answer is that the companies, if left to themselves would never reduce the rates. We would never have had the benefit of low street railway fares, which we have in Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, and other cities, if we had not insisted on the conditions we have. The people have been able to get the benefits they enjoy only by legislation—not by concessions on the part of the companies. The companies have never made any concessions to the people without being forced to do it. In proof of that, I wish to read, for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite a short extract from the Toronto "Globe," which, discussing this question the other day, said:

If an unbroken succession of failures can prove anything, it has already proved that the natural force of competition, though potent to maintain the even balance of prices and charges in ordinary commerce and industry, cannot be made to operate in railway transportation.

The estimate of a railway manager is, that there would be an annual saving of $200,000,000 if the railways of the United States were managed as a unit. Combination, absorption, or mutual understanding, invariably restores the monopoly, and the people are made to pay the full cost of their experiment. Competition is obviously impossible, and there is no safeguard for the public interest except effective governmental supervision.

That is the opinion of the "Globe," the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is a sound opinion—that you will never get a reduction of railway rates unless by legislation regulating the railway corporations. The "Globe" goes on to say:

The cost of railway construction has been greatly reduced since the present 3-cent rate was established. Mechanical inventions have doubtless lessened the expense of operation; and, while freight charges have been reduced steadily, passenger rates have remained unchanged. Has the reduction in cost been absorbed by free passes and reductions to favoured passengers? This is a question in which the public are interested. On the nation's highways all should be on an equality. If some secure favours, it must be at the expense of others More than half of the Canadian passenger traffic is at specially favourable rates. This is obviously unfair to those who pay what may be called specially high rates, and the injustice calls for legislative reform.

Now, it has been urged that, in proposing this reduction I am dealing with one company, whereas I ought to bring in a general law dealing with all companies. My answer to that is that I attempted to do that in this House two or three years ago, and I was then told: "Your proposal is unfair to those railways which run through unsettled portions of the country, to new railroads, and to railroads built at a very high cost." I now take at their word those who urged that objection, and I say, here is a corporation owned by people who give the 2-cent rate in the state of New York, who have found that rate a profitable one, and who are proposing to build a line through the most populous portion of Ontario, which is today without railway competition. That being the case, now is the time to take this matter in hand and place such a condition in this charter as will secure for the public the same benefit on this company's Canadian line, and do the company no harm whatever. The company will make money, because it will command the travel. It will be backed up, as we are told, by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the New York Central, and the Canada Southern; it has plenty of money; and there is no reason why it cannot take this franchise and make money out of it, and, at the same time, confer a great and lasting benefit on the people. We ought, by our example, to-night to show that we believe these railroads can be compelled to do justice to the people; but that can only be done by legislative interference.

Mr. MULOCK. Could the hon. gentleman inform the House when the law was passed limiting the New York Central to 2 cents a mile?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Fifteen or more years ago.

Mr. COATSWORTH. If the arguments of the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution are at all sound, it is somewhat surprising that this road has had so much difficulty in making its way. The charter was granted first about ten or twelve years ago, and if the financial success of the road was so sure as the hon. gentleman would lead us to suppose, the company surely would not have had the difficulties they have had to get even a portion of the road built. As a matter of fact, the road is chartered for 120 miles, and up to the present time, the company have been able to build only thirty-four miles. I must say, from my knowledge and experience of the road, that the enterprise would be entirely paralyzed if this resolution should be carried to-night. It is all very well to speak of the satisfactory arrangements the company have made, but these arrangements are merely in contemplation. They are not yet arrangements, in fact; and one of the first results of the passage of a resolution such as my hon. friend has moved would be that none of the companies which have made traffic arrangements with this road would be prepared to carry them out, but would at once give them up. So that it would be one of the best methods we could adopt to paralyze the building of this road. Now, we have imposed a heavy liability on the road already this session—a liability which I understand amounts to $50,000 and for which the company were not responsible, but we thought, in the interests of the people who have been taking part of the construction of the road, that the liability ought to be imposed upon them and that was done. It would be unfair to hamper an enterprise which has the support and sympathy, apart from actual financial support, of the people in the neighbourhood through which it is going to run, and I feel quite sure that if we were to attach this clause to its charter, the company would not be able to carry out the enterprise at all. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to compare this part of the country with certain parts of New York State. It may be that the facts and circumstances justify, between New York and Albany, the imposition of only a 2-cent rate, which do not exist in Ontario; and it would be exceedingly unfair to single out one road, as the hon. gentleman does, and impose on it the obligation of carrying passengers at 2 cents per mile, when all the other roads are charging 3 cents or more. We know very well, from our own experience, the difficulties these companies have in constructing their lines, and it would be impossible for this company to carry out the enterprise at all if we were to attach this condition to the building of the road. The hon. gentleman says that this is the part of the Vanderbilt system and a part of the New York Central. I wish to correct that statement. It is only in a small measure accurate, because it is not really the fact that this road is part of the Vanderbilt system or of the New York Central; but the fact is that over this road, which will be 120 miles in length, the New York Central will, for a short distance, have traffic arrangements with the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway. Unless we can have the charter put through without this condition, I am satisfied that no such arrangement will be carried out. I do not wish to take up the time of the House, as I am exceedingly anxious to have the matter disposed of to-night, and I will just close by saying that I think the hon. gentleman had better cease attacking individual roads; and if he wishes to bring about this reform in the railway system of Canada, he ought to bring in a Bill to amend the Railway Act. Let him tackle the Government and the Department of Railways and Canals, and then he will perhaps be able to have at least a fair discussion; and I feel sure the hon. gentleman knows it is impossible for him to get a fair discussion of this question when he is attacking one particular road.

Mr. FRASER. I have a good deal of sympathy with the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), but in this particular case, notwithstanding my sympathy with the general principle, I am bound to oppose the hon. gentleman for two reasons. First, I do not think it is fair we should attach a condition of that kind to any single company seeking incorporation here; and secondly, I raised in this House the question of the unpaid labourers, and the company have accepted, in the Bill now before us, the obligation to secure payment to these labourers and the furnishers of material already used in the construction of the railway. I think therefore, it would be ungenerous to impose this further condition upon this company. I think that if we apply a condition such as the hon. gentleman proposes on any company, it should be on a company which we do not compel, in the first place, to pay $50,000; and, as growing out of this, I do not wish to impose a condition of this kind which would so harass the company as to prevent the unpaid labourers from getting paid for the work they have already done. That is the primary matter I think we should have in view. The company is going to pay out $50,000 or $60,000 to the labourers. When we are asked to deal with the general question, I will then assist the hon. member, but as regards this special case I am opposed to his motion.

Mr. COCKBURN. As one of the representatives of Toronto, I am naturally interested

in the success of the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, which will connect the cities of Toronto and Hamilton and open a new avenue of trade to the Queen city of the west. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) bases his argument mainly on the assertion that there is a 2-cent rate on the New York Central Railway. He will allow me perhaps to read to him a quotation from a speech delivered before the assembled railway managers of the United States. The quotation is as follows :—

While the question of the enactment of a law fixing a 2-cent rate per mile as the maximum charge for the carrying of a passenger, has for several years and in several states been the subject of discussion, no such law has been passed by any state. I am aware that the impression exists that such a law is effective in New York and Michigan, and I desire briefly to explain the foundation for this impression.

It is the same false impression under which my hon. friend labours :

The statutes of New York permit generally the rate of 3 cents per mile, but on many roads through the more-sparsely settled portions of the state a much higher rate is authorized. The only exception to the rate of 3 cents or higher is the New York Central and Hudson River Road, and this rate applies only to passengers on one part of the road, viz., that part of the road between Buffalo and Albany. The statutes limit the fare from any intermediate station to Albany, or from any intermediate station to Buffalo, or from any intermediate station to any other intermediate station between Buffalo and Albany, to 2 cents per mile. This rule does not apply from Buffalo station to Albany or to any station on the same road in the state of New York beyond Albany. This rate was fixed something more than forty years ago.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKBURN. Yes, forty years ago, and it has been so tested that they have never repeated it anywhere else :

And was in consideration of the fact that the consolidated road paralleled the Erie Canal, then a favourite state institution, from which the state received tolls on all freight traffic.

In addition, he states also that they required the road should pay to the state the same tolls on freight that were paid on freight carried on the canals. It is true that in some of the crowded eastern cities, especially in the suburbs, they are able to run short trains at 2 cents per mile. But there is no railroad in the whole United States which really receives a clear 3 cents per mile even as it is. I find, in looking over the returns from the Interstate Commerce report,—the returns of seventeen railways—that the only railway the rates on which approach at all to the prices charged in Canada, or rather received in Canada, is the Boston and Maine railway, which receives 1·818, the New York, Ontario and Western which receives 1·822, the Fitchburg which receives 1·87, and the Canadian Pacific Railway which receives 1·70. Then as to our own roads : The Canadian Pacific, I believe, has received an average of only 1·70 per mile and the Grand Trunk has received 1·73 cents. The following are the complete figures :—

Railroad.	Year.	Rate per Passenger per mile.
Southern Pacific	1891..	2·187
Pennsylvania	1891..	2·583
Union Pacific System	1891..	2·477
Lake Shore and Michigan Southern	1891..	2·177
Boston and Maine Railroad	1891..	1·818
Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad and branches	1891..	2·081
New York, Ontario and Western	1891..	1·822
Wabash	1891..	2·177
Northern Pacific	1890..	2·548
New York, New Haven and Hartford	1891..	1·687
Great Northern	1891..	2·30
Chicago and Alton	1890..	2·135
Chicago and North-western	1891..	2·17
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific	1891..	2·198
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul	1891..	2·391
Fitchburg	1891..	1·87
Michigan Central	1891..	2·249
Canadian Pacific	1891..	1·7

It is true that in the state of Michigan there is a rule, and I commend this rule to the consideration of my hon. friend when he brings up a Bill to deal with the whole question. The rule in Michigan is this : When a road earns $3,000 per mile, the company is entitled to charge a rate of not more than 2 cents per mile ; if a road earns less than $3,000 and more than $2,000 per mile, the maximum rate is 2½ cents ; and if it earns less than $2,000 the maximum rate is 3 cents per mile. And this is only applicable to roads in the lower peninsular of Michigan. Now, as to Austria, which has been referred to, if my hon. friend had been there——

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Have you ?

Mr. COCKBURN. Yes ; I have been in Austria ; I have studied and lived in Austria ; and I know Austria. And I can tell my hon. friend that he is not the man with his tastes, to get on board any one of the cheap trains in that country. The passengers have to pay extra for every parcel of baggage he takes. There is a quarrel if you take a hand satchel. There is no heating, no closets, no water——

An hon. MEMBER. No boot-blacking.

Mr. COCKBURN—and, as the hon. gentleman remarks, no boot-blacking. This question of boot-blacking is very interesting to some gentlemen on the other side. Perhaps before the session is over, they will have an

opportunity of appointing a commission under a properly appointed president and vice-president to investigate the question of boot-blacking—a question with which perhaps they are intimately familiar from their early days. It is important that this railway charter should be granted, on the grounds I have stated, and also on the ground that the company have come forward and offered to pay all the wages that are due to the workingmen engaged in the construction of the road. And I feel persuaded that one effect of the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), although I know he does not contemplate it, and if he did he would not bring it forward—must be greatly to decrease the comforts on these roads. And a second result, considering that the railways are now unable to earn dividends for the bondholders or stockholders, must be to reduce still further the wages of the workingmen on the roads. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to rise in this House and try to stop the passage of a Bill which, in effect, provides $50,000 for paying the overdue wages of workingmen engaged in the construction of this road, and is, at the same time prepared to force an amendment which will have the effect of reducing the wages of the workingmen on our roads, I think he will find that he has made a mistake. What we want is not to reduce our fares by 33 per cent as the hon. gentleman proposes, but to have increased accommodation, swifter trains and more of them. There is no use trying to take the ground that the workingman is a pauper and is unable to pay his 3 cents a mile like any other man.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Maclean):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Beausoleil,	Harwood,
Boston,	Jeannotte,
Bowers,	Landerkin,
Brodeur,	Leduc,
Carpenter,	Lister,
Carroll,	Livingston,
Christie,	Macdowall,
Davin,	Maclean (York),
Dawson,	McIsaac,
Denison,	McMullen,
Desaulniers,	Mignault,
Devlin,	Mulock,
Dugas,	Pelletier,
Dyer,	Perry,
Edwards,	Pridham,
Fauvel,	Rowand,
Featherston,	Semple,
Forbes,	Sproule,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Wilson, and
	Yeo.—39.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Innes,
Amyot,	Lachapelle,
Bain (Soulanges),	Langelier,
Bain (Wentworth),	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Baird,	Laurier,
Baker,	Lavergne,
Beith,	Leclair,
Belley,	Legris,
Bennett,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bergeron,	Macdonald (King's),
Bergin,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Borden,	McAlister,
Bourassa,	McDonald (Assiniboia),
Bowman,	McDonald (Victoria),
Boyd,	McDougald (Pictou),
Brown,	McGregor,
Bryson,	McKay,
Burnham,	McLean (King's),
Cameron,	McLennan,
Campbell,	McLeod,
Cargill,	McMillan,
Carling (Sir John),	Madill,
Carscallen,	Mara,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Masson,
Choquette,	Mills (Annapolis),
Coatsworth,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cockburn,	Moncrieff,
Colter,	Monet,
Craig,	Montague,
Curran,	Northrup,
Davies (P.E.I.),	O'Brien,
Davis (Alberta),	Patterson (Colchester),
Dickey,	Pope,
Earle,	Préfontaine,
Edgar,	Prior,
Fairbairn,	Rider,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),	Rinfret,
	Roome,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Rosamond,
Flint,	Ross (Lisgar),
Foster,	Sanborn,
Fraser,	Smith (Ontario),
Geoffrion,	Somerville,
Gibson,	Stairs,
Gillies,	Stevenson,
Gillmor,	Sutherland,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),	Tarte,
	Taylor,
Godbout,	Temple,
Grandbois,	Tisdale,
Grant (Sir James),	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Grieve,	
Guay,	Tyrwhitt,
Haggart,	Vaillancourt,
Haslam,	Wallace,
Hazen,	White (Shelburne),
Hughes,	Wilmot, and
Ingram,	Wood (Brockville).—113.

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

THE CUSTOMS ACT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 140) further to amend the Customs Act.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address a word or two to the Minister of Justice. I think it would be as well that the attention of the House should be recalled to the really important question that was before us. When my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) was speaking before recess on this subject, he made certain statements of a very grave character, compromising the Department of

Justice, as well as the Department of Customs, and that in no ordinary degree. Now, so far as I can recollect, and so far as I understood the Controller of Customs, no attempt whatever was made to explain the very extraordinary circumstances related by my hon. friend from West Lambton. It appeared, Sir, from the statement made by my hon. friend as well as from the statement made in reply to him by the hon. Controller of Customs, that a series of the grossest possible frauds had been committed, and these frauds had extended over a period of several years, that these frauds had been repeated again and again, that they involved a great variety of forgeries and a number of separate and distinct perjuries, all committed for the purpose of defrauding the customs and the revenue of Canada. Under these circumstances, it appears to me, a very much better explanation ought to be given by the Controller of Customs and by the Government, and also by the Minister of Justice—although I am aware that he is in no sense personally responsible—why it was that so gross a miscarriage of justice could have occurred as appears to have taken place. I can conceive of no circumstances prima facie, under which the Department of Justice would be called upon to see that proper punishment was inflicted upon the offender if not under the circumstances detailed by my hon. friend, and apparently confirmed by the Controller of Customs. And if it has come to this pass—that forgeries and perjuries and deliberate frauds are to be permitted, to the great detriment of our revenue, and that department in which they are committed is to hold that it has discharged its whole duty in the matter by simply referring it to the Department of Justice, and the Department of Justice have apparently allowed at least a year and a half to elapse without being moved to take any other action in the matter—then, all I can say that a very bad example appears to me to be set to all other departments of the Government. I am very far indeed from desiring to see any vindictive measures taken against ordinary offenders against the customs, knowing, as I do, the extraordinary hardship which is inflicted upon a great many deserving citizens by the operation of the protective tariff, and having my own opinion, and a very strong one, as to the moral merits of a protective tariff. But, waiving that point, I must say I cannot understand how it is possible that such circumstances as were narrated to us could have taken place and could have been reported to the Department of Justice and yet no action be taken upon them. The thing appears to me to require, from both the Department of Justice and from the Department of Customs, very full explanation, because otherwise it would seem to us that these departments, for reasons best known to themselves, had been committing what, in less distinguished individuals, would almost mean compounding a felony. Apparently, in the mind of the Controller of Customs, and from the circumstances stated by him, there can be no shadow of doubt of the guilt of this party. The Controller of Customs stated again and again that the forged invoices were in the handwriting of the party named; he stated again and again that perjury had been committed in addition; and undoubtedly, unless there had been very clear proof of that, it is not to be supposed that he would have inflicted the maximum penalty which the law gives him power to inflict. As to the other questions, I do not propose to enter upon it at this moment, that is, the desirability of amending and reforming the practice in the Department of Customs, and of lessening the extraordinary power which might possibly be given with safety in the case of revenue collected for revenue purposes, but which are very unsafe and very liable to be abused in the case of a protective tariff. But I desire to recall the attention of the committee to the major portion of the charge of my hon. friend, which was that, with full knowledge of fraud, perjury, and forgery having been committed, no step whatever appears to have been taken by the Government to inflict punishment upon the offender.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It must be very gratifying to the Controller of Customs, as it is, I know, to the majority of the members of this House, to find in what an extraordinary fashion these charges have petered out, so far, at any rate, as his department is concerned; because, while the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) opened his guns directly upon the Department of Customs, and made severe strictures upon the Controller of Customs, it was not until his statements had been riddled, and his guns absolutely spiked, that he now attempts a mild assault upon another department, not referred to in the outset at all; and I think if that department is given ordinarily fair treatment at the hands of this House, the result of the consideration of that charge will be somewhat the same as in the first case. I must tell the hon. member for South Oxford that I am not able, and I do not think any predecessor of mine, no matter how distinguished, was ever able, to come to so strong a conclusion upon a matter of the character discussed this afternoon, as that hon. gentleman seems to have done. It is one thing for the hon. member in the midst of a discussion, to be struck by ugly words, such as fraud, perjury, and forgery.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Used by your own clerk.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Used by any man. It is one thing to have those words read out of documents, official,

or otherwise, and it is an entirely different thing to have those charges and statements examined by counsel and dealt with subsequently. It may be that the Department of Justice has been derelict, but nothing that has occurred to-day, and nothing thrown across the floor of the House, would lead any reasonable lawyer to the conclusion that that department has not acted properly, and as it should have done. The hon. gentleman says that the Controller of Customs simply referred the case to the Department of Justice, and had attempted in that way to get rid of the responsibility. But that is hardly doing justice to the Controller, because, if my ears caught aright the language of the letter he read, it was a positive instruction to the Department of Justice to take such action in the premises as those papers and facts might warrant. It was not then merely a reference of the subject to that department, but it was a complete and an absolute reference, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, of the whole particulars; and, under that state of affairs, undoubtedly the Department of Justice must give an account of its conduct to this House when properly required so to do, and the circumstances that arose after those papers reached that department, explanatory of the course taken. But I think I can ask the hon. member for South Oxford—I would not like to depend upon the hon. member for Lambton, after what I have heard to-day—ordinary courtesy. I do not think he will charge either my predecessor or myself with any dereliction of duty, until an opportunity has been given to inquire into the facts. I have never heard of the subject, I know nothing of the particulars; I have merely heard the facts stated in debate this afternoon; and I think the hon. gentleman, and the House in general will rest satisfied that the Department of Justice will not take very long to ascertain how the matter stands in that department, and to give a frank explanation to this House of the course of events since the reference from the Department of Customs.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will recollect that when the hon. member for South Oxford was asking his questions, he was careful to state that he did not charge against the present Minister any personal dereliction of duty, but he asked, as it was his right and his duty alike, that an explanation should be given to show what that department had done with reference to the very important matter which had been transmitted to it for action. I myself regret very much that any language should be used by the Minister which would seem to minimize, in his opinion, the gravity of the charges which were made from this side of the House this afternoon, and fully endorsed by the Controller of Customs. If my ears did not deceive me, the statement made by the Controller of Customs was that it had been proved clearly to him in the course of investigation that a certain party or parties had been guilty of fraud upon the revenue, of perjury and forgery, that he had satisfied himself personally that these crimes had been committed, and he had transmitted the papers to the Department of Justice so long ago, I think, as January, 1894, in order that proper action might be taken upon them. Now, there is no dispute about this. The charges made by the hon. member for Lambton have been reported upon by the Controller of Customs as absolutely true, proved up to the hilt. I think it was right that the Minister of Justice should not lose an hour in acquainting this House with the steps that have been taken by his department, as he himself is not personally responsible, to prosecute the parties who are alleged so to be guilty. If the hon. gentleman has examined the papers, or if his predecessor or the deputy head has examined them, and finds there is not sufficient evidence to justify these charges, it will be his duty to rebuke the Controller for having made them in this House. If, on the contrary, the Controller has reached a correct conclusion, or, if a prima facie case has been made out, the duty of that department is clear, those who defraud the revenue, and those who commit perjury in the act, must not go unwhipped of justice. This House would be recreant to its duty if it did not enforce in the strongest way, as my hon. friend to my left has done, a demand that the proper department should either discharge its duties, or receive a reprimand from this House for failing to do so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Controller of Customs with respect to this matter, whether the papers evidencing forgery, perjury and fraud upon the Government, to which he has referred this afternoon, were transmitted to the Department of Justice along with his report? I did not so understand the hon. gentleman. I understood the Minister to say that he had written a letter to the Minister of Justice, but I did not understand him to say that any of the papers which evidenced forgery, perjury and fraud were transmitted from his department to the Department of Justice. It is important we should know precisely what the facts are in this matter before we undertake to discuss the extent of the responsibility of the Department of Justice for dereliction of duty. Perhaps the Controller of Customs can tell us?

Mr. WALLACE. I altogether object to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) putting words into my mouth which I did not use. I read the letter sent to Sir John Thompson, Minister of Justice, as follows:—

Dear Sir,—I inclose you customs file 4856 of 1893, covering the documents submitted in connection with the seizure made of Boyd, Ryrie &

Campbell, of Montreal. Attached to the same is the report of my Acting Commissioner, Watters. I submit the whole matter for whatever action you may consider it advisable to take.

Accompanying the documents is a report of Mr. Watters, dated 14th of the same month, which refers in detail to the cases in which he claimed that forged invoices were used.

I am not going to discuss the legal question, but I desire to call attention to this fact, that the invoices were evidently written by Mr. Boyd, in Montreal, but the invoices themselves while forged invoices did not involve criminal forgery. It was similar to saying John Smith sold to William Brown certain goods. It was a case of fictitious invoices rather than forged invoices. The report went on to refer to other matters in which Watters claimed that forgeries had been committed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). These papers are all in the Department of Justice, I suppose?

Mr. WALLACE. I presume this is the file.

Mr. MULOCK. Has the hon. gentleman got the alleged forged papers in his possession now?

Mr. WALLACE. This is a copy of the letter sent to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that the file of the original papers?

Mr. WALLACE. I have here a statement showing the copies of invoices of goods purchased and imported for the last three years by Boyd, Ryrie and Campbell, which for the reasons herein stated have been seized wholly or in part.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the file of original papers in the Department of Justice now, or is it in the hon. gentleman's hands?

Mr. WALLACE. This is a copy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the file which the hon. gentleman holds in his hand the original file which he transmitted at one time to the Department of Justice and which came back to his hands, or is it merely a copy?

Mr. WALLACE. The letters written to the Department of Justice are originals—the letter to Sir John Thompson is a copy.

Mr. MULOCK. Where are the original papers alleged to have been forged?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And sent to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. WALLACE. Here is a list of them.

Mr. MULOCK. Where are the originals?

Mr. WALLACE. They are in the department, unless they have been stolen out of it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What are those papers in your hands—are they originals or copies?

Mr. WALLACE. Everything went to the Department of Justice, the whole file and all the papers we could find.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What I want to know is, whether those papers which the Minister said were forgeries and evidence of fraud and perjury are in the hon. gentleman's hands, in his department, or in the Department of Justice?

Mr. WALLACE. They were sent to the Department of Justice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did they remain there, or did they come back to the hon. gentleman's department?

Mr. WALLACE. I cannot tell.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A great deal of time might have been saved if the committee had waited till the Department of Justice had something to say. We are very careful of papers, and I heard some hon. gentleman talking about papers being lost. I was unable, however, to break into the department after six o'clock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And you tried?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I failed in the attempt, but I expect to have these papers in the morning.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman knows what the practice is. Where papers are sent to the Department of Justice for the action of the department, are they not retained in the hands of the department until action is completed?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the ordinary course.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the ordinary course would be that if the papers were sent to the Department of Justice——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They would be there now, unless a report had been sent back explaining the action taken or the reason for not taking action.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I do not think I would have occupied the time of the committee except for the fact that I very much disapprove of the charges made by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) against the Controller of Customs. I think I may safely say that the charges made, as it was made by him in a most careful and studied manner in his speech, was one that was very unfair, and I think I am justified in saying unwarranted in itself. The more we reflect on the language used by that hon. gentleman the more this committee will conclude that his language and his charges were unjustifiable. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), before he took his seat, made the remark, referring to the charges made by the hon. member for West Lambton, that the charges

made by the hon. member for Lambton have all been established.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, I did not say so. I said the charges made by the hon. member for Lambton with respect to crimes of fraud, perjury and forgery having been committed to which he had referred, had been confirmed by the Controller. There is no dispute about that.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I am perfectly willing to accept the hon. gentleman's statement or explanation, and to assume that that is what he intended to say. I am perfectly willing to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation. The hon. member for Lambton, as well as every other hon. member in this House, would be derelict in his duty if he thought and felt that blame attached to any department of the Government and did not bring it before the House, and any such charges should receive the careful consideration of the House and impress themselves on the department attacked. But these are not the circumstances which that hon. gentleman has detailed to the House. He has made general charges and specific charges. I do not object to the general charges he has made, for he has a perfect right to make them. He has complained that the department has been negligent, that the department has not been conducted in a manner satisfactory to the mercantile community, and that various judgments have been given by the Controller different from each other. But the hon. gentleman has not given the committee any instance whatever of improper conduct or of any neglect in answering correspondence. The hon. gentleman has not complained himself that he has been coolly treated in the department. What evidence does he adduce to bear out the statement that he has made? Nothing but an article spitefully written in a newspaper which I think he called the "Pharmaceutical Journal." That is all the evidence the hon. gentleman has brought forward to condemn the Customs Department. The hon. gentleman has promised he will do more than that, that he will show particular instances in which the Department of Customs has been corrupt, not as I understood the hon. member for Queen's to say that these charges have been all established. The charge made by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) was not at all against Boyd, Ryrie & Co., but it was a direct charge against the Controller of Customs that he had been guilty of corrupt conduct in the matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) described in dramatic language the office of the Controller as a star chamber, the doors of which were shut when the examination took place. His language would lead us to understand that decisions were made by the Controller and judgments rendered by him in consideration of the influence and wealth of the parties charged. That is a very grave charge. It is a charge that no gentleman should make against another in this House without being prepared to substantiate. It was distinctly charged by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) that Boyd, Ryrie & Co. were allowed to escape, while men such as Watters were put in jail. The tenor of his whole speech was to lead the House to believe that the Controller of Customs was corrupt in connection with this case. The circumstances that the hon. gentleman detailed, were detailed for the purpose of influencing the House against the Controller of Customs. For instance, the hon. member (Mr. Lister) asked, why did not Boyd, Ryrie & Co. select a solicitor in Montreal, where they resided, and why did they go to a distant city in western Ontario for their counsel. He stated that this counsel was a friend politically and otherwise of the Controller, and the insinuation clearly was that this company went to Toronto for that counsel in order to bring corrupt influence to bear upon the Controller of Customs. If it were not done for that purpose then why did the hon. gentleman breathe the name of that solicitor in Toronto, and why did he breathe that the firm went 500 miles west to get that solicitor. It was done simply for the purpose of insinuating that corrupt influence could be brought to bear upon the Controller who was to decide the case. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) further than that used language, which on reflection, and when he reads it in "Hansard," I believe he would wish he had not used. When the Controller stated that the firm had been fined the enormous sum of $14,000, what language did the hon. member use? He referred to the star chamber of the Controller, and he said to him: Sir, then you have been guilty of a felony as well as they. In his own words, he charged the Controller with compounding a felony and with taking money to cover up evidence of crime. That language is surely going further than is necessary for the purpose of instigating an investigation. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) has read the Customs Act,—and I am sure he has—he must know that it provides that the unpleasant duty is cast upon the Controller of hearing the evidence and investigating cases which come before him. It further gives the Controller the right to impose such fines as the merits of the case warrants. The hon. Controller told us that when this case came before him, he spent days and weeks investigating it, and then he imposed the fine of $14,800. What folly it is for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) to talk, of the Controller compounding a felony, when he did his whole duty under the law, and imposed the penalty which went into the Exchequer of Canada. Such a charge against the Controller is absurd. Every day of the week my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) is prosecuting some person before a judge, and the judge does what the Controller is compelled to do, namely, to administer the law. Would the

hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) say that because the judge fixed the legal penalty of a fine, that the judge was guilty of compounding a felony. Surely he would not. The hon. gentleman could not have considered the effect of the language he used. Surely he ought to be ashamed of it.

Mr. LISTER. I think if you read my speech to-morrow, you will be ashamed of your speech to-night.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. If the hon. gentleman says he did not use that language then he will withdraw it. Surely the hon. gentleman used the language "compounding a felony" in reference to the Controller. What did the Controller of Customs do in the matter? He held an open investigation lasting weeks upon weeks and heard witness after witness, and inflicted a fine. After that the hon. the Controller transmitted the papers to the Department of Justice. That is exactly what he should have done. When the hon. member for West Lambton commenced his charge there was no reflection whatever against the Department of Justice. It was a purely personal attack against the Controller, and it was only incidentally it came out that the papers had been transmitted to the Department of Justice. Sir, the duty of the Controller of Customs ended when he transferred the papers to the Department of Justice, and I am perfectly sure that the Department of Justice will be able to give as clear an account of what became of these papers since they received them, as the Controller has given of them before they left his hands. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) has put himself in the position that he is in to-night. In all fairness he ought now to withdraw the charge he has made against the Controller of Customs. He has not made one single observation against that hon. gentleman that has not been wiped out and disproved. There is, of course, the fact, that these men were guilty and robbed the department. But that is not what we are dealing with. The charge made was that the Controller had dealt with them in a corrupt manner for robbing the department, and that charge has completely fallen to the ground. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) ought to be prepared to withdraw the statement he has made. The Controller of Customs fined the guilty parties in a very large sum, and after he fined them he could not have done more than to transmit the papers to the Department of Justice. Then, Sir, passing from that we have the Ogilvie charge. That charge is one that we are justified in saying nothing about just now, because it is so to speak, subjudice, not having been disposed of by the department itself. I think it would be improper and injudicious to make any remarks in regard to that when the Controller's information to us is that the matter is still before him, and undecided, and I do think, when the hon. gentleman considers the effect of the charges he has made against the Controller, and the circumstances which have been developed here to-day, he would not be doing a very ungraceful act if he were to withdraw any personal reflections he has made against the Controller.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) deserves the thanks of this House and this country for bringing forward the question which he has done to-day. I have sat in this House with the hon. member for West Lambton for many years, and I have never known him, nor has any other member of this House known him to make a reckless statement which he is forced to withdraw. He generally studies very carefully the questions he brings before the House, and when he brings forward a question such as he brought forward this afternoon, he does it after mature consideration. Now, I think the circumstances surrounding this case are such as to justify my hon. friend in presenting these charges in the clear, definite and straightforward manner he has done; and although the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) demands their retraction, it is my opinion that he does so because he does not clearly understand the points which he has been attempting to make. The hon. member for West Lambton says he has the facts in his possession, and he is prepared to go into an exhaustive inquiry before a commission of this House as to the manner in which the whole affair was conducted by the Controller of Customs. That ought to satisfy the hon. member for East Lambton that he has no ground for demanding a retraction at this juncture. It is quite clear that the manner in which the Customs Department has been handled in the past has caused a feeling of discontent and dissatisfaction throughout the entire Dominion. The Controller of Customs this afternoon attempted to show that this discontent was largely confined to the Board of Trade and the merchants of Montreal, and he referred to the fact that the Board of Trade of the city of Ottawa had expressed its satisfaction with the manner in which the Customs Department had been handled. Allow me to quote from an article which appeared in the Montreal "Witness," a journal of high standing:

> The Government, in its customs dealings with the trade interests of the country, has forfeited and lost the confidence of the importers, the merchants, and even of the importing manufacturers. That is clear to every one, and is plainly manifested in this petition, which prays that the customs laws in regard to administration shall be so changed as to take the decision of disputed cases out of the hands of the Government altogether and place it in the hands of boards of experts and the regular courts of the country. * * * * This petition, which is a constitutional rebellion against the customs tyranny of the Government, has already been supported by over forty boards of trade of the Dominion, in towns and cities,

from Vancouver to Halifax, whose petitions have already been presented. So far as we have heard, only one board of trade did not join, that of Ottawa, which is still too near the presence of the Government of the day to dare to do more than squeal, though it declares that "something" should be done, and is understood to be secretly in favour of the petition.

This shows that all the principal merchants in the different boards of trade throughout the Dominion, including even that of the city of Toronto, save and except that of the city of Ottawa, have petitioned in favour of the change which the Montreal Board of Trade asked. The petition of that board, of which I have a copy, is signed by no less than 593 merchants and business men of that city.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. gentleman say that the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto adopted that resolution ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I say that, according to this article, the boards of trade throughout the country have joined in expressing their approval of the change petitioned for by the Montreal Board of Trade, save and except Ottawa.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has just said that the Board of Trade of Toronto has done so. Has he any proof of that ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I have taken the authority of the Montreal "Witness," which says that every board of trade, except the Ottawa board has done so.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman said the Board of Trade of Toronto did so. That is not correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have corrected my statement ; I have told the hon. gentleman what I quoted from. It is quite clear that business men generally throughout the Dominion are dissatisfied with the manner in which the Customs Department has been administered. I know that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) this afternoon gave the Controller of Customs a kind of certificate of character. No doubt it will be valuable to him the day after to-morrow —he may possibly be able to use it. But perhaps my hon. friend from Halifax has cause for doing this. I am not going to say that the Controller gave him a hint a short time ago as to the probable change in the duty on sugar. I do not know whether he gave him a hint or not ; but if he did not, my hon. friend struck the speculation in sugar at a very important and convenient time, and happened to get into port a large amount of sugar on which he saved the payment of the increased duty. I am not charging the Controller of Customs with having given him the wink ; he may or may not have done so. But there is one thing certain—there is a great deal of personal good feeling between the two hon. gentlemen, and the hon. member for Halifax was quite willing to-night to be the first to jump up and, in a very valiant way, come to the relief and defence of the Controller of Customs. We do not know what may have been the moving cause of his valiant effort. I contend that if the Controller is anxious to relieve himself from the awkward position in which the hon. member for Halifax says he is placed in relation to the business men throughout the country, he ought to consent to the appointment of this board of experts. To-night the hon. Controller said something with regard to the character of the experts appointed in the United States. He said some of them were men engaged in the liquor business, and who had no commercial knowledge at all. Well, it is not very prudent for those who live in glass houses to throw stones at their neighbours. My hon. friend, once on a time—it may be a long way back—used to sell liquor by the glass across the counter, perhaps like some of those American experts, and besides ran a one-horse retail store for a number of years, which may perhaps have helped him to get some little knowledge for the discharge of his important duties as Controller of Customs. Then, again, his predecessor in office occupied the dignified position of running a one-horse country paper in a small town in western Canada before he became Minister of Customs, and that surely could not have given him any very extensive knowledge to fit him particularly for the office of Minister of Customs. My hon. friend has not had any very extensive experience personally in commercial matters which would give him peculiar aptitude for discharging the important duties of Controller of Customs, and I should advise him, if he wants to command the confidence of the commercial men of this country, and if he wants to have the Customs Department enjoy the credit and confidence which it now lacks among the mercantile community, to have a board of experts appointed who would regulate the value and give consistency and solidity to the whole system of the customs tariff. In this manner he might win that respect for the management of the Customs Department of which it now is sadly in need. The boards of trade of Toronto and Montreal and other important centres, have expressed their desire for the appointment of such a board of experts. The hon. Controller of Customs cited the city of Ottawa as being content with the present condition of things. On looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that Ottawa has only paid $263,000 of customs dues altogether, while Montreal pays $7,000,000, and to set off a city like Montreal, which pays such an enormous amount of customs duties by a city which pays such a small amount as Ottawa, is like comparing the report of a shot-gun with that of a five hundred pound cannon. It is unfair to treat

Montreal in this manner. Take the petition, and I find that 595 of Montreal's foremost business men have signed it, praying that this change be made in the customs laws. Are the views of these men to be set at naught? I would draw attention to the contents of the petition, but that has been done so ably by the hon. member for North Simcoe, that it is unnecessary that I should do so; but I must repeat that when the Controller of Customs is now asking the House to consent to a change in the customs tariff, he should pay some heed to the memorial of the Montreal and other boards of trade, and thus allay in some measure the discontent which now exists.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) has scarcely been fair to the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister). He has assumed, from what has occurred in this House, that the statements of the hon. member for West Lambton are wholly erroneous. I would rejoice if it were that the information on which those statements were made should prove incorrect, and I know nothing of the circumstances, except what I have gathered here to-night; but enough has been said to call for a fuller explanation than can take place on the floor of this House. First, let me ask for what good purpose hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to assume that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) made an improper charge against a stranger to the House, Mr. Fullerton, of Toronto. I fail to discover anything in the language of the hon. member for West Lambton that was intended in the slightest degree to reflect on the character of Mr. Fullerton. If he said anything it must have been complimentary to that gentleman, because he said that Mr. Fullerton had pleaded the cause of his client with success. Now, it does not require the statement of any member of this House to vindicate the character of Mr. Fullerton. He is a worthy citizen of Toronto, a prominent member of the bar, who has lived a lifetime in that city, and who deservedly enjoys the respect of the community. He is a prominent man, filling a high position in the city of Toronto to-day, with credit to himself and undoubted satisfaction to the public, and we all know that he would not do anything that could, in the slightest degree reflect on his good reputation, and I am sure that my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) had not the slightest intention of implying that Mr. Fullerton had done so. To come back to the question, the Controller of Customs had an opportunity of entirely disposing of any charges made against him by adopting the course suggested. It is, at all events, a matter of doubt at this moment whether justice has been done. It is conceded that crime has been committed, and that the knowledge of its commission came to the Government nearly two years ago. Yet up to this moment no member of the Government can tell us what steps have been taken to vindicate the majesty of the law. Now, if nothing more than this has come out of the discussion, the discussion has been most profitable, and I would therefore again call the attention of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) to the unfair position in which he has sought to place his colleague in this House when he asked the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) to assume that he was entirely mistaken in his statement, simply because a partial denial was made on the floor of this House. Members of Parliament are compelled, in the public interest, to proceed upon such evidence as from time to time they may be furnished with, and their responsibility depends upon whether they exercise good judgment and good faith in accepting the information as correct, and taking proper steps to have the matter sifted in the public interest. Any man may make a charge on the floor of Parliament, which might not be true in fact, and yet make it in a perfectly honourable way, and in the best of good faith. With regard to this particular charge, until the Government accept the challenge of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) and appoint a committee with power to examine witnesses under oath, the charge must remain in the unfortunate position of neither being proved nor disproved. That is not the position in which it should be, and if I were the Controller of Customs I should be the first to ask the House to appoint a committee. I trust that he will adopt that course, and I trust that the finding of that committee will be to uphold everything that could be said in vindication of the Controller of Customs and of every member of the Government. I say that in all sincerity, for I do not think that any member of this House should rejoice in discovering that a fellow member——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What charge would the committee have to investigate?

Mr. MULOCK. The evidence taken before the Controller should be produced.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but what charge would they have before them to investigate?

Mr. MULOCK. What became of the papers—that was one thing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was not the hon. member for West Lambton's charge.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for West Lambton suggested that the papers, the alleged forgeries, had been parted with. And, of course, if papers that are said to have been forged have been parted with, we know that no criminal prosecution for forgery can be successful. Now, if these

papers upon which a criminal prosecution would have to rest are not in existence to-day, the question naturally arises how have they disappeared ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to make a suggestion ?

Mr. MULOCK. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is going on to deal with the further procedure in this case. From what has been said in the debate, it appears that my department ought to be heard from before any intelligent action could be taken by the House. Even if the hon. gentleman wants to suggest an inquiry, I think that every one will say that, in view of what has been stated, some information should be given the House in respect of the position of the Department of Justice. And I have undertaken to do that. So far as this Bill is concerned, could not the hon. gentleman agree to let us consider this Bill now, and leave the further discussion of the topic the hon. gentleman is referring to until the statement is given—which will be prompt.

Mr. MULOCK. I have no objections to defer anything further I have to say. But when the hon. gentleman laughed at the idea of a committee ascertaining what had become of the public records——

Mr. WALLACE. Who said that public records have been mislaid ?

Mr. MULOCK. I think what the hon. member for Lambton has said——

Mr. WALLACE. He did not say so, and he will not say so now.

Mr. FOSTER. He said he knew nothing about it.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman dare not say they are gone or we will have to find out where they have taken them to.

Mr. LISTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows where they are ?

Mr. WALLACE. I say there are no papers gone that I know of. Are there any papers gone that the hon. gentleman knows of ?

Mr. LISTER. There are a great many papers gone that I know of. I do not know where the hon. gentleman's papers are.

Mr. WALLACE. Because if the hon. gentleman says they are gone, we may have to make him swear where he has put them.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman had better be careful not to make that charge outside ; he might be liable for action.

Mr. WALLACE. I will make the charge here or any time.

Mr. LISTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that I abstracted his papers ?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has made charges in this House——

Mr. LISTER. That is not the question. I have made no charge in this House that I would not make anywhere else.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman does not dare to make the charge outside that he has made in this House.

Mr. LISTER. I have made no charge in this House that I would not make to the hon. gentleman or to anybody else outside of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. We will see if the hon. gentleman is able to do it.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman must not think that he can bully members of this House. He must remember that he is not now in an Orange Lodge.

Mr. WALLACE. And we won't allow the hon. member to do any bullying either.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has not forgotten his old ways. I have a word or two to say in reference to the speech of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) in defence of the Controller of Customs, championing his cause against the so-called charges made against him. And the hon. member thought proper to say that the charges made by me were unfair, unwarranted and unjustifiable. Sir, what were the charges made by me ? One charge I made was that the system of carrying on the customs under its present administration, is, to use the language of the public press of this country, iniquitous ; it is distasteful to the whole business community of Canada, except perhaps to the board of trade of the city of Ottawa under the eaves of the public buildings. And when I say that, I echo the feeling, I believe, of every business man in Canada. I made the charge that no man, the political head of a department of Government should be called upon to discharge the duties of a judge in matters involving oftentimes enormous sums of money and, oftentimes, the reputation and character of business men throughout the country. What I said was that these charges should be investigated by a court ; a court that would deal fairly between the parties, a court that could not be influenced by political motives or otherwise. Everybody knows what influences are brought to bear upon public men. And I then stated, and I now repeat that no public man occupying the position of my hon. friend should have cast upon him the duty of discharging judicial functions such as he is called upon often to discharge as head of that department. What I said was that there was a feeling in the country among certain people that they had not been fairly dealt with, and a feeling on the part of others that they had been favoured. Whether that feeling is well-founded or not is another question. It is an

evil if that feeling exists, whether it be justified by the facts or not. I charged here to-night that a prominent firm in the city of Montreal had defrauded the revenue of this country, and that an investigation had taken place before the Controller of Customs in his little office on the hill. That is true. Is that the place to hear a case of this kind? Is that the manner in which a suit of that kind involving many thousands of dollars should be decided? Is it in the interests of the community at large that a lawyer should plead his case before the Controller of Customs in his office in the city of Ottawa, without evidence and without the protections offered by a regular court. And what do we find? The Controller of Customs is pleaded with, because the plea should plead his case before the Controller of Customs, a gentleman standing very high in his profession, and a man in every sense worthy. In doing that he was simply discharging a duty which he had to discharge in the interests of his client. If he had succeeded in getting them off for $4,000, he would have been doing his duty, because he was acting for them. At all events, the fact is plain according to the statement of the Controller of Customs, that Mr. Ryrie, one of those partners, was the gentleman who appeared before the Controller of Customs. Now, he appears, my hon. friend hears the case, it is decided, and the papers, my hon. friend says, are sent over to the Department of Justice. The case is decided to be as flagrant as it is possible to imagine. A man has committed perjury, not once, but a dozen or more times. He has made these invoices, he has defrauded the revenue, and the papers are sent to the Minister of Justice, who talks about spiking his guns, and all that kind of nonsense. He ought to be a soldier instead of a politician, evidently. They are sent over to the office of the Minister of Justice, there they stay for two long years, and no step is taken to prosecute the man who has committed the crime. Nothing has been done. One letter is written by the Controller, but with the exception of that one letter, there appears to have been no inquiry.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Do you make that charge now, that nothing was done in the Department of Justice?

Mr. LISTER. Nothing more appears to have been done, and I will venture to say that no information was ever laid.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. One charge was that the office of the Controller of Customs was small. I understand the hon. gentleman has explained that the charges against the Controller of Customs was that he conducted his business in a little office on the hill.

Mr. LISTER. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And his charge now is that the Minister of Justice conducts his business in a little office on the hill, too.

Mr. LISTER. I think it is pretty close to the office of the Controller of Customs, and there is a little man in that little office, too, who is ready to crawl in and crawl out whenever he gets a chance. So the papers are sent over by the Controller of Customs more than a year ago, or possibly two years ago, there they remained in the office of the Minister of Justice, and there they remain, so far as we know, up to the present time, and so far as the public knows, no steps have ever been taken by that department to bring the offender to justice. Why, Sir, my hon. friend, in answering what was stated, was very particular to say very little about the Ogilvie case. As a matter of fact, Mr. W. W. Ogilvie made a claim upon the department for $3,000 or $4,000, or perhaps more. The claim was to have duty returned to him that had been paid to the department, upon the ground that the corn upon which this duty had been paid, had been kiln dried for human food, when, as a matter of fact, I believe it can be established that instead of being kiln dried for human food, it was ground up, or crushed, and used for feeding cattle, and other purposes. Under these circumstances, Mr. Ogilvie would not be entitled to have his money back, the corn would have to pay duty, and the duty paid upon it would belong to the country. An investigation was made, my hon. friend says. He does not undertake to say when that investigation was commenced, he does not undertake to say whether it was a year ago or not, or whether that investigation has been completed, or what has been done, further than that the sum of money claimed by Mr. Ogilvie is still in the hands of the Receiver General and under the control of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it has not been paid to Mr. Ogilvie.

Mr. LISTER. I do not know whether it has been paid to Mr. Ogilvie or not, but what you say is that the money has not been paid to Mr. Ogilvie. Very well, that would answer every purpose so far as it goes. But has the Controller gone back to the time when he first discovered there were irregularities, when he first discovered there was an attempt to defraud the Government? How does he know that $4,000 is all that Mr. Ogilvie would be entitled to, or what he would be entitled to collect from Mr. Ogilvie? All that we have is the fact that $3,000, or $4,000, or of $5,000, is held by the Government which Mr. Ogilvie claims to have returned to him, and which the department has found out he was not entitled to, because the statement made by Mr. Ogilvie's man under oath, that this grain had been ground in such a way

as to free it from duty, was not correct, and it was therefore an attempt on the part of Mr. Ogilvie to get back from the country, money which he was not entitled to. I think the House has a right to know what steps have been taken against Mr. Ogilvie in respect of this claim, what investigation has taken place, what the charge is, whether affidavits were made; and if affidavits were made, which were, in fact, false, then it is the duty of the Controller of Customs to take such proceedings at law as will bring the offender to justice. This is the whole sum and substance of the charges made here to-day. The Minister of Justice may say that the guns have been spiked, he may say what he likes, but these are grave charges against the administration of the Customs Department, and the House and the country have a right to know how that department is administered. If, as a matter of fact, Mr. Ogilvie, or his man, have committed a fraud upon the Government, or attempted to do it, then Mr. Ogilvie should be prosecuted the same as the commonest offender in the country; if he is entirely clear he should, of course, not be prosecuted. But I say it is such things as these that make the people of this country feel that the administration of the Customs Department is not what it ought to be, in fact, that the law ought to be changed so that all questions between a subject and the Crown involving the payment of taxes, or any matter of that kind, should be determined by a tribunal specially appointed for that purpose.

Mr. CURRAN. I have listened attentively to the several speeches of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, and I have heard the name of Mr. Ogilvie bandied about in a manner which I think is altogether unjustifiable. If the hon. gentleman has any charge to make against Mr. Ogilvie of having committed a fraud, he should specify that fraud, and say what his charge is, and let this House know why the name of a gentleman of the high standing of Mr. W. W. Ogilvie should be dragged into this debate and heralded throughout the country. Mr. Ogilvie's position in the city of Montreal is well known. He is a gentleman who was born there, who grew up there, and has established one of the largest commercial enterprises on the whole continent. He has conducted his business in such a way as to earn for him the position of President of the Montreal Board of Trade, and many other positions of trust. I think it is utterly unfair and unjustifiable that his name should be dragged into a discussion of this kind unless the hon. gentleman has some foundation for it, unless he has received information from a reliable source. Certainly we have had more than one intimation here to-day that the hon. gentleman's informant in these matters is a man who is not now enjoying his liberty, and who is far from having earned the respect of the community, nor acted in such a manner as to show that he was worthy of the office he until lately filled. Now, Sir, if, upon such information, the character, the integrity and the commercial honour, as well as the truthfulness, of such a man as Mr. Ogilvie, are to be put in question before this country, the character of the information upon which such charges are based should be made known to this House. But so far, no charge at all has been made against Mr. Ogilvie further than this, that he has made an application to the Department of Customs to have certain moneys refunded, and that there is a dispute between him and the department as to the refunding of these moneys. What charge is there against Mr. Ogilvie in that circumstance? What charge is there that the Controller of Customs can prosecute against Mr. Ogilvie? What is there before this House to show that Mr. Ogilvie, upon any occasion, has ever laid himself liable to the imputations that have been made against him? I say it is too bad that, for political purposes, the names and reputations of some of our most respectable citizens should be traduced; and I hope that my hon. friend will state here and now whether he has any charge to bring against Mr. Ogilvie, or else apologize to that gentleman for having brought his name before this House and the country in such an unwarrantable manner.

Mr. LISTER. There has been a good deal of fury indulged in by the hon. gentleman. If he had listened to the Controller this afternoon——

Mr. CURRAN. I was listening.

Mr. LISTER—he would have heard the Controller say that he was investigating the matter as regards Mr. Ogilvie, and also that the money, instead of being paid back to Mr. Ogilvie, was in the hands of the Receiver General.

Mr. CURRAN. That is a disputed account.

Mr. LISTER. The charge against Mr. Ogilvie, and I have made it over and over again, is that of having corn kiln-dried and ground for human food, and instead of that being done, the corn was crushed and used for animal food, and a refund claimed.

Mr. WALLACE. That was not the charge. The charge was made in plain terms that application had been made for a refund under certain circumstances. There was nothing in it, because the law did not permit a refund under such circumstances.

Mr. LISTER. That is a mere evasion. The hon. gentleman knew I was wrong in regard to that statement. The statement I made was that corn ground and kiln-dried was manufactured for human food, and if such was the case he would be entitled to

a refund of duties. The charge was that the corn was crushed and used for animal food, and was liable for duty. I ask the Controller if there is not a question pending between the department and Mr. Ogilvie; whether the department has not been informed that Mr. Ogilvie's claim to a refund is not just, for the reason I have stated; and whether the matter is not being investigated by him now as Controller. The hon. gentleman, I observe, will not answer. The truth of the matter is that such information has been given to the department as disentitles Mr. Ogilvie to a refund of the duties, and I believe an affidavit is in the department supporting that claim, or if it is not, it was; and that affidavit, according to my information, is not true, and on account of the information which the department possesses this money has not been paid back to Mr. Ogilvie, but all these matters are being investigated by the department at the present time. The hon. gentleman will not say when he commenced the investigation. To-day it is under the consideration of the department, and it has been so for over a year, and is not determined yet. So there is this question between Mr. Ogilvie and the department as to the amount, and also the right of Mr. Ogilvie to obtain a refund of the duties. I say again that so far as these matters are concerned they are proper subjects for the consideration of the House, and it is the duty of hon. members to bring them before the attention of Parliament and the country, and it is no part of the duty of the Controller of Customs or any member of the Government to treat one citizen of this country different from any other citizen. If this be true, then as regards the gentleman who made the affidavit, be he Mr. Ogilvie or anybody else, it is not only the duty of the Government to retain the money, but it is the duty of the Government to prosecute the man who made the affidavit, if such were made, for having committed perjury.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the committee will now pass to the consideration of the Bill itself, I will suggest that, in view of the discussion which has taken place, the words "assistant-commissioner of customs" be omitted from subsection 2, and the following words added to section 3:—"The office of assistant commissioner of customs is hereby abolished."

Bill reported.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 11th July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Calgary and Lethbridge Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, the memorial of the legislative assembly of the province of Manitoba in answer to the remedial order of the 21st of March, 1895.

Government House,
Ottawa, 11th July, 1895.

GENERAL INSPECTOR OF INDIAN AGENCIES.

Mr. BOSTON asked, When was Absolam Dingman appointed General Inspector of Indian Agencies? 2. What salary did he receive? 3. Who preceded him in this office? 4. Has he been superannuated? 5. If so, why and when? 6. How much per annum will he receive from the superannuation fund? 7. How much per annum has he paid into that fund? 8. Will a successor be appointed? 9. If so, when and who? 10. If not, why not?

Mr. DALY. 1. Absolam Dingman was appointed Inspector of Indian Agencies by Order in Council of the 22nd July, 1882. 2. He was appointed at a salary of $1,400 a year, which was increased by regular statutory increment to $1,800 a year. 3. The position of Inspector of Indian Agencies in Ontario, Quebec and the Eastern Provinces was created on the appointment of Mr. Dingman, and he therefore had no predecessor in office. 4. Yes. 5. To promote economy. By Order in Council of the 28th May last, his retirement to date from the 30th June last. 6. $468. 7. In 1883 he paid $33.43 (which covered the superannuation abatements from his salary for 14 months and 8 days); in 1884, $29; in 1885, $30; in 1886, $31; in 1887, $32; in 1888, $33; in 1889, $34; in 1890, $35; in 1891, $36; in 1892, $36; in 1893, $36; in 1894, $36; in 1895, $27; being abatements for 9 months. 8. No. 9 and 10. Because it is considered that the duties performed by Mr. Dingman can be

as efficiently, and more economically, performed from time to time by officers sent from headquarters.

DAIRY PRODUCTS, 1893.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 21) to amend the Dairy Products Act of 1893 be placed on Government Orders.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. GIROUARD. I wish to put the following question to the leader of the Government:—Will the negotiations to be entered into with Manitoba, relating to the schools, unless they bring an acceptable arrangement on the lines of the remedial order and the terms of the judgment of the Privy Council of the 29th January, 1895, preclude or postpone the introduction of the remedial legislation announced in your statement of Monday last?

Mr. FOSTER. My answer simply is, they will not.

RUMOURED RESIGNATIONS OF MINISTERS.

Mr. LAURIER. I see that everything is serene once more in the atmosphere of the Cabinet. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be able to give us information as to the non-existing crisis which was supposed to exist.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad that my hon. friend shows such skill in reading political weather predictions, if I may so denominate them. I have but very few remarks to make in reply to the question which has been put by my hon. friend on previous occasions, and repeated to-day. Some differences arose between members of the Cabinet with reference to the question of remedial legislation. The statement which I made the other day to the House gave the position of the Government on that matter. The differences in the Cabinet arose chiefly on two lines. Some of our colleagues were of the opinion that it was useless, and consequently unnecessary, to prolong negotiation or to enter into further negotiations with the Manitoba Government with a view to the settlement by that government of the question—by that government themselves with the powers that they have. The other question of difference arose consequentially from that. They believed that remedial legislation should be introduced at once, starting from the premise that there was nothing to be hoped for from the action of the Manitoba Government and legislature itself. I need not reiterate the position of the Government. That was shown in the statement I made the other day in this House. Both these positions were taken in that statement. The one that we would yet grant to Manitoba a certain amount of time, in the hope that negotiations would be entered into and an amicable settlement of this question arrived at. The other was, that in so intricate and important a question, the greatest deliberation was necessary in the perfecting of legislation in the matter, and that no remedial legislation should be introduced this session. These differences of opinion were canvassed by the different members of the Government. I regret to say that one of our colleagues, who has not a seat in this House, finds it impossible to accede to the view of the majority of the Government. He stills holds very firmly and strongly to his view that remedial legislation should be undertaken and pressed to a conclusion at once; and as he finds it impossible to accede to the view of the majority in that respect, his resignation has not only been sent in but accepted, and he is now no longer a member of this Government, I regret to say. With reference to our two colleagues from the province of Quebec, who have seats in this House, I must say that they showed a disposition to canvass and discuss and look thoroughly into the grounds of difference between their own views and the views of the majority of their colleagues, as expressed in the statement I made the other day to this House, and in the end these differences proved to be rather a misunderstanding as to details than a real divergence of opinion as regards the principles that were involved. At the most it was simply a question of disagreement as to detail. As to the question of principle that remedial legislation was necessary and that it would be introduced by this Government at the next session of Parliament, to be called before the 3rd of January, in the event of the province of Manitoba not making a reasonable and satisfactory settlement of the question—with reference to that matter, I say it was a matter of divergence upon details and not upon principles. On the principle all were agreed, all members of the Cabinet stood side by side with my two hon. friends upon my left, and my hon. friends have been enabled—and wisely and patriotically, I believe, acted in that line—to see that it was a misunderstanding or a disagreement simply upon details, and they have been able to come to the conclusion that in the statement which was made on Monday last by me, the remedial legislation was actually and positively promised, and that there is no intention at all of going one single jot outside that statement, and that our intention is to carry out in perfect good faith the statement of the Government on Monday last. Having come to that conclusion, my two hon. friends, the Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works, have believed it to be their duty which they owe to their party, to their country, and to the cause which they themselves have deeply at heart, to work in

harmony with their former and present colleagues, and that we should stand together and carry out the policy of the Government in this way. I do not know that it is necessary for me to make any further remarks at present.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I have very little indeed to add to what has just been said by the leader of the House. The question, as I view it, is one of the gravest that Parliament has been called upon to consider since confederation. Believing, as I do, that minorities must be protected under the constitution, and being anxious for the settlement of the school question—after repeated interviews, and, to my mind, satisfactory assurances from the Premier and from my colleagues, I consider that in view of these assurances, by refusing to help the Government in carrying out remedial legislation upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and of the remedial order in Council, I would have been sacrificing the interests of the minority and jeopardizing the settlement of the question. This induces me to continue to act with the Government to secure, as I believe, remedial legislation in accordance with the pledges given by the Premier and by the leader of the House.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) I do not think I need add much to what has been said by my colleagues. I must say, nevertheless, that if I am at this moment occupying the seat which I formerly held, it is solely due to my sense of the duty which I owe to my country, to my party, and especially to the cause, the success of which I have so much at heart. If I am here, it is because I have become convinced, after the repeated assurances which my colleagues have given us and the warm sympathies which has been shown us by all our friends, that, in delaying the settlement of this question we are thereby rendering the more sure, its settlement in a definitive manner, and in a manner perfectly satisfactory to the country and to all those who desire to see justice done, who love peace, and who are devoted to the well-being of their compatriots. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if I have ever had a duty to fulfil, the importance of which, and also the painful character of which I felt and understood, it is that which I am fulfilling to-day, and in which I may appear, perhaps, in the eyes of the public, as sacrificing for my own personal interests something of the interests of my country. However, Mr. Speaker, I am above all that. I am above the accusations which will be levelled against me in the province of Quebec and elsewhere, I am prepared to endure those attacks in the hope that we will have our reply in six months—in the session which will be held on the 3rd January next. If in the course of those six months I should be covered with opprobrium and insult instead of being covered with flowers and greeted as a hero, I console myself with the hope that this question will then be settled, and that I will then have not only the consolation but the happiness of being able to say to my compatriots: that, to-day, by yielding somewhat in what regards my personal dignity, I have done so in the interests of my country and of those I represent in this House.

Mr. LAURIER. Once upon a time, Mr. Speaker, not very long ago, in a country which I need not name, there was a rumour prevalent that the cat came back to the cream. Feline nature will assert itself, and to-day, we have a small family of kittens coming back to the Premier. Only a few days ago they started upon what they represented to be a crusade for a holy cause. But after three days' experience in the cold, far from the kitchen, exposed to the inclemency of the season, they have come back to the cream. And at once I must tender my apologies to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean). That gentleman, in his paper, the Toronto "World," two days ago, had a paragraph which I read as follows:—

> The French Ministers are said to have resigned, but the resignations are not confirmed, and may be a bluff.

I confess, Mr. Speaker, that having French blood and only French blood in my veins, when I saw that statement made concerning my French fellow-members who represented the majority of this House in the Cabinet that their game was only a game of bluff, I could not help feeling indignant against the hon. member for East York. I must offer my apologies for that feeling of indignation. If this was not a game of bluff, what was it? It was simply a misunderstanding, my hon. friend says. There was only a misunderstanding during these three days in which the country has been kept in suspense. We had supposed there was a grave crisis. We had supposed that a deep chasm existed between the hon. gentlemen who had thrown up their portfolios and the majority of the Cabinet. But it was simply a misunderstanding. The members of the Cabinet had been sitting together and discussing the questions before them, not for days only but for weeks, and I may say for months. And the more they discussed with a view to a settlement, the less they understood one another. But one section, it so happened, remained inside, and the other section remained outside in the cold. That cleared their understanding and convinced them that there was nothing between them but a very little matter which was not worth resigning over. What was the misunderstanding? I understood that the policy of the Government had been laid down on Monday last by the Minister of Finance. Here in an announcement, if I was able to

understand plain English plainly spoken, it was stated that, at the next session of Parliament, to be called not later than the 4th January, if, in the meantime, Manitoba had not been brought to terms, there would be some legislation introduced to give satisfaction to the minority. I understood that this was binding upon the Government, and, if I had been a member of the Administration, I would have been disposed to take this as a pledge binding upon the Administration. But, Sir, if I am to accept an interview which was published in the Montreal "Star" yesterday, my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works for one, and, I suppose my hon. friend, the Postmaster General also, were not satisfied with the pledge given upon the honour of the Crown, by the gentlemen who were the representatives of the Crown. This is what appears in the Montreal "Star" of yesterday, in the form of a solemn interview with the Minister of Public Works. The Finance Minister told me the other day—and in that only repeated what had been said before—that not much dependence was to be placed upon the utterances of ministerial newspapers. But this is an independent newspaper, and, moreover, the interview has such an air of authenticity, that it is difficult to believe that it is not perfectly genuine. The correspondent goes on to say:

> I had an interview with the Hon. J. A. Ouimet, Minister of Public Works, this morning.
> He looked in splendid fighting trim——

I may say this seems authentic enough; this would not be disputed.

> —seated in his library with Hon. Joseph Royal, ex-Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, and Mr. Joncas, M.P., who had just finished breakfast with him.

These details give an additional character of veracity to the narrative. He said:

> You may announce through the "Star" that, unless the Government, at three o'clock this afternoon, brings in a written pledge signed by every member agreeing to remedial legislation next session, I will take my seat as an independent member, and move a want-of-confidence motion.

This language referred to yesterday, but yesterday my hon. friend did not appear in his seat; to-day, however, he appears in his seat, apparently satisfied. Who has signed the pledge? It was only a misunderstanding, after all, as we have been told by the Minister of Finance. The pledge had been given on the faith of the Crown; but that was not satisfactory to the Minister of Public Works, and he wanted the written signature of every member of the Cabinet. Well, to me the honour of the Crown would have been sufficient, not so to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. He wanted to have the individual signatures of my hon. friends the Minister of Finance and his colleagues. Has my hon. friend the Minister of Finance taken a new pledge? Has he signed the pledge? If he has signed the pledge, who knows but, at some future time, he may say that he did so in a moment of weakness? Has my hon. friend the Minister of Justice signed the pledge also? Has my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, the Rupert of this Dominion Parliament, signed the pledge also? Has my hon. friend the Secretary of State, who has just come through an election in Haldimand, signed the pledge also?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the people of my constituency I expressed my opinion on this subject, but the hon. leader of the Opposition, in a hundred speeches, has failed to express his opinion.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend spoke so clearly in a hundred different speeches, the Minister of Public Works is hard to satisfy if, after listening to all those speeches, he has to have the written signature of the Secretary of State. I have read those speeches of the Secretary of State, and the more I have read of them the stronger become my conviction that he had learned Tallyrand's famous saying, that speech has been given to mankind to disguise thoughts. And my hon. friend the member for Huron (Mr. Patterson), fresh from a milder climate, has he also signed the pledge? And what about the Minister of Militia, has he also signed the pledge? And my hon. friend the Controller of Customs? I apologize to my hon. friend; he is saved by his position from the necessity of giving his signature. Now, Sir, I imagine we have seen the last of this misunderstanding. There is a grave lesson, however, in all these proceedings, and the lesson is this, that these gentlemen who sit together, statesmen, the Government of Canada, why, they have so little confidence in each other that unless they are bocked in writing, one of their own colleagues will not take their word. This is the Government of Canada, Sir, this is the Government of Canada that we have in this House. You may search in vain the annals of any British country, nay, of any civilized country, to find the like of that. There is one thing, however, which binds hon. gentlemen together, and that is, not the signature of the hon. gentlemen which was demanded by the Minister of Public Works, but the cement of office; I now beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was not that ring of triumph in the motion which was faintly heard to-day from the lips of the leader of the Opposition, as he moved that this House do now adjourn, which we noticed on the previous occasion; and, perhaps, the experience of his previous motion, and of the debate which followed, may, to some extent, account for the feebler tones of the

hon. gentleman on this occasion. The leader of the Opposition has endeavoured to withdraw to-day from the defiant position which he took up the other day, in as graceful a manner as was possible for him to do. He has dwelt upon a misunderstanding on this side. Undoubtedly, there has been a misunderstanding, and we are generous enough to rejoice that, considering the small comfort the Opposition have had during this session of Parliament, this misunderstanding, on your right, Sir, has somewhat tended to alleviate the sad disappointment that has existed on that side of the House since first we met in this session down to the present moment. Did the leader of the Opposition, as, with forced humour he referred to newspaper skits and newspaper cartoons, forget the humiliating position in which those comments leave his own party and himself ? If the Conservative party in Canada deserves all the ridicule that has been heaped upon it by those paid cartoonists in the organs of the Liberal party—

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Tory organs.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, in any organs. If they have dilly-dallied with public affairs, as has been charged, if they have shown a lamentable want of cohesion, if they cannot trust each other on your right, how is it that these brilliant gentlemen who, from the remarks of the leader of the Opposition to-day, are supposed to be a compact force—how is it that they are unable to come up and take possession of the treasury benches ? What is it that leaves them in a pitiable minority, whether they divide the House on a supposed crisis, or whether they divide the House when affairs are running smoothly ? I leave the leader of the Opposition to consider how it is that, if his opponents are so weak, if his opponents are troubled with misunderstanding, his own party grows weaker and weaker as the days roll by. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, why, on the occasion that is now under consideration, his party is only able to conjure up a few gibes and jeers ; I will tell you why the leader of the Opposition, though on an admittedly great occasion he can be humorous, can be nothing else ; it is because, though he has spoken at a crisis in Canada's history, though he has spoken, not for the second time only on this subject, but dozens of times, neither the House of Commons nor the people of Canada know where he stands upon the Manitoba school question to-day. Challenged on this eventful day, challenged at a moment when he fancied that he was about to achieve a party triumph, challenged in terms by the Secretary of State, the hon. leader of the Opposition did not dare to take up the challenge, but quickly concluded one of the weakest declarations that was ever made by the leader of a party, either on a supposed crisis, or on any important occasion in a House of Parliament. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that both members on this side of the House and the country at large appreciate fully how difficult it is to grapple with this question, and they have seen in the last few days a Government exhibiting that extraordinary strength, that while they did not conceal the fact that they were preparing to make an announcement which hon. gentlemen opposite know is most difficult to bring all minds together upon, and that they were, in the face of their opponents, ready to state their position in the House and in the country on a clear and definite platform. They were powerful enough and strong enough, I say, to harmonize the honest differences prevailing in their own camp, to reconcile them in the clear light of day, honestly and fairly, to admit that differences have existed, but they were able in the end to make the proud boast that a spirit of compromise prevails in the Conservative ranks, that patriotism exists in the Conservative party to-day as it has since 1867, and that on this question as on all other great constitutional questions, thank God, the Conservative party has in the end come together and in the end has triumphed, as I believe it will triumph on this question. So putting jibes and jeers aside, this at all events is our position to-day. Hon. members heard it stated from the lips of the leader of the House a few days ago ; hon. members heard that some of his colleagues could not go with him on this question ; hon. members now hear to-day that we have a Government consisting of the same number less one, that we have now a Government committed absolutely to an important policy, and a Government thoroughly in accord one member with another. Will hon. gentlemen opposite now tell the country where they stand ? Will they before they ask this House to adjourn —I ask them through you, Mr. Speaker—let the country at large know whether in as brief a time they can come together on this great question and tell the people exactly where they are prepared to stand. They will then remove the suspense in the country to which the leader of the Opposition has referred. There has been suspense. There is no longer any suspense regarding the position occupied by the Conservative party and the Government ; there is suspense, however, in regard to the position of the Opposition on this Manitoba school question, and I now make way for some of the hon. leader's lieutenants to remove that suspense and tell the House where they and their party stand.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). The motion now before the House is a motion to adjourn. What is the meaning of a motion of that kind under the present circumstances ? The meaning is that the House is to be led by hon. gentlemen opposite and not by hon. gentlemen on this side who have been leading the House for so many years.

We from the province of Quebec are deeply interested in the Manitoba school question, and we have strong reasons why we should desire hon. gentlemen opposite to come to a decision in regard to that question. Where are hon. gentlemen opposite on this question at the present time? They are complaining that we on this side of the House have had some differences of opinion or even misunderstandings? What understanding have they had on this question? The understanding has been to remain mute and silent. I make a special appeal to my hon. friends from Quebec, who no doubt care a great deal for this Manitoba school question, never to allow it to be said that they voted for adjournment and thereby allow the hon. gentlemen opposite to cross over to this side of the House without having some policy on this difficult and important question. I have too much confidence in the Conservative party, I have too much confidence in the Government at the present time, I have too much confidence in the public utterances made on the floor of Parliament, utterances which cannot be ignored without disgrace and dishonour, I have too much confidence, I repeat, in the present Government not to believe for one moment that remedial legislation on the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and of the remedial order passed in March last will be carried out. For these reasons, I hope my hon. friends from Quebec will to-day act as they did the day before yesterday, and oppose this motion to adjourn. What reasons have they for giving a different vote from that recorded by them the other day? Would they advance this question which they have so much at heart? No. We stand in the same position to-day as we did the day before yesterday when we come to confront and compare the position occupied by the two parties before the House, and I hope the same vote will be given.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not concerned in answering the challenge, nor have I a right to answer the challenge which the Minister of Justice has thrown down to my hon. friends who sit on the Opposition side of the House. But I am here to say, speaking, I hope, still as a Conservative, as I claim to be, speaking in the name and as representing the feelings of a great number of gentlemen on this side of the House on the matter——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. We shall see before the session is over whether my statement in that regard is correct or not. But we know at least where the Government stands, and where the Government stands unitedly. I cannot for my part understand what this three or four days trouble has been about, what this difficulty has been, if the explanation which is offered to the House is all that is to be told about it. Why, Sir, a very clear and definite statement is made to this House on Monday last, that the Government would call an early session for the purpose of implementing the remedial order by a Bill which the Government as a Government would press to a conclusion. But we are told now that because the Government intimated that they would correspond with the province of Manitoba and endeavour to see whether Manitoba would obey the order and comply with it, or rather do what was just to the minority, a misunderstanding arose. Was that misunderstanding justified? Was there any secret statement made? Was there any subterfuge on the part of the majority which gave rise to the course taken by the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Public Works? The pretense is that the majority of the Cabinet might have accepted something else than the remedial order, something less than the contemplated Bill, and if that was the idea which prevailed, if that was the subterfuge which underlay the statements, then I think the hon. gentlemen from Quebec were right in having an explicit statement and an explicit and clear understanding with their colleagues, and I cannot imagine there could have been anything else than that subterfuge or we would not have had three or four days interregnum. Now we know where we are. The province, which has told us in plain but yet in firm language, in answer to the order of His Excellency, that they will not take the responsibility of carrying that order into effect, is to be invited again to stultify itself and to say that it will carry the order into effect. We know perfectly well that that is hopeless. And what of the thirty-nine gentlemen from the province of Ontario who have told the Government that they were not prepared to endorse or support the Government which will carry out the remedial order by a Bill in this House? These gentlemen have now, it seems, to give in to their leaders from the province of Quebec. These gentlemen who brought their pressure to bear with such effect that the Government dare not introduce a remedial Bill this session—although the Bill was ready cut and dry to their hands, and has been since March last—these gentlemen are now, forsooth, to take what is administered to them (for the second time in the history of this Parliament) from the province of Quebec. They are to take the statement made here by the Minister of Finance. And the deliberate answer given to the question of my hon. friend from Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Girouard) that there is to be a pretense of asking Manitoba that which it is known Manitoba cannot comply with; and then the great Conservative party, forsooth, is to be pledged, in the interest of minorities, to force upon the small province of Manitoba, through the federal powers, a hateful school law, which, I trust, will never by this Parliament be placed upon that or upon any other community.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, all the hon. members in this House have, no doubt, realized the serious nature of the position in which the Government of this country have been involved within the last few days. We have all realized that grave differences had arisen between the hon. members of the Government, as to how to make a satisfactory settlement of the question that confronts them and come to an understanding on the same. Within the last few years, Mr. Speaker, members of this House who showed a great concern for the future of the country, men distinguished for their abilities, great statesmen whose science and legal attainments made them a tower of strength for this House, have departed from our midst—I now allude to the late Sir John A. Macdonald and to the Hon. Edward Blake, among others, the former of whom has departed from our midst to join the great majority, and the latter has left us to display his abilities in a higher parliamentary sphere—and I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether possibly these men could, with all their clear insight into politics and with their large political experience, have foreseen that the Government of the country should, one day, fall into the weak hands that now hold the reins of power? Apart from this consideration, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that at as early a date as 1890, Sir John Macdonald, when his political career was verging to an end, and at a time when religious and racial differences were arising in our midst which threatened the very life of the Canadian Confederation and jeopardised the great work of his whole life, Sir John Macdonald, I say, with those cares preying upon his mind and feeling that his career was drawing near its end, and in accord with a most distinguished statesman, who was then the leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition in this House, devised the means of settling those differences, in case they should ever come up for solution before the Government of this country. This legislation was carried without a dissentient vote in this House. That legislation was framed with a view to referring to the courts for decision these most intricate and important political questions, and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who was fully aware of the consequences that were involved in the passage of this legislation, recorded his vote in favour of it. Subsequent events, Mr. Speaker, evinced the remarkable wisdom of the policy pursued, under those circumstances, by those statesmen, Sir John A. Macdonald and the Hon. Edward Blake. The Manitoba school question which was then just looming up above the horizon, all bristling with difficulties, under the shape of national and racial prejudices, was referred to the courts, and in the case of Barrett versus the city of Winnipeg, the minority which appealed to a higher jurisdiction, until she should reach the foot of the Throne, was non-suited. Nothing daunted by this first failure, the minority resolved upon fighting it to the bitter end, and decided to press their claims until justice should be done and until the political problem at issue should be solved, no matter what the final issue might prove to be, if only it was settled on the lines of justice and British fair play. An appeal for redress against the Acts complained of was then taken under the constitution, before the Governor General in Council. His Excellency the Governor General in Council, previous to considering the grievances of the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba, deemed it his duty to refer a certain number of questions to the Supreme Court of Canada. The decision of the Supreme Court was that no appeal would lie to the Governor General in Council. Once more the Manitoba minority decided to appeal to the highest court in the Empire, and the decision of the Privy Council of Her Majesty, of January, 1895, was to the effect that the grievances complained of were well founded, and that the school laws enacted by the Manitoba Government in 1890 invaded the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in educational matters. Now, the only alternative left for the Government, Mr. Speaker, but to hear like complaints and grievances of the Roman Catholic minority and to give a decision on the lines of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England. His Excellency the Governor General in Council decided, in conformity with the judgment of the Privy Council, that the grievances complained of by the Roman Catholic minority were well founded and called for redress, and a declaration or remedial order based on the lines of that decision was passed on to Manitoba. The legislature of the province of Manitoba took into consideration the order sent on to it by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, and gave the Federal Government an unequivocal, and positive answer. Mr. Speaker, I may remark that, prior to the passage of the remedial order, His Excellency the Governor General in Council had already taken into consideration the grievances of the Roman Catholic minority; and that his attention had been drawn to those grievances by the petition signed by all the members of the Roman Catholic Episcopate of the Dominion of Canada; further, that His Excellency in Council, last summer, had thought fit to transmit to the Government of Manitoba an extract of the report of the Privy Council approved of by His Excellency, asking the Government in the most parliamentary way, to redress the grievances of the Catholic minority, which interested the Dominion in general; and that in pursuance of a policy which requires that the right of minorities in the different provinces of the Dominion, irrespective of creed, should not be prejudiciously affected, with regard especially to freedom of conscience and worship. The Manitoba Government de-

clined to remove or redress the grievances complained of by the Catholic minority and did not give a satisfactory answer to His Excellency in Council. Subsequently, an appeal was taken to the Privy Council, and, as alluded to above, a favourable decision was rendered by the committee of the Privy Council, and then, the remedial order was sent on to the legislature of Manitoba. And what are the terms and the purport of the decision come to by the Federal Government, in reply to the legislature of Manitoba. The Government, by its declaration on Monday last, pledges itself to enter into further negotiations with the legislature or rather with the Manitoba Government. There is only one political body with which we can now negotiate; that is the legislature of Manitoba, and that political body is now adjourned. The legislature shall not sit again before this Parliament has come to an end. How then can this Government hope for a satisfactory settlement of the question, if they are precluded from negotiating any further with the legislature of Manitoba? I may say further, Sir, that the reply given by the Manitoba Government to the Cabinet, which I have before me, is not only improper, but insulting for the Government. What is the purport of the answer? First, the Manitoba Government state that the legislature has always realized the importance of the school and educational problem in that province; and that they have good grounds for believing that they still realize its importance. That the Federal Government, that passed on to them the remedial order, know very little as to how to solve the problem, and that in case they should require a royal commission to advise them, the small legislature and the members of the Government of Manitoba will take the trouble to come down to Ottawa, to open the eyes of the Cabinet. Such is the purport of the answer given. Last summer, the Cabinet sent a message to the Manitoba Government; and with a view to enter into further negotiations, they made overtures to them set down in such courteous terms as to preclude the legislature of Manitoba from all possible risk of refusing to enter into negotiations, had they been in the least degree disposed to do so. Entreaties were of no avail. The case had then to be taken before the courts, in order to get to a proper construction of the constitution. The minority, relying upon a judgment of the Privy Council, which decided that they had good ground of complaint, and stated their grievances in no uncertain way; relying moreover on the admissions made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), when arguing the case for the Government of Manitoba before His Excellency the Governor General in Council; relying further upon the admissions of the very promoter of the law, that it was a tyrannical and unjust law; I say that the minority applied for relief to this Government, which passed a remedial order and sent it on to the Manitoba Government. The latter, through its positive and improper reply, has divested itself of its legislative powers so as to invest this Government with the same. Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be seen from the remarks I have just made, how it happens that, through the exertions and the wise measures adopted by the far-sighted statesmen who governed this country—some of whom have disappeared from the parliamentary arena, while others have since joined the great majority, bequeathing to us a rare monument of legislative wisdom and foresight—this is how it happens, I say, that the Manitoba school question was allowed to reach a stage of settlement, and a clear and unequivocal solution, through the medium of the legislative power of this House. But, Sir, it belongs to great statesmen to unravel great political problems, and to small statesmen to make them unsolvable. I am afraid less no settlement should be reached on the school question, during this Parliament. I apprehend less the Government should not be able to fulfil their pledges, however positive they may be. There is no reason for dilly-dallying with the question. The Government, as in duty and honour bound, should take their ground and redeem their pledges. My political opponents, as well as my political friends, know that I have nothing to gain by my present attitude. My political opponents know my fidelity to my party, from the exertions I have put forth to fight them. They know also how, in the political campaign that took place quite recently, I fought against my hon. friend from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), whom I see now in his seat. Those who took part in the struggle are aware of the strenuous exertions I put forth to secure the return of the Government candidate. They know the earnestness with which I upheld the honour of my party. I regret to say, Sir, that I was deceived as to the degree of energy and good faith of the Government. I say further, that, after receiving from the Manitoba Government such a letter as the one they received, there is no other path open to them, with a view to bringing any further negotiations to a successful issue, but to crawl from Ottawa to Winnipeg, and beg on their knees from the Greenway Government to rid them of this legislation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. (Translation.) On all fours.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) And I am sorry to see at the head of this procession my hon. friends the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron). I have no hesitation in saying, Sir, that it is below the dignity of this Government to be under the necessity of crawling on all fours to Winnipeg, after having met with so flat a denial as the one they received. Sir, the remedial order was of such a char-

acter as to lead us to believe that we had at last found a proper solution of the political problem. The pledges that were then given by the Prime Minister in the other House were of such a nature as to induce us to believe that the pledges given would be redeemed. Now, the Government wishes to enter into further negotiations with the legislature of Manitoba. I warn him against the impolicy and the unprofitableness of such an undertaking. As I suspect the good faith of the Government, I cannot approve of the course they pursue nor repose any confidence in them any longer. I am sorry to say that in the ranks of the Ministry there are not to be found men up to the standard of our departed chieftains. While I greet the Ministers as the successors of the great men who have sat before them on the treasury benches, of those men who have removed the obstacles that blocked the way to legislation on these intricate questions; but unfortunately, I do not know that they are ready to learn the lesson of wisdom and experience which they have been taught by these great patriots. But, Sir, I may say that there is one member of the Cabinet who has thought it below his dignity to take back the resignation he had sent in, and again fall in the ranks of the Cabinet. The political career of this man is a remarkable one. He may, no doubt, have inveterate political enemies, but all agreed in saying that he is a man endowed with great energy and moral courage. I am satisfied that his compatriots will greet him as a courageous man. Sir, some are of opinion that he has inflicted incalculable injury upon the Liberal party. I consider, Mr. Speaker, that this man has not dealt a mortal blow to the Liberal party, but that, through him, the province has got rid of a dangerous Government, as well as the Liberal party upon which was saddled the responsibility of the action of that Government, although they did not approve of its course. He has merely lopped off the mouldering branches and useless twigs, that would otherwise have pumped the sap of the Liberal party, stunted its growth and prevented its bearing an abundant harvest of political fruit. Now, Sir, this man seems to have endeavoured to rid the Conservative party of a certain faction which is imperilling the very life of the party, through its stubborness, its disloyalty, its spirit of partiality and injustice, in denying the minorities in the different provinces their lawful rights in religious and educational matters. I believe, Mr. Speaker, as others do, that the Tory party, outside of the province of Quebec, will look upon Mr. Angers as one of their enemies, but to those of our Ministers who have remained at their posts in the Cabinet, I shall say this: that Mr. Angers, by his attitude on that question, has reunited into a solid phalanx the whole province of Quebec. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are asked to vote confidence in the promises of the Cabinet. Allow me, Sir, in connection with this matter of blind confidence which we are asked to repose in the promises of the Cabinet, to tell the House a story. One of the members of the Government who is now in his seat on the treasury benches, had, it seems, made certain promises to one of his friends who had a claim to settle with the Government and who was pressing the settlement of his claim. Now, what I wish to impress upon the House, is the characteristic reply made by the member of the Government whom I now see in his seat. His friend told him, one day: "Say, I am out of patience; I can't trust you any longer; you must settle that affair right away." Said the Minister: "Don't get mad, friend, I am going to make you another promise." Mr. Speaker, the Government wants to give us further pledges. They promise to enter into negotiations with the provincial authorities of Manitoba, to find out whether they can arrive at a satisfactory settlement in favour of the oppressed minority. Those negotiations cannot and will not have any result. Some say, Sir, that it is only another device to adjourn the settlement of the question, and I think they are right. An hon. member on the other side of the House reminds me, on good ground too, that the hon. members of the Opposition have not stated to the House their policy with regard to the Manitoba school matter nor where they are prepared to stand on the question. They retort, rightly too, that the Opposition is not bound to state to the House the course it intends to pursue on the question. In that respect, the Government have made known their opinion. But it is none the less true that, whenever they happen to hear themselves reproached with not having fulfilled their promises, they remind us of their former promises. But, on the other hand, the Government admittedly have the benefit of the position, as they have a well-defined public policy on the question, and a policy still better defined and reiterated by the ministerial statement which has just been made to this House. I give the Government credit for this well-defined attitude; still I should give them more credit, were they to pass from the domain of mere speculation into the realm of substantial reality, were they to give up making mere promises, in order to fulfil the same. Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that, to my mind, the future of confederation is seriously threatened, and the danger will only be intensified by the course pursued up to the present moment towards Manitoba. There are rocks ahead, and the weak policy of the Government is a serious threat for the future welfare of Canada. No legislative power should be allowed to transgress the law of the Empire nor interfere with the judgment of the highest courts. Let us take a look across the line and take, for instance, the great American people. They also had their own political problems and very important ones too to solve; and in fact, if we take any

of the great nations of the world we will find that in order to develop their territory and rise to the rank of a great people, they all had extraordinary difficulties to face and to overcome. Such was the case with the American republic. The United States saw its very life threatened. It had an hair-breadth escape, under certain circumstances. The dilly-dallying of the great leaders of the republic with the problems they had to face, led the country to civil war, and this was the outcome to the doctrines that pervaded the United States, which brought about a conflict which resulted in the loss of millions of human lives. That doctrine was that of non-interference, advocated now by my hon. friend the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in favour of the province of Manitoba. He might learn from history how rivers of blood flowed throughout the land, as a result of that doctrine taught by Calhoun. What was that doctrine, Mr. Speaker? It was the doctrine of State independence, even in the matters which were within the scope of the jurisdiction of the central authority. Calhoun, the famous apostle of slavery in the southern slave states, was the first truly great American statesman who first advocated the doctrine of non-interference, which the hon. member for North Simcoe would like to see applied to the judgment of the Privy Council by the Manitoba Government. As the Government here have more than once already yielded to the Manitoba Government, especially at the time when there arose a difference about railway monopoly, they now allow them to break the constitution and the law. They have kept breaking the law and infringing upon the rights of the minority these five years past. The minority has been robbed of its rights and the weak Government that we have for the Dominion of Canada come now and tell us: Let the minority wait six months longer and the Government go on robbing that while and should nothing turn up during that time, we shall then afford them relief and redress. To my mind the constitutional theories professed by Manitoba present symptoms of a rebellion against the highest courts of the Empire and against the decrees of Her Majesty in Council, and I hold that the Government are open to censure for not carrying out the judgment of the Privy Council. On these several grounds, I cannot, until the Government shall have fulfilled their pledges, vote confidence in them; as soon as they shall have fulfilled their promises—better late than never—I shall vote confidence in them. The Catholics of Manitoba have suffered long enough; for too long a time have they been deprived of their schools; too long have they been ground down; for too long a time have they, a poor minority, been compelled to contribute out of their own moneys to the education of children whose parents were much wealthier than they were. The reign of injustice has prevailed long enough. I arraign the Government for not taking now the necessary steps to put a stop to such a state of affairs, after the judgment of the highest court in the Empire has provided the means for them and at a time when no obstacle stands in the way. Compromises have ever been fatal. In the United States, the compromises made with regard to the doctrine of non-interference by the Federal Government with local governments, led to this result, that the southern states, emboldened in their course by the inertness of the central power, finally believed they were under no obligation to obey the federal constitution. They went to the length of holding that the different states could override the judgments of the courts and the enactments of Congress. The federal government allowed the constitution of the country to be transgressed by the states, just as this Government allows the constitution to be transgressed by the province of Manitoba. Now, what was the result of such a policy? The American Republic came within an inch of being wrecked, and for over three years it was a prey to all the horrors of civil war. I wish to impress upon the Government the danger of allowing the dogma of non-interference being planted in this Canada of ours, either through their own inertness and supineness, or in any other way. I want the Government to let it be well understood by the provinces that they shall not be allowed to wreck the constitution, what though the majority of their inhabitants should require it, and even though their legislatures should so enact. Where then do I stand to-day? I know not that any one among the Government supporters share my views on the matter; but I am going to define my political attitude for the future. I somewhat defined it a moment ago, when stating that the Government should have no claim to my support, until they had enacted a remedial legislation, restoring the rights of the minority, on the lines of the judgment of Her Majesty's most honourable Council, and of the remedial order passed on to the Manitoba Government. As all the hon. gentlemen are aware, I am in perfect accord with my party as to the other articles of its political platform; but on this capital point, I consider that the Conservative party is now under the leadership of men who have their moments of weakness; and upon the present occasion, I consider that they have had a moment of deplorable weakness. Wherefore do the Government not pass their remedial law now? Are there insuperable difficulties standing in the way of its passage? I see none at all. As I said a moment ago, it is humiliating for the Government to enter into any further negotiations with the Manitoba Government. It is almost a disgrace for the Government to go back on bended knees to the Manitoba legislature, after we have been told that every one of its members had an imperative man-

date from the people, under which they were bound to return the answer they have given us. Did there transpire anything calculated to prevent our passing the contemplated legislation? Or did anything happen of such a nature as to warrant our entering again into any further negotiations with Manitoba? It is transparent now that no such negotiations could come to an issue. Manitoba has already given our demands a flat denial, and shall still do so. The problem to be solved is by no means a new one. It might be objected that it matters not whether we should wait a little longer, as we are asked to do in the declaration made before this House on Monday last; that the question is near being solved and it matters little whether a delay of a few months should occur or not. A Parliament which should concern itself with its duty, and a House which should concern itself with its honour, would take no such action, after receiving such an answer as has been given us by the Manitoba legislature. I say that there was here again a moment of inexcusable weakness on the part of the Ministers. If they deemed it necessary to such a course, it was only owing to their lack of firmness and resolution, at the beginning. How shall I stand, in the future, in relation to my party? I am going to define my attitude, leaving it to others who share my views to determine their own position, which, however, I think will be exactly similar to mine. In the future my attitude towards the party shall be that of a Conservative unionist. In Great Britain, where the constitutional regime is so well understood, there is a party of Unionists, which was formed with a view to the upholding of the British constitution. A fraction of the Liberal party there, Sir, have coalesced with the Tory party and adopted a policy based on the lines of the upholding of the Union. That party now styles themselves Unionist. It matters little whether the English Liberals did right in forming into a coalition with the Conservative party, but I say my position in the future, shall be that of a unionist. I am in favour of the upholding of our constitution in all its integrity. I do not wish to join the ranks of the Liberal party, which has made no satisfactory declaration of principle in my opinion at least, on the important issue which is now before Parliament. I do not want my course to be construed as if I were disposed to form an alliance with that party. I do not wish to sever my connection with the Conservative party, but I shall be ready, should the Government fail to redeem their present pledges, to make an alliance with any patriot, with any man willing to join hands with me to uphold the constitution and adopt a policy calculated to check any transgression of the constitution. I am a Government supporter in so far as I am ready to help them to reach the object they pretend to have in view. Such is my well-defined policy, or rather, my position in the Conservative party. I shall join, in the future, with all the men willing, like me, to uphold the constitution, with all the men disposed to protect the rights of the minority, with all the men willing to stand by the minorities. Mr. Speaker, while perusing the history of the American Federation, I found described there the very same spirit of tolerance and benevolence which pervades my own province towards the Protestant minority. That example is found in one of the states of the federation; in the state of Maryland. The extract I am going to quote is from Bancroft's History, v. I, p. 275. Allow me to add that I sincerely wish that the state of things described in the extract I am about to read, should prevail not only in the province of Quebec, but throughout the different provinces of the Dominion. Such a state of things as described by Bancroft should also prevail here, in Canada; let our fellow citizens from the other provinces take a hint from the American historian in this respect for their future guidance; let them follow in the footsteps of the people of Maryland—in connection with the treatment accorded to the minority there. I may remark, Mr. Speaker, that what Bancroft says of the course pursued by the people of Maryland applies to the line of conduct adopted and followed by the Catholics in the province of Quebec towards their Protestant fellow citizens:

> But far more memorable was the character of the Maryland institutions. In all the other countries of the world persecuting laws prevailed. The oath of the Governor of Maryland, which was devised in 1648, went on in these words: "I do further swear I will not by myself, nor any other person, directly trouble, molest, or discountenance any person whatsoever, for his or her religion or in the free exercise thereof." Toleration grew up in the province silently, as a custom of the land. Thus did the star of religious freedom harbinger the day; though, as it first gleamed above the horizon, its light was coloured and obscured by the mists and exhalations of morning. Roman Catholics who were oppressed by the laws of England, were sure to find a peaceful asylum on the north bank of the Potomac; and there, too, Protestants were sheltered against Protestant intolerance. The foundation of the colony was peacefully and happily laid. Such were the beautiful auspices under which Maryland started into being; its prosperity and peace seemed assured; the interests of its inhabitants and those of the proprietor, Lord Baltimore, were identical; and, for many years, peace and harmony prevailed undisturbed. The history of the province is one long record of benevolence, gratitude, and toleration. Harmony was disturbed by no intestine faction.

Would to Heaven that it would also apply to the province of Manitoba. At the entrance of the province of Manitoba into confederation, Cartier, when framing its constitution, exclaimed: "May the name of that province, which means, 'God who speaks,' prompt its citizens to speak the language of reason, justice and truth." Cartier! how cruelly deceived you

have been in that respect by thy English-speaking fellow-citizens! On the very floor of this House, within the walls of which went forth these utterances, lo! we hear to-day from a Government which pretend to be the heirs of his policy, we hear them declaring that justice should not be done immediately to a minority which has been deprived of its rights for these five years past. Let not my words nor my attitude be construed into a threat to the Conservative party as such; but if any construction is put on them, let it be as a blame inflicted upon the weak and vacillating policy of the men who represent Cartier to-day, at a time when an injustice is being perpetrated, and when they have to deal with the rights of the French and Catholic minority in the provinces. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that the constitution of the country is in jeopardy, if we cannot bring about justice, concord and harmony to prevail in our midst. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the liberties of our country are threatened. What is freedom? I shall give my own definition of it; but let the hon. members of the Government listen to the definition given to it by one of the greatest geniuses that ever lived in this land of America. Here is what Franklin thought of popular freedom:

Should I be asked what distinguishes free countries from those which are not, nations which are ripe for freedom from those which are still far from it, I should say: It is neither a constitution nor houses of parliament, nor newspapers—for all these may become instruments of oppression and tyranny; the true test is justice and a respect for the law. Tell me what the tribunals are and I will tell you what the people are. Do the government and the citizens bow down before the law and the protecting forms which it has set up? Doubt it not, then, liberty is there! Is the law played with, evaded by treacherous or violent measures, are there any special tribunals or judges corrupted either through passion or interest? Flee! liberty in that country is but a snare, and public institutions but a mere mockery. Liberty, mark well my words, is a regard for right—it is but another name for justice.

Was there any justice in the course pursued by the majority in Manitoba towards the minority? Is there any justice in the course now followed by this Government and this Parliament, when postponing the settlement of the question to a session to be called six months from now? Both Governments are guilty in that respect. The Government of Manitoba, for its spirit of rebellion, and this Government, because of their recklessness and weakness displayed by them in having the law of the land respected, and in restoring the reign of injustice, which, in the words of Franklin, is but another name for liberty. In the province of which I have the honour to be one of the representatives here, I may say, Mr. Speaker, without fear of contradiction that, should the legislation of that province, where the French and Catholics are in an overwhelming majority, attempt any invasion of the religious freedom and other rights of the minority, it would be annihilated, pulverized by the French and the Catholics themselves, the very day the members of that legislature should go before the people and claim its support. How comes it, Sir, that the reverse should take place in a province, the majority of which is recruited from emigrants, that came from abroad to claim hospitality on our shores? And remember, Sir, that they claimed hospitality from a race which is entitled to as great a credit for having developed the country and promoted its progress and march onward towards civilization, as the Anglo-Saxon race itself. I say further that they claimed hospitality from a race without the co-operation of which there would be no province of Manitoba to-day. They claimed hospitality from a race without whose help there would be no Canadian Pacific Railway to transport the emigrants. They claimed hospitality from a race which, by way of acknowledgments and gratitude, they now rob and despoil, exerting themselves at the same time to ravish the souls of its children. Mr. Speaker, I am far from being hopeful in the political future of the country. And in rising in my seat to-day to address the House, I was prompted by no other consideration, as a representative of the people in Parliament, but a desire to fight the good fight for the freedom of my fellow-citizens; let them be English or French, Protestant or Catholic, it matters not. I stand to-day, as I have always stood up to this moment, as a champion of tolerance, as an advocate of freedom and equal rights for all.

Mr. LACHAPELLE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me, in rising to reply to the speech of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), to state that I will not take up certain important parts of that speech. Although my hon. friend was very eloquent, I do not deem it necessary to reply to all the observations made by him. The essential point now before the House is whether we should withdraw our confidence in the Government, by voting for the motion to adjourn moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition, or whether we should continue them that confidence. That is the whole question. In referring to the Government, I beg to specially refer to the hon. Ministers who represent in the Government the province of Quebec. Should we now forsake the hon. the Minister of Public Works and the hon. Postmaster General, or should we continue them the confidence we have placed in them evey since we have been following them? That, Mr. Speaker, is the whole question. I will take the liberty to reply in as few words as possible to the hon. member for Bagot. The hon. gentleman prefaced his remarks by a history of the Manitoba school question. He, perhaps, forgot after this history of the question, to give us the true and proper appreciation which was now to be made of it. Who is it that struggled for the

minority, who is it that battled for the Manitoba schools since 1890 ? Who is it that stood the fight required in order to come to the peaceful settlement, which we all desire, of this difficult and important question ? Is it not these very Ministers whom the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) so easily deserts now ? Is it not these very Ministers whom he takes pleasure in bantering by stating that they are not great statesmen, but little statesmen ? The error in appreciation made by the hon. gentleman seems very strange to me. It seems to me to form the most of his speech. I can well understand that it would be different if the position were different. I can well understand that if we were, for instance, at the last moment when action might be taken on this question, we could no longer hesitate. I could then understand all the violence of his language. What is the question after all ? Nothing more than a mere postponement of three or four months to finally settle this school question. The Government, through the hon. leader of this House, states that the remedial legislation claimed by the hon. member for Bagot, will be brought before this Parliament at the next session. For my part, I cannot see the logic of the speech of the hon. gentleman, and I think that under the circumstances we should not forsake those who undertook to settle this question, for, after all, it is only a question of postponement and nothing else. But it is said this is a new promise. I deny that the Government spent their time deceiving the friends of the separate schools in Manitoba, that they spent their time making promises to lure public opinion. No doubt promises were made, but to say that since 1890, the Conservative party spent their time luring public opinion with the settlement of this Manitoba school question, no, I deny it peremptorily. What are the facts ? The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) has just stated that we have been pleading for four years, appealing from court to court, and all that to end in this new promise of passing a legislation at another session of this House. There is no fault to find in the hon. members of the Government, for their is nothing extraordinary in their whole conduct. The suit was a protracted one, but is it not true that we see people pleading for years and years for a simple matter of a hundred dollars ? Is it surprising that in a case of this magnitude, the judicial proceedings before the courts should have been protracted ? We must not prejudice the public opinion. The hon. gentleman is wrong, and he is mistaken in following the course he has just adopted. It is not a good way to have justice done to the minority in Manitoba. As I stated a moment ago, it is only after all a question of a postponement for a few months, and there is no question of principle involved. We all know that our hon. friends on this side of the House are devoted to the cause, the settlement of which they have so much at heart, a most important cause if ever there was. If it was a question of principle, I would understand the course followed by the hon. member for Bagot. But such is not the case. The hon. leader of the House stated that there only arose differences of detail between the members of the Cabinet and that these differences do not relate to questions of principle. In his statement of Monday last, the hon. leader of the House solemnly stated on behalf of the Government that all the members of the Cabinet were one on the question of principles, that is on the question of doing justice to the minority in Manitoba. Every one agreed on that question, and they were all unanimous as to that. No dissatisfaction was shown in this respect. All there was to do, according to the statements made to-day in this House, was to remove the misunderstandings, and it is what was done. Perhaps there was also, apart from these misunderstandings, let us say the word, a mutual want of confidence, but all the members of the Government accepted a statement which was calculated to reassure the hon. Ministers who represent the province of Quebec in the Government. Under these circumstances, I say that the Ministers from the province of Quebec were not only bound to give in and take back their vacant seats, but they were bound, and rightly bound, to ask the support of their friends in the fulfilment of the duties and obligations they undertook to fulfil and the putting aside of all trifling personal vanity, so that they might do their duty, cost what may. The hon. the Minister of Public Works imparted to us his feelings in the words so full of emotion he has uttered at the beginning of this sitting. The fact is I perfectly understood his position. I perfectly understand that he has passed through one of the most painful moments of his political life and that the hon. Minister suffered more than one can fancy. Solemn statements were made in this House, statements which implied a most formal pledge on the part of the Government to settle in a satisfactory way the Manitoba school question. The first opinion is not always the sound one, far from it ; it may even be said that it is often unsound, but the one following cogitation and reasoning, the second one, is truly the good one. I hope this second opinion of the people will finally be with the hon. Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works. Both these gentlemen have reconsidered their first decision, as it was their duty to do. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, whom I regret to see out of the Government, has followed another course. He considered the situation from another point of view. The question is such an important one that we must not be surprised by this. The province of Quebec has too much interest in the settlement of this question not to be represented in the Cabinet which pledges itself to give it a satisfactory solution. It was not advisable for our Ministers to leave their seats vacant,

and I say this considering the whole thing from the only standpoint of the settlement of this question. Would the question have been better served by our representatives remaining out of the Cabinet? I say no. For all these reasons, I think the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) is wrong in withdrawing his confidence from the Government, and that he was also wrong when archly bantering the Ministers of the province of Quebec. I say he is mistaken, he falls into a serious error which he himself will find out when in sober thoughts. I say he is mistaken because we are going to continue the same struggle in this House under the direction of our Ministers. We are also going to continue this struggle during the recess. We joined in this fight when our Manitoba co-religionists began complaining and we will only cease fighting when they will cease complaining and when the question will be finally disposed of. I therefore say that it is because the hon. Ministers of the province of Quebec and because the majority of the members of the province of Quebec, I have no doubt, show this opinion that they will continue to give the Government that confidence which is so necessary to bring about the settlement of the school question. The Government has given our French Ministers explanations satisfactory enough to justify their coming back. It was said that it would have been better to require that the Bill should be brought before the House. From a practical point of view, I do not think it would have given us more guarantees than those contained in the statements made by the Government Monday last and to-day. For one thing is sure, except for one actuated by a feeling justifiable with our opponents, but not with us, and that is that it follows from these statements made by the Government that the question will have to be settled at the next session in a satisfactory way. Should the Government not keep their promise, I regret to say it, but I would consider that as a dishonouring act which I do not believe the Ministers likely to be guilty of. I now come to a point of the speech of the hon. member for Bagot on which he laid particular stress. It is that the Manitoba legislature cannot receive new propositions from the Government for a settlement of this important question. He says the Manitoba legislature is not sitting. But no one will question that it can be called together for the consideration of a serious question. So that the reasoning of the hon. member for Bagot on this point is altogether groundless. As I understand it, the reason why a friendly hand is held out once more to Manitoba is to justify the strong action this House will have to take should it decline to accept it. I beg to state to my hon. colleagues in this House, and particularly to those of the province of Quebec—I have no fear in making this statement—that Sunday last I happened to meet the Superior of the community of St. Sulpice in Montreal, the venerable Father Collin and we talked the matter over. Sunday last, we were in full crisis, something like to-day for all that. I was representing to him that the settlement of the question could be postponed. Here is his answer: When a body, political or non-political, is compelled to take a violent action, it cannot take too many precautions, and your action will be all the less violent, said this gentleman who is acknowledged as a luminary in the province of Quebec, your action will be all the more acceptable to your natural opponents on this question as you will have taken more time to settle it, and then if you should be compelled to cause this policy to be followed by a strong action, you no doubt will have to take it. Well, I think this statement from so distinguished a man as Mr. Collin expresses the opinion of all the members of our clergy, of all our bishops, from Bishop Langevin to Bishop Gravel.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LACHAPELLE. (Translation.) I am so well satisfied that such is the opinion of these reverend gentlemen, who are perhaps more interested than we are in the settlement of this question, that I have no fear in stating that I will not have the humiliation of being contradicted by any of them. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have replied to the principal points of the speech of the hon. member for Bagot. A splendid speech, full of historical researches, but a speech which, I think, without any desire to judge it too severely, would have its justification in other circumstances, but not now. The question now is only as to the motion to adjourn. The only question we have to answer is this: Should we withdraw our confidence in a Government which for four years, through even personal sacrifices by some of their members, have helped us to continue this series of costly trials? What do they ask from us? A few more months to settle this question. Should we withdraw from them our confidence? I think we should not.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I heard with deep regret the statement made on Monday in the House by my hon. friend the leader of the House, that unless the Manitoba Government makes an acceptable arrangement with this Government in the way of remedying the grievances which the minority complain of on the lines of the remedial order and the terms of the judgment of the Privy Council in January last: "this Government would be prepared at the next session of Parliament to be called not later than the 2nd of January next, to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority, based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order of the 21st March last." I say again, Sir, that I heard that declaration with profound disappointment and regret, and sent here as I have

been by my constituency to support the present Government, and bound as I think I am in honour to give them all proper support in what are properly Government measures, I think it, perhaps, proper and wise to say here in the presence of the Government, so that my words may go to my own constituents and to the country: That any Bill based upon the remedial order which imposes the provisions of paragraphs "A," "B," "C," any Bill exempting the Catholics of Manitoba from the duty of paying school rates, and which furthermore empowers the Catholics of Manitoba to organize separate schools, and furthermore entitles the Catholics of Manitoba to a proportionate share of provincial moneys voted for education, is one which I cannot support.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) rose in his seat, I was prepared to record my vote against the motion to adjourn, moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition, but now, I have changed my mind. Why, Sir, at the very moment when we still cherished the hope—however faint a glimmering of hope it might be—to secure the settlement of the Manitoba school question, at this very moment, I say, when we are making the sacrifice of our self-love, we meet with provocations, and that from one of the most important members on this side of the House! The hon. member for Albert stands up in his seat and tells in so many words: You may do as you please, gentlemen, but should the Government introduce and press to a conclusion such a legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the minority, what though such legislation be based upon the constitution, I cannot support any such measure. I was inclined to think, Sir, that the Government were in earnest when pledging themselves before the country, and I was prepared to oppose the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition; but how can we take for serious a declaration which is not even accepted by as influential a government supporter as the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon)? The course followed by the hon. member is a blame cast upon the Government. This last challenge, Sir, fills the cup to the brim. I have relied so far on the pledges given by the Cabinet, up to the moment when their own friends repudiated those promises. What course then is there open to us, when we are confronted by such a situation? I have written in the newspaper, of which I am the editor, that the grievances of the Catholic minority in Manitoba would be redressed. I was prompted to take that position by the pledges which were given me by members of the Cabinet. We do not want to invade the rights of any minority; but, also, we want equal rights to all. We shall not allow Manitoba, nor any other province in the Dominion, to tear off a leaf from the constitution. As representatives of the province of Quebec, we want justice done under the constitution and nothing else. Now, Sir, I was prepared to grant the delay asked for by the Government, in the hopes that such a delay might bring about a settlement of the question in the near future; but, if the very arrangement we had accepted, perhaps to our prejudice, is to be set aside, we cannot any longer put up with that. The hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Postmaster General have made, this afternoon, a great sacrifice—in fact, one of the greatest sacrifices which a political man may be called upon to make—by consenting to remain at their posts in the Cabinet, in order to extricate the position; and this is the very moment chosen to provoke us, in the way the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) did, and that, too, by a man who, through his attainments and influence, occupies a high situation in this House. He tells the Government in so many words: What decision so ever you may give, we shall never consent to vote in favour of a remedial legislation which will afford relief to the minority in Manitoba.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Are the Government to blame?

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) I state a fact. Such is the answer to the offers of peace made by the Government, after the events that transpired within the few last days. It is an unwarrantable challenge on the part of the hon. member for Albert, who is so well informed as to the facts I allude to. The very fact that the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) stands up and tells this House that he cannot support any remedial legislation which may be introduced, vindicates the statement that there is no longer any hope that the Government may succeed next sesssion in passing a legislation which will afford relief to the minority in Manitoba. And, moreover, with such declarations as those, what do the positive pledges given that a remedial legislation is to be introduced next session, amount to? No doubt, as the hon. member for Bagot said, the Government have pledged their word. But can they redeem their pledge? I am afraid less this pledge should be as ill-fated as all the other promises. I was ready to take stock in this new pledge given by the Cabinet; but I cannot forbear, after the challenge hurled by the hon. member for Albert, recording my vote in favour of the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. JEANNOTTE. (Translation.) I did not at first intend to address the House on the question at issue; but circumstances are quite altered now. I think the statement which the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has just made, alters considerably the position, and forces me to record my vote in favour of the motion of the hon. leader of the Oppo-

sition. Should the hon. member take us to be children, he is quite mistaken. We all stand on the floor of this House on a footing of equality and we do not mean to be dictated to by anybody. From such provocations as that of the hon. member, we fear, not without grounds, less the pledges made in relation to the settlement of the Manitoba school question be not fulfilled we want to have serious pledges. But in voting in favour of the motion, I do not mean to cross over to the other side of the House. I place no reliance on the Liberal party. That school question has been raised by the Liberals of Manitoba and their friends. I regret that the Liberal leaders have not yet thought fit to inform us as to the policy they would carry out in power; they have not pledged themselves to settle the question in conformity with the constitution. Is there not among the hon. gentlemen opposite, one single man devoted enough to the interests of his party to state to the House that they are in favour of settling the question according to the wishes of the Episcopate? Let the hon. gentlemen muster up sufficient courage to make such a statement and they may be sure thereby to win sympathies that they are lacking now. Were I to judge by the position taken by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) I should say that, to my mind, the delay asked for by the Cabinet is not likely to be conducive to a settlement of the question; because, pledges are of no avail, if they did not materialize. Should the Government, next session, introduce a remedial legislation, I shall only be too happy to support their policy then as in the past, without for all that giving up my freedom and independence. Nor do I intend to oppose their general policy. I was returned to this House as an independent Conservative, and I intend to remain so, reserving to myself the right of judging the different questions that come up before the House on their own merits, let them be introduced either by the Conservative or by the Liberal party. As to the different measures brought up by the Cabinet, I am ready to support or oppose them, according as I consider them to be in the public interest or not. I do not intend to enter into the merits of the question as it is a trite matter. I may be allowed, before I resume my seat, to say that I look upon the course pursued by the hon. the Minister of Public Works and the hon. the Postmaster General as one requiring extraordinary courage. For I presume that, after all that transpired in the Privy Council, they came to the conclusion that there was no longer any hope of coming to a settlement of the school question, by allowing their Protestant colleagues in the Government to assume the whole responsibility in the matter. They have decided to remain at their posts in the Cabinet until next session, in the hope that, through their exertions a satisfactory settlement of the question may be arrived at, in accord with the wishes of the Catholic minority. To my mind, they should not be blamed for the course they have pursued; although, I am sorry to say I for one cannot approve of it, under the circumstances. As to whether the pledges given are such as may be relied upon, that is a question as to which they are better informed than I am. As I have not the same grounds as they have for judging of the propriety of such a course, I shall feel it my duty to record my vote in favour of the motion.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, for fear my silence on this occasion might be taken as an endorsement of the action of the Government on this question, I wish to say I do not approve of that action, and I hold myself free, when the proper time comes, to oppose the proposed measure.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr Speaker, I do not know that it is necessary for me, as I am already so deeply pledged in reference to this matter, to repeat again, what I have said more than once in this House, that if any Government attempt to impose upon the people of Manitoba legislation of the nature referred to, against the will of the people, I shall most assuredly feel it my duty to record my vote against that Government, when the question arises. However, I desire to say that I think the course the Government has pursued in endeavouring to arrive at a friendly arrangement with the Manitoba Government is on the lines of the best British statesmanship, and is a course which I believe the people of this country will most heartily approve.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. AMYOT. I am sorry that I hear "question." I suppose the question which we are discussing now is important enough to justify us in attempting to get a clear understanding of it. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) has just said that when the motion was made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, he was disposed to vote against it; but that, as he sees the Government abandoned by one of its friends, he will abandon the Government too. I cannot see the logic of that. I know the difficulties the Government has to face in connection with this important question. When so many friends threaten to abandon it, what help does it receive from the Left? Who is ready on the left to abandon his party to help the Government on this question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. AMYOT. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but the question will be discussed before the public. To-day it is very fine to laugh in the House; but the time will come when we will say to these hon. gen-

tlemen before the public: "When did you state your policy on that question?" In this House you do not speak; you are not obliged to speak—I admit it; you may remain dumb—you have the right to do so. You may do what you please, but you must take the consequences of your action, and your action to-day is essentially nothing. What does your press say? What does the "Globe" say? What do all the Grit papers of Ontario say?

Some hon. MEMBERS. What does the "World" say?

Mr. AMYOT. The "World" is not the whole world for me.

Mr. CASEY. What does the "Spectator" say?

Mr. AMYOT. What do the Grit press say? We will speak of the others in a moment. The "Globe," not later than yesterday, and the day before, declared that it would be a terrible thing to pass remedial legislation; and it supported its contention with the same strain of argument which it generally uses in all its articles. The "Globe" is forming the opinion of the Grit party in Ontario. The Grit party is dumb in this House. Where is the help that the Government receives outside of its own party? It will lose some friends and it gains nothing from the Left. Hon. gentlemen come to us and seriously say: On account of that, give up your alliance with your old friends of thirty years.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No; six months.

Mr. AMYOT. Six months? No. In 1892, as soon as the contestation of my election was over and I could not be accused of coming to my own friends from personal interest, I joined the ranks of the Conservative party, to which I had given my support till 1885. I gave up the Conservative party when they were in power in Ottawa and in Quebec, and went to the Opposition. I did not do it for my personal interest or the personal interest of my friends.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AMYOT. Who can deny that? I see it is near six o'clock, and I may as well take the time that remains between now and then in speaking of my own personal affairs, as it seems to please the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition. This is the way they receive the discussion of this question. When they are before the electors they are in favour of remedial legislation; but they will not say it in the House or write it in the Grit press. They want to change the grounds of the discussion, and discuss my personal merits instead. It is not a very brave attitude for a party which professes to deserve power. Mr. Speaker, I am not ashamed of my personal position in this House and in this country. I gave up the Conservative party on account of what I thought was a great crime in the administration of justice. So long as that question was in the political arena, I did not rejoin the party; but when it ceased to be a living question, and when the men who had been commanding in Canada at that time were doing so no more, I had to judge the party as I found it standing before the country. Not believing in free trade and not believing in all the divers theories of the Left, I went to protection, which I never abandoned, because in the greatest moments of excitement in the National party, I said, so long as the United States protect themselves against us, we must protect ourselves against them. I never gave up that policy. I went back to the Conservative party with unstained hands, and with the dignity of a man who was true to his convictions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AMYOT. Many of those who say "hear, hear," could not say as much. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen exhibit such a spirit to-day before so respectable an audience and so respectable a House. This discussion is upon a question involving the future existence of the confederation. To-day the question is whether the federal treaty, the solemn pact which has been entered into, will be respected or not, whether two millions of people will be deceived by two millions and a half of people. Look at the Act of Confederation containing a solemn written promise, endorsed by Her Majesty the Queen; look at the Act of Confederation and the Manitoba Act, which is based upon it. What does the Act of Confederation say? I will not quote the precise words, but give their meaning. It says that the minority will continue to have separate schools. I ask the hon. member for Albert if that is not the meaning of the treaty?

Mr. WELDON. I do not think so.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman does not think so. I will have, I suppose, to read him the very words of section 93 of the Confederation Act:

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, &c.
>
> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the provinces of confederation.
>
> All the powers, privileges and duties that the union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the separate schools and school trustees, of the Queen's Roman Catholic subjects, shall be, and the same are hereby, extended to the dissentient schools of the Queen's Protestant subjects and Roman Catholic subjects in Quebec.
>
> Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic

minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

In case any such provincial law, as from time to time seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority on that behalf, then, and in every such case, and as far as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section.

Now, I will ask the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) if he considers that, under this section, separate schools, for instance, are granted in the province of Quebec? Does he consider that we would have the right in Quebec to abolish the separate schools of the Protestants, and does he consider that in Ontario they would have the right to abolish separate schools? I will allow him with pleasure to interrupt me.

Mr. WELDON. It does not seem to me that this is the motion or the time to discuss that question with the hon. member. I shall have great pleasure, if I happen to be here next winter, to discuss that matter with him.

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. gentleman is of course at liberty not to answer my question. I think if he had an answer which would justify his interpretation of the clause A, B, C, and if he wanted to follow the A, B, C, of the law he would give me an answer at once.

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

After Recess.

Mr. AMYOT. I cannot refrain, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), making a short review of the circumstances which have brought about the situation now existing. We must remember, first, that the law in question, passed in 1890, was obtained through false representations and false promises; and I say that the Conservative party was not responsible for that law. An appeal was made to the courts. In that first appeal the Catholic minority was defeated. You will admit, Mr. Speaker, that the Catholic minority submitted to that decision, did not foment trouble, did not go on attacking the laws and the courts of justice. A second appeal was taken, and this time it was successful. This second appeal which was taken before the highest tribunal of the Empire, declared in most emphatic terms that the appeal to the executive at Ottawa was well founded, that the Governor in Council had jurisdiction, and that the proper course to be pursued must be determined by those to whom that determination has been committed by the statute. It was therefore decided by the highest tribunal to which we can apply that the appeal was well founded, and that the rights and privileges of the minority had been infringed. Upon that decision the Government passed the remedial order. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has repeatedly admitted that this remedial order binds the Government for the future. I am of opinion that he is right. The remedial order was sent to Manitoba; Manitoba sent its answer, and some say that the answer is a complete refusal, without any hope whatever for future action. Such, however, is not the opinion of the "Globe," and of the press generally in Ontario. The "Globe" has said constantly that there is no hope whatever, and I will in a moment give two or three quotations from the paper in that respect. I think myself that there is no hope whatever that Manitoba will do anything. But when you see in a country numerous newspapers saying the contrary, we must take facts as they are, and public sentiment and opinion as we find it. At all events, the Government, finding that there is a refusal say: We will present a remedial law and will press it for adoption at a special meeting of the House which will be called for a specific date. They ask us to support them, they want delay, and we are asked whether we approve them in that course or not. Mr. Speaker, I respect the opinion of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). No more generous heart perhaps beats in any breast in this House or country. I respect the opinion and sentiments of the hon. senator (Mr. Angers), who has just left the executive, but the question between them and us, or at all events, between them and myself is this: We are all friends of the separate schools; but who will be the best friends of the schools? Who will work in such a way as to insure their re-establishment? The reasons which the Government gives for asking delay are these: They want to take away the pretext which is invoked in the press that the remedial law should not be presented now, because there is a chance that Manitoba will revise its decision. They want to apply that supreme remedy of the remedial law only when all possible hope or chance of acting by Manitoba has been exhausted. Such is the position they take. Can I blame them? And for the benefit of whom will I blame them? Would it be for the benefit of the schools? I do not think so. I am not afraid of the ultimate fate of the schools. They are based upon the law as interpreted by the highest tribunal, they are based upon justice, and in no civilized country can such a cause be doomed to perish. I am sure that these schools will ultimately be established. But the Government says: We want to take away the pretext that Manitoba, if we gave them another chance,

might act. And I yield to their opinion; I think that, acting in wisdom, we must give them the delay for that reason. If they were to press the law immediately, they would be accused by the "Globe" and all the newspapers that follows its advice of having acted hurriedly. The Government believe that, when we have to deal with a nation a delay of six months is not too great a one, if it tends to bring harmony. They say, impliedly: We want to have some time to prepare public opinion, to explain the question of autonomy to our people. The question of autonomy is perhaps not entirely understood. The autonomy of a province is sacred, I admit. The autonomy of the Dominion Parliament is sacred also. Each must remain within its own sphere. But there is something more than the autonomy of a province in this question; there is the question of the autonomy of the family. The subject of education belongs to the fathers, to the heads of families. The powers in this respect are only delegated to the provinces, they are only delegated to the schoolmasters. We in this Parliament have been constituted the guardians of the autonomy of the family in this regard. It is declared in the Manitoba Act that vested rights in matters of education, vested either by law or practice, shall not be infringed upon. And in that law it is declared that if the provincial government infringes upon these vested rights, we in this Parliament are to be the guardians and must restore those rights. And shall we abandon that position? Shall we not allow the delay asked for by the Government, who ask it in order that they may facilitate the restoration by explaining the question to the people? And why need they explain it? Because, unfortunately, the great majority of the newspapers in this country have been leading public opinion astray. And I will show that to be the case. It will not please everybody, but it is true as far as I can see. Public opinion has been led astray by the fight which has been going on in Ontario for twenty years, which fight has kept the Tories of Ontario out of office for that length of time. The principle of the autonomy of the family, the sacred principle of education, will kill in this country any government either in Ontario or the provinces that will not recognize the rights of every one. And to-day the circumstances are favourable for our friends in Ontario to correct their mistakes of the past, and to prove that they are ready to receive all citizens, of any creed and any race, in their ranks to work together harmoniously for the good of the country. If the Tories of Ontario, who are far from being numerous in this House, should succeed in depriving their brother Tories of Ontario, who are with us, of the party advantages safely obtained by giving equal justice to all, they will kill their party in this House, not only for to-day, but for many, many years to come. In this Dominion the sentiment of equal justice and liberty of conscience is sufficiently understood to obtain everywhere. Well, the Government want to help in spreading the knowledge of that noble sentiment; they ask for delay, and I think they should have it. Another reason they give is that the law will be a most intricate and most complicated one, and they want delay so as to have the necessary time to prepare it—to prepare it in such a way that if it is called in question before the tribunals of the country it will resist attack, in such a way that it will work smoothly and will completely overcome the regrettable difficulty that is sprung upon us through no act of the Conservative party. These are the principal reasons why the Government ask us to wait for six months more. And they come boldly and manfully before the country, and say: This is our policy, we want to propose a law in the lines of a remedial order based upon the judgment of the court; we will propose it and press for its adoption. And our representatives in the Cabinet are satisfied with the kind of law that will be proposed. Am I to say that these two hon. Ministers of large experience, lawyers, men who have been mixed up with public affairs for a long time past have not their eyes open? I cannot say that, Mr. Speaker. I have confidence in them, and I will continue my confidence in them. I have confidence in the hon. the Premier, who, when he entered public life was defeated in his riding, because he was a supporter of separate schools. I have confidence in these gentlemen to whom the country has entrusted its destinies for such a long time; I have confidence that they are sincere, that they do not deceive us. The reasons they give for delay are sufficient, and I cannot refuse to grant them my confidence for the future. Now, Mr. Speaker, I said this afternoon that the Grit press was opposed to the schools. I was asked to speak of the Conservative press. I do not want to take up too much time of the House, but I have here a quotation from the Montreal "Gazette." Those who wish to read it will find it in the issue of 5th July. This paper is one amongst many others that most emphatically admit the grievances, and the obligation of this Parliament to come to the rescue. But there is a quotation which I cannot refrain from giving, as it is the opinion of a man, an honourable man, who does not belong to this country, but occupies now a very exalted position, Lord Salisbury. Here is what he said about a month ago. I take this from the Ottawa "Citizen":

And Lord Salisbury, less than a month since, delivered an address in London on "Religious Education," in which he said: "All they (the Church of England) asked was for freedom for

themselves and for others, freedom for all alike to teach the children of parents who sympathized with them sacred truths as those parents understood them."

The Ottawa "Citizen" is another of those papers which voices the opinion of the Conservative party favourable to the re-establishment of separate schools. Now, what do I find in the Grit press? The "Globe" of August last said:

> The attempt to restore the separate school system in Manitoba by outside interference is hopeless, and the sooner that this is recognized the better.

And a few days ago it spoke of "the tremendous task of making an additional law for the west." This is a very clear position for the "Globe," and it reflects the position taken in this House by the hon. member for North Simcoe, whom I must congratulate. He is a frank man. He comes squarely before a million and a half Frenchmen and says to them, everywhere except in our province and on our hustings: We want to deprive you of your French language. And he, a celebrated lawyer, admits that the judgment of the Privy Council established that the Catholics were deprived of their privileges and vested rights, and still he says: We will refuse to restore them to you; we will go on and take away your money by force of law. Here is a lawyer who says boldly: We will rob you. I have seen the time when the Catholics were thrown into the fire or given to wild beasts to be eaten. To-day the hon. gentleman is just and fair, and he is satisfied with robbing us. He says: I will take away the money of your people by force of a law which has been declared illegal. He refuses to give a remedy to the grievance, and he calls that applying the law, and thinks he is a just man. He wants to deprive us of our language, he is bold enough to say so. Unfortunately, he is too old a man to begin that work. His hair is getting gray; and it may well be that when he is no longer honouring this world by his worthy presence, the French language will be spoken still, numerous French children will be born, and they will perhaps pray in French for the repose of his soul. Now, I admit his manliness. He says he will fight the Government because they have promised to bring down a remedial law. I like that position, because then we will see how many people in the Dominion are so fair and just, and of so noble a character, that we may go on living with them. But I am sure that, if I may judge the future by the past, the number who will follow him will not be large enough to entrust him with the destinies of this country. Now, Sir, it has been said that if Cartier was living he would blame the Government. I do not think so. If Cartier was living he would say: Here is a very difficult question; public opinion has been led astray by the press for political and party interests; and here is a Government who wish to apply a remedy, to bring back to Canada an era of peace and harmony. They are honest and honourable men, and they ask for delay. Their reasons are good, their policy is good, and they have given an assurance to the minority that the majority would come to their rescue. And then Cartier would add: Do not destroy the great work of confederation, give a chance to the party that has always remedied the errors of their adversaries, give public opinion a chance to be enlightened and set right again, and then we will be in that happy position in which every one desires to see this country, justice will prevail, and it will be an honour to be a Canadian.

Mr. TAYLOR. Occupying as I do the position of chief whip for the Conservative party, and having been vilified in the press, I think it but right that I should make a few remarks before this debate closes. Ever since I was 18 years of age I have been an Orangeman, and I am now representing perhaps the strongest Orange constituency in the province of Ontario, containing more Orangemen, more Protestants, than many, if not any other constituency in the province of Ontario; and for these reasons I think it but right that I should say a few words on this question. Orangemen are not constitution wreckers. Orangemen, if true to themselves if true to their obligations, must uphold the constitution of our country, It is true we have some men in this country, and I am sorry to say we have them in this House, who pretend to be more Orange than King William ever was; and, although they have never joined an Orange lodge in their lives, yet they would willingly wreck the constitution and wreck the country, if they could, to make some party capital out of it. Orangemen are not made of that kind of material. I have been blamed by my constituents, and many of them passed resolutions condemning me for a vote I once gave in this House on a burning question at that time, known as the Jesuit question. Resolutions were passed condemning me for having given that vote. It was said that I gave that vote for the purpose of pandering to Rome. 'Tis true, in my constituency there are some 700 French and Catholic voters, but, for reasons best known to themselves, and exercising the right of every British subject to vote as they see fit, they have, in my last three elections, almost unanimously voted against me, and for the Reform candidate, only excepting twenty-five or thirty of them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Good for them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, good for them, but bad for the Conservative party. It was said that the vote I gave on the Jesuit question was given with the view of capturing those Catholic voters. When the next

election came on, my 25 or 30 Roman Catholics friends who had stood by me in my former election, continued to stand by me in the succeeding election, but no more. I did not receive one more French or Catholic vote in that election than I did in any previous elections, but for the vote I gave on the Jesuit question, I lost many of my warmest supporters, Orangemen and Protestants who had strong views on that question. But there are times in the history of every man when he should rise above party feeling in the interest of his country, and when he should take, not only his political life, but, if necessary, his physical life, in his hands, for the salvation of his country and the maintenance of the constitution. I knew when I was giving that vote on the Jesuit question that I was taking my political life in my hands. But I am a layman. I did not take advice of the lawyers, because they gave advice on both sides, and if you listen to lawyers, you will——

Mr. BERGIN. Pay for it in the end.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, if you pay for it, you can get almost any kind of advice. If you listen to the lawyers you will come out somewhat in the position that the Irishman found himself in. Two Irishmen came to this country and put up at a hotel for the night. During the night, the hotel caught fire, and their mode of escape down the stairway being cut off, they simply had to jump out through the window. Pat put his clothes on and jumped, and Mike followed, but Mike in putting his pants on had not discovered that he had put the wrong side to the front. When they landed on the ground Pat asked Mike, "Are you killed?" Mike said, "No, I am not killed." Pat then asked him, "Are you badly hurt?" Mike said, "No, but I think I am badly twisted." So it would be if we took the advice of lawyers; we would come out badly twisted if we took their advice, either on the Jesuit question or on the Manitoba school question. But, being a layman, interpreting the constitution as I interpreted it, I did my duty in voting as I did on that question, believing I was living up to the constitution and to my obligations in upholding the constitution of this country. After the election of 1891 the school question began to loom up. An agitation was got up in the country then. It was stated that in the session of 1892 legislation would be introduced to establish separate schools in Manitoba. At that time, I called together the Conservative Association of the constituency of which I have the honour to represent, and made a speech on that occasion, a portion of which I will read to the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it all.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will read all dealing with the question that I propose speaking on. I said:

Now, Mr. President, having dealt with local matters as far as I purpose doing at present, I will refer to a subject which is creating a good deal of interest throughout the country. That is what is known as the Manitoba school question, with reference to which I wish to define the course that, as your representative, I intend taking when it comes up in Parliament at its next session.

The Dominion of Canada is governed by a constitution known as the British North America Act. This Act was passed by the British Parliament and accepted by the Parliament of the Dominion and the confederated provinces of Canada.

Previous to confederation each province was a colony in itself, had its own parliament and had the right to pass its own laws, subject to the approval of the British Parliament. Each province had its own customs and excise laws. When confederation took place, all this was changed. The British North America Act gave to the Dominion the right to collect all customs and excise duties, with the condition that it should pay to each of the provinces an annual subsidy of 80 cents per head of the population of the province, the amount being based on the last census returns. The census was to be taken every ten years by the Dominion Government for the purpose of arriving at the amount to which each province should be entitled.

Each province was to have a legislature of its own and was given exclusive jurisdiction to deal with certain questions, such as municipal institutions, all school questions, dealing also with its own moneys, its own Crown lands, &c., &c.

The Dominion Government was to have exclusive jurisdiction over other matters, such as trade and commerce, administration of justice, taxation, &c., &c.

All Acts passed by any of the provincial legislatures were to be approved by the Governor General and his advisers, who have the right to veto any Act of the provincial legislatures, which veto power is, however, not to be exercised unless the Act under consideration interferes with private rights or those of the Dominion, or injuriously affects any other province of the Dominion. In a similar way the Queen and her advisers have the right to veto any Act passed by the Dominion Government, but the power is restricted to Acts contravening private rights, rights of the Crown, &c., &c.

The legislature of the province of Quebec passed a few years ago an Act, known as the Jesuit Estates Act, with the object of settling a local question with which the Government of Quebec had, by its constitution, the exclusive right to deal. This Act affected property held by the government of Quebec, which had formerly belonged to the Jesuits. When the Jesuits were suppressed, they left this property in the province of Quebec, and the local government took it over and held it as Crown lands. After many years, the Government undertook to sell the land, but the Roman Catholic Church claimed it, alleging in support of its claim that it had carried on the work of the Jesuits while the order was suppressed, and that it was, therefore, entitled to the lands. In the meantime the order of the Jesuits had been restored by the Pope, and it also claimed the property. The Quebec Government, however, said that the property belonged to neither of the claimants, and, forthwith, offered it for sale. The government soon found that it was impossible to find purchasers, as Catholics were restrained by the bishops, who forbade the sale, and Protestants were reluctant to buy, owing to the fact that the Catholics, who numbered

seven to one Protestant, all, directly or indirectly, claimed a share in the property. Matters remained in this condition until Mr. Mercier undertook to settle the question. He opened negotiations with both the bishops and the heads of the Jesuit order. They offered to surrender their claim for $2,000,000. They afterwards reduced their demand to $1,000,000, and, finally, after a good deal of correspondence, an agreement was made by which Mr. Mercier's government pledged itself to pay $400,000. This amount was not to be paid, however, unless the Pope, who is the common superior of Catholic bishops and the Jesuit order, should be made a party to the contract, and should say how the money was to be divided for educational purposes between the Jesuit colleges and the other Roman Catholic institutions of learning. A further condition was, that the Pope, as head of the church, should see that the bargain was carried out in all its details, and that no further claims were set up to prevent the government from going on and disposing of the property. This being all satisfactorily arranged, Mr. Mercier said that, as this was the people's money, all going to Catholic orders for educational purposes, a sum proportional to the Protestant population should be voted to the Protestant Committee of Education for the educational purposes of the Protestant portion of the community.

An Act was, therefore, passed by the legislature of Quebec, ratifying this arrangement, no opposition being offered by the Protestant members of that House. This Act, when passed, had to be sent to the Governor General for his approval. The Governor, on the recommendation of his advisers and of Sir John Thompson, as Minister of Justice, allowed it to go into operation, as it was an Act which, by the constitution the Quebec government had a right to pass. After the Governor had approved the Act, a petition was sent in asking him to disallow it. This was not done. When the House met, Colonel O'Brien moved a resolution, which was, in effect, that the Government ought to have disallowed the Act. If this motion had carried, it could not have changed the Act. It would only have caused the Government to resign, for it must do so if a vote of censure be passed. I, as your representative, had to vote on the question, and I voted as I would do again on the same question. I voted that the Government should not be censured for having done its duty and having lived up to the constitution by which we are governed. It is on account of this vote that I have been charged both in the press and in the pulpit with having voted to give the Jesuits $400,000. In this statement there is not a word of truth, yet the circumstances were so misconstrued that many people, not knowing the true state of the case, condemned me. I think, however, that now most people fully understand it, and freely admit that, as your representative, I did right, because, if we are to run this country without causing disruption, we must allow each province to live by its own constitution.

A few years ago the province of Manitoba passed an Act known as the Public Schools Act. This provided that there should be but one public school system, and that no moneys should be voted to separate schools. When this Act was passed by the government of Manitoba, it was sent to the Governor General and Council for approval. A petition, signed by every archbishop, bishop and priest in the Dominion, was sent to the Governor General, asking that the Act be disallowed. The Governor, acting upon the recommendation of Sir John Thompson, as in the former case, allowed it to go into operation, as it was an Act which, by the constitution given to Manitoba, the government of that province had a right to pass. Now, before Manitoba became a province, separate schools, both Catholic and Protestant, had existed there, and, after it became a province and was given a constitution, these were continued. The government of Manitoba voted money each year to these separate schools, but the legislature, as it had a right to do, passed an Act which changed all this. The separate schools continued, and after a time taxes were called for. The supporters of separate schools, both Protestant and Catholic, refused to pay taxes to the public schools. Their property was seized and sold, and one Catholic and one Protestant case was tried in court and appealed until the matter reached the Queen's Privy Council. There it was decided that the government of Manitoba was competent to pass the Act and had not exceeded its constitutional powers in any way.

Now, when Parliament meets, I expect that some French member will move a resolution similar in every respect to that moved by Colonel O'Brien on the Jesuit question, to the effect that the Government ought to have disallowed the Act. It would, however, defeat the Government and cause it to resign, as it would be a vote of censure. How will my friends who found fault with me for voting as I did on the Jesuit question, wish me to vote on this? If they are consistent, they will have to find fault with me again, for I intend to vote on this question in just the same way as I did on the other, seeing that, so far as our House is concerned, they are exactly parallel questions. I will again vote and say that the Government did right in not disallowing the Act. I intend to be consistent, whether those who find fault with me are so or not, but I do not blame any one for finding fault, as many were misinformed and did not understand the question.

It is said by some and believed by many that the Government will introduce legislation to override the provincial Act and to grant separate schools to Manitoba. I do not know what the Government may do or intend to do, but I do know the course that I, as your representative, intend to pursue. As a supporter of the Government and as my duty demanded, I notified my leaders over two months ago that, if they introduce any legislation to interfere with or override that of the province of Manitoba, I feel it to be my duty to vote against them. I now tell you, the members of this association, that this is the course I have marked out for myself, and, if I am not, on this question, in accord with the majority of my party, I will feel it to be my duty to tender you my resignation, as I claim that the provinces alone have the right to settle these local questions. If the Jesuits' Estates Act is to be repealed, it must be by an Act of the local legislature of Quebec, and if separate schools are to be recognized by the government of Manitoba, it must be by an Act of the legislature of the province. But the same law must apply to all provinces, that each shall have the power to deal untrammelled with its own local questions, a power to which they all have a right by virtue of the constitution granted under the British North America Act.

That was a speech that I made two years ago, and before the last decision of the Privy Council was rendered, and on which decision the remedial order now under discussion was based. The decisions of the Imperial Privy Council are part and parcel of our constitution in this country, and since I made that speech to my constituents

the Privy Council have rendered their judgment. They have said by that judgment that grievances exist in Manitoba, and that by the Act of 1890 the Manitoba Government have perpetrated an injustice on the minority in that province. That decision of the Privy Council was signed by Her Majesty the Queen and was sent to our Government, and in turn it was the duty of the Governor General in Canada and his advisers to pass that remedial order on to the Manitoba Government. That was the constitutional way of doing it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says "hear, hear." I will shortly quote his words where he distinctly stated that it was the duty of the Canadian Government to send it on to the Manitoba Government. I will also read the statement of the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) that the Government were entitled to no credit for having done this because it was simply their duty to do so. That is the opinion of lawyer against lawyer. That is what these gentlemen say, and what can we laymen say when we have the advice of two such constitutional lawyers as my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser). Then what did the Government of Manitoba do? When I was up in Haldimand I met the hon. the Attorney General of that province, and in one of his speeches which I will quote shortly, he said that the Government of Manitoba would immediately send the remedial order back to the Federal Government as soon as the House met. Did they do that? No. The legislature of Manitoba met and the remedial order was there before them, and Mr. Greenway asked the House to adjourn to give him time to consider such an important matter. The House adjourned and he took the matter into consideration, and he met the House and asked for another adjournment that he might have still further time to consult able lawyers so as to thoroughly understand the remedial order. When he met the House again, did he say to the Dominion Government or to the Governor General: There is your remedial order, do what you like with it. No; but he holds out the olive branch and says: If further negotiations are had the matter may be adjusted. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) wrote a letter to the papers and in that letter he stated that it is the opinion of the people of Manitoba that the matter may be adjusted.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to say that I never said that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I refer you to your letter published a short time ago in the "Citizen."

Mr. MARTIN. My letter did not say any such thing.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, whatever that letter said is what I say. I am not a lawyer but I know what plain English means, and if the letter of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) means anything, it means that the matter can be settled and will be settled by the people of Manitoba, who will grant what is asked for.

Mr. MARTIN. It means just the opposite to that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will not misquote the hon. gentleman, I will read his letter:

> Editor Citizen,—I notice in your issue of to-day's an interview with the Hon. Mr. Ouimet, from which the following is an extract:—
>
> However, it would be idle to discuss that now as no legislation has been asked by the Catholics of Manitoba giving them the right to share in the funds provided for education by the Government or by the local authorities if their schools are not up in secular teaching, to the public schools of the province. All that they ask is to be at liberty to add to the secular education required in the public schools such religious teaching as will meet their religious views. I may say that if that had been provided for in the legislation of 1890, we would never have heard of the Manitoba schools question.
>
> There has been all along a very serious misunderstanding between the Roman Catholic Church and the people of Manitoba, if the above is an accurate statement of the position of the Church. I suppose, however, that we must take for granted that Col. Ouimet is in a position to formulate the wishes of the Roman Catholics in connection with this question. If so, then I may say at once that there is no need of any remedial legislation in order to bring about such a state of affairs. I believe the people of Manitoba would be willing to give the Roman Catholics all that is asked for.
>
> Everybody wishes that a solution of the question may be found without any coercion on the part of the Dominion Parliament, and if the demands of the minority are correctly expressed by the Minister, I am very much at sea in my acquaintance with the views of the Manitoba people, if they will not bring about of their own accord all that is asked.

"All that is asked," says the hon. gentleman. The grievances are to be remedied as stated by the Minister of Public Works. My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) says that the people of Manitoba and the government of Manitoba will give them all they ask.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, if he sees any resemblance whatever between the statements in the interview with the Minister of Public Works, and the language of the remedial order?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have read the statements of the Minister of Public Works as given here, and I have read the statements of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin), and I will leave it to the common sense of the people of this country who are laymen and not lawyers to draw their own inference. I believe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) has fully corroborated what I stated before I commenced to read his letter. The letter of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) continues:

> When I introduced the School Bill of 1890, I pointed out that in so far as it provided for re-

ligious exercises in the schools, it was in my opinion defective. I am one of those who deny the right of the State to interfere in any way with matters of religion. I said then, and I still think that the clause of the 1890 Act, which provides for certain religious exercises, is most unjust to Roman Catholics. If the State is to recognize religion in its school legislation such a recognition as is acceptable to Protestants only, and in fact only to a majority of Protestants, is, to my mind, rank tyranny. The desire of those with whom I think in this matter is to eliminate every question of a religious nature from the school laws and to make the schools purely secular. This has not been done in Manitoba, and that course is apparently not supported by a majority of the people there. That being so, surely it will be admitted that the nature of the religious exercises or religious teaching (I am unable to make any clear distinction between the two) should be such as is agreeable to the consciences of those whose money is taken to support the schools. I have sufficient faith in the liberality of the Manitoba people to declare on their behalf that if a final settlement of this question can be reached upon the lines suggested by Col. Ouimet, they will do their part. What Manitoba has insisted upon is that the Roman Catholics shall not have a system of separate schools such as existed prior to 1890, which were exempt from the general laws as to efficiency. If the Roman Catholics are willing to accept the schools as they exist at present and as they may from time to time be modified with the addition of such religious teaching as they may desire, then there should be and I am sure would be no difficulty in reaching a settlement of the whole question without any legislation on the part of the Dominion Parliament.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH MARTIN.

Ottawa, June 25th, 1895.

If I can understand the English language, and if my hon. friend from Winnipeg speaks, as he professes to speak, for the legislature and the people of that province, then there will be no difficulty in the Government of Manitoba adjusting the difficulties that are claimed to exist in that country. I may just say for myself that had the Government done as it had been rumoured two years ago they would do—had they introduced an Act to override the Act of the Manitoba legislature, I would then, as I notified them, have voted against them. Had they introduced it at the session a year ago, I would have done the same; the decision of the Privy Council had not then been rendered. Had they introduced it this session, I would have voted against them. And, in pursuance of my duty as whip, I found that if the Government introduced legislation this session to override Manitoba, and if enough Government supporters voted against them, it was the intention of all the Liberal members of this House, whether Protestant or Catholic, to down the Government for it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How did you find that out?

Mr. TAYLOR. I found it out by statements which were carried to me by hon. gentlemen in close communication with hon. gentlemen on that side of the House.

Mr. DEVLIN. You do not know what you are speaking about.

Mr. CAMERON. You speak now.

Mr. TAYLOR. I got the information; and, whether it was worth anything or not, it was my duty to communicate it to my chief. At the same time I communicated to him that if he introduced legislation to force Manitoba, there were many Government supporters who would do the same; for they thought that the matter should be deferred, and that every possible effort should be made by this Government to have the matter adjusted amicably, on the lines of the letter of the hon. member for Winnipeg, by the local legislature, which, by the constitution of this country, has exclusive jurisdiction to deal with such matters. Like the hon. member for Winnipeg, I have faith in the people of Manitoba. I believe the people of Manitoba and the Government of Manitoba will obey the remedial order, and the decision of the Queen's Privy Council, which is part and parcel of our constitution. I have no reason to doubt that they will obey that order, for the word sent down here by the Manitoba legislature was to the effect that they were willing to try and adjust the matter. The hon. member for Winnipeg says his letter has a different meaning from what I take from it, and from what the people of this country will take from it. But you may take the same meaning from the answer of the Manitoba legislature to the remedial order. If I can read and understand the English language, it says: We are willing to negotiate further. Then I say it is the duty of this Government to meet them on that ground. Had the Government introduced and tried to pass legislation at this session, I believe they would have been acting wrongly and contrary to the true meaning of the constitution; but they have delayed the matter to another session, in order to try to adjust it, as I believe they will; because I believe and accept the statement of the hon. member for Winnipeg that the people of that province are just as loyal and true, and as ready to uphold the constitution of this country, as any other community under the sun. Therefore, I believe they will, and until they do differently, I will not believe to the contrary.

Mr. CASEY. If they do not do it, what then?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not believe they will refuse; I have no idea that they will. I take the word of the hon. member for Winnipeg, who was a member of the Manitoba legislature, and the father of the Manitoba Schools Act, and who says it went too far—that it did an injustice, and that the legislature of Manitoba will undo the wrong that

was done at that time. I have been blamed by some of my friends in my own constituency, as well as by some outside of it, for having gone up to the county of Haldimand to assist in the by-election of the hon. Secretary of State. I was invited to take part in that election; and being then, as I am now, a good supporter of the Government of the day, I felt it my duty to go. I went and did what I could to carry that election in the interest of the Government and of the country and of the Conservative party. I had the honour of meeting on the platform there my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who was defending the claims of the candidate he had put forward in the constituency, and I found that riding flooded with inflammable literature in the attempt to raise a fight in this country before the fight was on. I found an Orange card for Orangemen, and other cards in other colours, distributed all over the county. I will read:

> Your vote and influence are respectfully solicited on behalf of Jeffrey A. McCarthy, the candidate opposed to the acts and policy of the Dominion Government with respect to the Manitoba school question.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What is wrong about that?

Mr. TAYLOR. Because had I as an Orangeman sat at the Council board, as the hon. Secretary of State had, I would have felt it my duty, as he felt it his duty, as a loyal citizen of this country, to pass the remedial order on to Manitoba. That was all the Government did up to that time; but the hon. Secretary of State was condemned as not worthy of a seat in this House or in this Government, simply because he had carried out the constitution of this country. Had I been in his place, I would have done the same. And what does my hon. friend from North Simcoe say in his argument before the Governor General and Council? This is his argument:

> Another question is as to how remedial action is to be carried out. You will make a remedial order. I do not quite agree with my learned friend that you are to frame an Act of Parliament for the legislature of Manitoba. Your duty would be well performed, in case remedial action was to be taken, if you pass the remedial order and left the legislature of Manitoba to put that in the form they saw fit.

That is what my hon. friend said, and he went further. He said:

> The Privy Council have determined that there is a grievance: they have determined that there is jurisdiction in the Governor General to pass a remedial order * * * * I am not going to say that there is not a grievance. I am precluded from that by the judgment.

My hon friend agreed that there was a grievance, that the duty devolved upon the Government to pass a remedial order, and yet in the face of that, he sought to have the Secretary of State, when the Secretary of State came before his constituency for re-election as a member of the Cabinet, condemned, because the Government had done their duty in obeying the Queen's command to remedy the grievance, if there was a grievance. Some people have found fault with me for having gone up to Haldimand to do what I did, but had I been in the place of the Secretary of State, sitting at the Council board. I would have obeyed the command of the Queen and the Privy Council just as he did. The question for the county of Haldimand to decide was this: Had the Secretary of State done wrong in performing his duty? And they decided that he had not by electing him by the largest majority he ever obtained in that constituency. I had the pleasure of meeting my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on a platform at Haldimand. The hon. gentleman preferred a charge against me there, and I told him that I did not think he would prefer it in this House. He charged me with having attacked his personal character. I repudiated the statement. He charged me with having circulated throughout that constituency the statement that members of his family were members of the Roman Catholic Church. I did not say so; I denied the charge; I gave him my word of honour that I had not said so. But a friend of the hon. gentleman was at the meeting, and did hear one of the speakers make that statement, and stronger statements than I made? Then the hon. gentleman tried to make people believe that I was in that constituency for the purpose of raising sectional feeling against himself. I was not. I did not attempt anything of the kind, and I have not attempted it here. I have heard the rumour repeated in Haldimand, and outside, but I do say that if the hon. gentleman wished to educate his daughters in a nunnery——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let the hon. gentleman go on. It is in keeping with his usual character.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not. I am just repeating what the hon. gentleman tried to charge me with up there. I said there that I would put the question to my hon. friend here, and I want to be as good as my word. I say that he has a perfect right to do that as has any other man in this country; but he had no right to make the statement in the constituency of Haldimand, where I was unknown, that I was making statements which were not in accord with the facts. I may quote, also, another statement of my hon. friend, in reply to a reference of mine to my hon. friend from Guysboro' as an authority for making the statement that I referred to. The hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) was quoted in the "Globe" as having said

at a meeting held on 5th April, according to a despatch from Halifax :

> At the meeting where Sir Hibbert talked so violently, Mr. D. C. Fraser pointed out that the Manitoba question was not the issue ; that the Government could not claim credit for discharging the duty imposed upon them by the Privy Council ; that the Liberals were in favour of meting out justice to the Manitoba minority ; and that by appealing to religious prejudices Sir Hibbert Tupper was injuring the cause of the Manitoba minority. The trade question and the boodle record of the Government were paramount issues. The meeting in question was at Beaver Meadows.

I stated that this was the opinion of a leading Liberal from the maritime provinces, who was an able lawyer, and I put his opinion against the statement of the hon. member for North Simcoe. The hon. gentleman then got up in that audience and replied that the hon. member for Guysboro' was not a lawyer, but an old miner. I retorted that the hon. member for North Simcoe would not repeat his statement to the hon. member for Guysboro' on the floor of this House, and said that I would not make a statement in any constituency which I would be afraid to make in this House. These two hon. gentlemen can now settle it among themselves. However, I think the majority of the people of Haldimand accepted my statement in preference to that of the hon. member for North Simcoe, judging by the majority by which they returned the hon. Secretary of State. The people of Haldimand did not condemn the Secretary of State for what he had done, and for what any honourable law-abiding, law-loving citizen of this country, the subject of Her Majesty the Queen, would do, in sending on that remedial order. The people of Haldimand did not condemn him, and I certainly was not going to condemn him. I believe that the Government, in sending on that order to Manitoba did right. I believe that they have done right now in saying to Mr. Greenway : We accept the olive branch you hold out ; we accept the statement of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) ; we believe that the people of Manitoba, if given the opportunity, will settle this question. I believe that they will, having every faith in the statement of the hon. member for Winnipeg, having every faith in the people of Manitoba ; and I do not think there is an hon. member on this side who can or will condemn the Government for having sent on that remedial order, and for having asked that four or six months' delay be given them to try and adjust this matter with the Manitoba Government in a constitutional manner, which will be acceptable to the people of Manitoba. If time be given, I believe that the people of Manitoba will remedy the injustice which the hon. member for Winnipeg says that he and his colleagues committed in passing that Act in 1890, and every law-abiding, law-loving person in this country will be grateful to this Government for having taken the course they did.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is not without some feeling that I rise now to state before this House and before the country that I cannot accept the policy of the Government with respect to the question now under discussion. In the early days of the session, when the hon. leader of the Opposition addressed the House on the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, he inquired from the Government whether the words uttered by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) with respect to the school question were a true index of the policy of the Government, or whether it was to be found in the words uttered by your humble servant, who was then seconding the Address. Now, I must proclaim that I was not speaking the truth, but that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was right. Since the Government are not willing now to fulfil their promise, which they are able to do just now, I cannot support the policy which they intend following in connection with this important question which has now troubled the people of this country for nearly five years. I do not delude myself as to the difficult position in which my present stand will put me in this House, no more than I deceive myself as to the position in which I will be put by both political parties. I am well aware that the position I am now taking may ruin my political career. I am very weak and very young, and I am beginning my private career almost at the same time as my public career. My public career may end to-morrow, but after all my motto is this : Do what you ought, and come what will. If I should be removed on account of this question, if I should never come back in this House, I will enjoy the satisfaction of having done my duty. Should my action now cause my ruin, I wish to be ruined. When I came to this House in 1892, I pledged my whole support to the Government. I never measured it to them. I excused many things which a good party man, under the constitutional system, must excuse, and that in the public interest. But there are circumstances in which you cannot go farther than public interest dictates to you : You shall not go farther. Here is a circumstance in which public interest dictates to us : You should no longer support the Government. It is true the Government has promised us a remedial legislation for next year. We must take their statement as put before this House. Were there any promises made outside of this House ? I know not. Should there be any, they are not known. Is it because the Government was afraid to make them public ? In any case, as long as they are not public we must say that they do not exist. I will make at the outset a reproach to the Ministers. They were wanting in fair

play in respect to one of their colleagues, the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Angers). When the hon. gentleman had resigned owing to the statement the Government was to make in this House, he begged the Prime Minister not to put the official statement before the House prior to his own official explanation being given. He in all reason claimed that his explanation should be known at the same time as the official statement of the Government. Why did they not do that? It was because they wanted to prejudice the case of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture. They wanted to produce the effect they had in view. They wanted the explanation of the hon. Minister to come only three days after the official statement. I say there was no fair play, I say the Government were even wanting in courtesy towards the hon. Minister. Why do we not accept now the statement of the Ministry? It is because the province of Quebec would not accept of it. It is because, in spite of the shadow of promise which is to be found at the end of the Ministerial statement, the Government has put themselves in the impossibility to bring again the question before the House. It is because the Government does not proclaim the jurisdiction of this Parliament. Why do they want to enter into negotiations with the Manitoba Government? We know, in the first place, that the Manitoba legislature has declined to take any action on the remedial order. The Dominion Government says there is a difference of opinion with respect to this question and that there is still a glimpse of hope to come to an amicable settlement. What does that mean? If our Government do not admit that they have met with a refusal, they say therefore to this House that we have no jurisdiction. Where does the jurisdiction of this Parliament come from? It comes solely from the refusal of the Manitoba legislature. If there was no refusal, we have no jurisdiction. Now, they want to enter into negotiations with the Manitoba Government; with a political body which has no right to refuse and therefore to give jurisdiction to this Parliament. What right has the Manitoba Government to say to the Government at Ottawa that it will settle the school question with the Catholics? The question is as to the removal of an unjust law. The Manitoba Government has no such right; it exclusively belongs to the legislature. Propositions in view of a settlement may be made to it, but not to the Manitoba Government. It is stated in the Ministerial declaration that a communication will be addressed to the Manitoba Government, not to the legislature, in order to try to come to an amicable settlement. But if our Ministers make new propositions, they renounce thereby to the remedial order. When making new propositions, I presume the intention will be to receive either an approval or a refusal. To do that, the Manitoba legislature will have to be called together. Now, it can only be called on the advice of the Ministers of Manitoba, and as they are opposed to any arrangement, one has only to read the speeches delivered in the course of the debate which ended by a refusal to be satisfied in this respect—they will not call the House together. Now, was there really a refusal to obey the remedial order? Assuredly there was. What does the answer say? It says substantially: We cannot obey the remedial order; we cannot abolish our present schools. It says, moreover, that the Catholic separate schools existing prior to 1890 were inefficient, and, thirdly, it suggests the appointment of a commission, not for an amicable arrangement, but to prove that the legislature was right in its refusal. Therefore, the refusal is emphatic, and should the Dominion Government wait for a fuller refusal, it will never have it. Never receiving a more emphatic refusal, the Federal Parliament will never have any jurisdiction. If, moreover, the argument does not quite hold good as legal argument, I think it holds good all the same, but I will consider the question under the most unfavourable light. I say that should the argument not be quite legal, at all events, new difficulties are created by new facts. It is giving more legal form to Manitoba to prevent the Catholic minority from having the justice which it claims and to which it is entitled. Suppose we pass here a legislation in that direction, I am not simple enough to think that Manitoba will not oppose such a law before the courts, that the province will not appeal to the judicial power to have our law quashed. And if they have to go to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, they will go. If we should now pass the remedial law, it is certain the judgment of the court would sanction our legislation. It is sure we would have in our favour the whole authority of the last judgment. But add new facts, and you will prevent the Catholics in Manitoba from arguing for the maintaining of the remedial law with sure chances, since it will be said that new facts have occurred. I think it is giving a great advantage to the Manitoba Government, and uselessly putting Catholics in a less favourable position. I stated a moment ago that the Manitoba Government would decline to change their law, and I think no reasonable man could say the contrary. Already there was a definite emphatic and, I will say, insolent refusal by that Government, and should there be any people inclined to think the statement of the Manitoba Government is not formal enough, and even, I will say once more, insolent enough, they have only to take the statements made in the course of his speech by Mr. Sifton, the Attorney General of that province, the very man who brought this measure before the legislature. Here is what he substantially said: The question is not whether the system is good, but whether we should obey or not the remedial order. The position is this, that we have changed the old school

law, and that we decline to restore the schools we have then abolished. We cannot be forced to obey the remedial order. It is after such statements that this Government would have it believed that the Manitoba Government would consent to make new suggestions to them. Manitoba will answer as she has already answered : We have nothing to suggest, all we have to say about that matter is to be found in our answer to your remedial order. Further on, Mr. Sifton says again : There are two essential things which the Federal Government cannot do : they cannot, by a remedial legislation, compel us to tax and contribute to the support of these schools by public moneys. And Mr. Sifton infers from this that the Federal Government can do nothing by interfering. What do the Ottawa people know about school matters in Manitoba ? They know nothing, says Mr. Sifton, and he expresses the hope that the Dominion Parliament will not decide to interfere with the Manitoba school system. Such are the words of Mr. Sifton, which are to guide those who are intent on foreseeing what will result of the step this Government intend to take and construing the answer made by Manitoba to the remedial order. What does the statement of the leader of the House say ? It states that if a satisfactory arrangement is not come to, then the Parliament will be called and a remedial law passed. The main features and the particulars of the Bill to be introduced are not given. But suppose the Manitoba Government should not give any answer, or merely an evasive answer, what would happen ? Must the Parliament be called ? No, since it would have no jurisdiction. And mind, this is the position taken by the newspaper "The Mail," in an editorial published a few days ago. Here is what the "Mail" of the 9th July, 1895, said :

> Provided the Manitoba Government declares that the province will absolutely and positively do nothing, then Parliament will be called in January of next year and the Government will follow the decision of the Judicial Committee with a measure of legislation, which the House will be asked to adopt.

Therefore, the Parliament will only be called if Manitoba should send a quite positive answer and should refuse to submit to the injuction of the Federal Government. But if we should have an evasive answer, such an answer as the Manitoba Government can give with the ill-faith which characterizes them, and for the purpose of embarrassing the Federal Government, an evasive answer tending to the indefinite postponement of the settlement of the question, we would have no session, and, consequently, no remedial legislation. That is why we should not now accept the promises of the Government. Why do they not bring up a legislation at once ? I have pondered about this without being able to get a satisfactory answer. The Government have the confidence of the House, at least they contend they have it and I think they have it. I think they have the confidence of the Conservative party, and if they have the confidence of that party, they ought to bring up a legislation this very day, and not wait for six months. If they have not now the confidence of the majority of this House to enable them to pass such a legislation, will they have it in January next ? If they are unable now to pass such a legislation, where will they find the majority required to pass it in January next ? They intend to glide along until the eve of an election and appeal to the people without definitely settling this question. If it is true that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has computed forty friends of the Government decided to oppose a remedial legislation, who can tell if there will not be fifty in the month of January ? I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is not reasonable to wait any longer. If the Government have the confidence of their friends, if they are sincere, let them bring up their measure at once and we will see what fate it will have. But in the meantime I cannot have any confidence in the statements they make to us. If I am mistaken, I will be the first to proclaim it when January has arrived. I will be the first to state that I was mistaken, that the Government was right and I will hasten to make apologies to them. The Government may be sure that I will then give them my entire support. I wish I be mistaken, but I think what I have just stated fairly conveys the opinion of the many serious people and expresses the opinion of the men most devoted to the cause of the minority in Manitoba. Two or three years ago, I attended a meeting of the Conservatives of this House, and the Hon. Sir John Thompson then stated that he wished to settle the question in a constitutional way. I want to know, said he, if the Dominion Parliament has a right to interfere in the school matters in Manitoba. The question is a new one, and I wish to know the opinion of the highest court in the Empire. If it should state that we have a right, we will interfere. If, on the contrary, it denies us such a right, we will not interfere. I then approved of and I still approve of this position. It was just and reasonable. It was important to know whether we had a right to command to the Manitoba legislature and give it an order such as we ought to give it to-day. At this meeting, all the Conservatives accepted this principle. It was therefore admitting that should the judgment of the Privy Council be favourable to us, it should be carried out. Well, will they now violate the implicit agreement made on that day ? Will there be any breach of the faith then given to us ? Time will tell. The position taken by Sir John Thompson is approved of, I may state without any fear, by the whole Catholic clergy. And since the judgment of the Privy Coun-

cil has stated that rights were violated and that we have a right to interfere, it behooves the Federal Government to have the courage to have it carried out. The hon. member for Hochelega (Mr. Lachapelle) stated a moment ago: But this a new postponement which we are requested to grant; suits involving only a hundred dollars last much longer, it is not surprising that so much time should be required for the settlement of such an important question. It is true that sometimes unimportant trials may last years and years. But in the present case, the trial is over, the judgment is rendered, the Catholic minority won their case, and it only remains for the Federal Parliament to carry out the judgment. The time is off, the "mise en demeure" is done; therefore if we have the courage that such a judgment ought to give us, we ought to say to the Manitoba legislature: You have declined to do justice to the Catholics, we are equal to our duty and we will pass the remedial law. When the French Ministers resigned, they had no doubt good cause to do so. I cannot believe that men occupying these high positions, men whom I always respected and I still respect could have tendered their resignation without any good cause. It will be observed that when their resignations were tendered, the official statement of the Government was before the House. Therefore it was after mature deliberation that they came to such a decision. Well, where are the new facts? What additional guarantees have they secured to change their decision?

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) There are none.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) Let them be shown to me. If such guarantees exist they are wrong in not putting them before the House. If there are none, surely the responsibility they now assume is very great. There is nothing extraordinary in what we now ask. Is it very difficult to do a small minority like that of Manitoba the justice to which they are entitled? What seems extraordinary to me is that the Federal Government which is especially charged with the protection of the weak and few, should have to be requested over and over again, not to do them justice, but to prevent them from being fleeced out every day. What we claim for the Manitoba minority is not justice, it is simply asking a thief to leave us at least a shirt. It is very elementary; it is not justice, or it is the most elementary justice. And it is the Conservative party, the party which signed the constitutional Act of Manitoba and exacted the guarantees which were acknowledged by the Privy Council, it is that party which declines to cause to be respected these rights which they themselves inserted in the constitution of Manitoba. Indeed, the hon. member for Bagot was right when he stated a moment ago that should Cartier be living, he would mourn over the want of courage of his old party—he who always protected the minorities—he who took good care to put in the constitution of Manitoba all the guarantees to which the original settlers of that province were entitled. He it was who founded the Conservative party and was its greatest statesman, for he was not afraid to cause to be respected the constitution he had given to his country. If the Conservative Government can no longer do justice to the minorities, if they are no more their protectors, indeed they are wanting in their duty, they no longer represent, in my opinion, the views of the Conservative party; they no longer represent the platform of our party.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) This is ancient history.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) I would ask the hon. member for L'Islet to proceed with precaution. I do not mean to say that it is ancient history. I agree with him that these last years, there was introduced in the party an element which has caused to mourn the men who have at heart the interests of our country. I do not say that the Government yielded to that element today. I do not say either that they did not give in. But I say that this element was introduced into the party and it was consequent that for several years a wrong direction was given to it. And now the hon. Minister of Agriculture goes out of the Government because there is no more respect for the traditions of the Conservative party. They will likely attempt to throw discredit upon his conduct. Mr. Speaker, if there was a man who has shown energy and moral courage, it was Mr. Angers. There is one thing sure: if he goes out of the Cabinet, it is not for his personal advantage. He leaves his position poor and with no other means than he may derive from his talent. He deserts a good position, as any one will admit, with nothing but his abilities to earn his living and support his family, but he has the satisfaction of having done his duty, of having shown that he was a man, that he had in his breast a heart beating at the right place. He has shown that he had courage. Be sure, Mr. Speaker, that the course he now takes will be approved of by the majority of the people in our province and supported by right-thinking men who will admire the position he now takes. I do not say that I leave the ranks of the Conservative party to join that of the Liberal party. No, I say I remain a true Conservative, and I will never support a Government which will not pledge itself to do justice to the Catholics of Manitoba. We are told by some who try to discourage us: What will you win by your stand? Merely to cause the hon. leader of the Opposition to come into power. I do not care who will come

into power after this Government. I do not care to know whether the present Government will be kept into power or whether the leader of the Opposition will succeed in getting into power at the next election. Should the hon. leader of the Opposition carry the day, and should I be returned, I will give him my support, I will give him fair play, provided he begins by doing justice to our compatriots of the west and he causes to be respected the constitution violated by the Manitoba Government.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, allow me to congratulate the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay upon the splendid speech he has just delivered. His reasoning expresses the views of the great majority of his compatriots, to whatever party they may belong. The hon member has taken the position of a man of spirit. Charged by the Government, at the beginning of this session, with the confidential task of proposing the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, he pledged his word that full justice would be done during this very session to the oppressed Catholics of the province of Manitoba. And finding now that the Government, according to their statement, flinch in the fulfilment of their pledges, finding that the Government are changing their position, the hon gentleman withdraws his confidence from them. This Government do not respect the statements they made and under which they pledged the power of the Crown to do justice to the Catholic minority; they flinch in the fulfilment of their duty and the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay says plainly to them before this House: I have been deceived. This Government has deceived me; the Ministers who made promises to me have deceived me and I withdraw my confidence from them, and I return them with the contempt it deserves the word they have given me and which they have not kept. The position of the Government in connection with the question of the schools of the minority in Manitoba is as clear and simple as it can be. It has nothing new. The Government has no new difficulties to meet. The difficulty has been the same for five years and during five years the Government has been hesitating. It was only in the month of March last that driven to their last intrenchment, they were compelled by the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to take a position and to say: We will uphold the Catholic minority. The Government then stated that this minority had certain rights and privileges granted to them by the law passed in 1871 by the Manitoba legislature. They found that these constitutional privileges granted to the minority the right to build, maintain and direct the schools, to impose taxes for the maintaining of these schools, and to have their share of the public moneys voted for educational purposes. The Government asserted unanimously that such were the privileges and the rights of the Catholic minority in Manitoba, and at the same time they summoned the province of Manitoba to restore the separate schools, to give to the Catholics the privileges and the rights of which they had been unjustly deprived. The remedial order added that should Manitoba fail to settle the question according to the terms of the order, such a refusal would give to the Dominion Parliament the necessary jurisdiction to force on the Manitoba legislature the law it would decline to enact. The pledge taken by the Government was a solemn one. It was a pledge upon their honour they could no more disown and as soon as the condition existed of the refusal of the Manitoba legislature to legislate, it was their duty to take action. They were in duty bound to cause to be respected the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to cause the constitution to be respected, to replace the minority in the position which it formerly occupied. That was the position of the Ministers; such were the Ministerial statements. I have no doubt whatever that such was the intention of the Government when they called Parliament. When they filled the vacant seats, the hon. Minister of Justice, who made the report upon which was based the remedial order, went to Nova Scotia and appealed to the confidence of the people by making use of this remedial order. He said to the voters of that province that should Manitoba refuse to act, this Parliament would give relief to the wronged minority. On the other hand—and I am referring now to what I know—I have seen and heard the hon. the Minister of Public Works going in the county of Verchères, from church door to church door, from one parish to another, stating that the Government had taken measures for the relief of the Catholic minority, and that should Manitoba refuse to comply to the remedial order, the Federal Parliament would do its duty. On nomination day, the hon. Minister stated, in the presence of Mr. Geoffrion and of thousands of voters, that the Government would propose a remedial legislation at the next session, legislation based upon, and drafted in the very terms of, the remedial order they had just passed. The hon. Minister stated that Parliament had specially been called to pass such a legislation. I am not referring to newspaper reports or to matters of hearsay. I attended the nomination in the county of Verchères, and I positively heard, along with thousands of other people, the statements I have just referred to. Therefore, a legislation was to be brought up during this session for the relief of the Manitoba Catholics should the legislature of that province refuse to comply to the remedial order. I once more say that the hon. the Minister of Public Works stated that the Parliament had been specially called to pass the remedial legislation

upon the refusal of the legislature to do justice to the Catholic minority. There was no doubt whatever about the refusal of the Manitoba legislature. The fact is the decision of the Government of Manitoba was not doubtful. It was known by the result of the vote on the motion of Mr. Fisher, one of the Liberal members of Manitoba, who requested the legislature to pass a resolution stating that the federal interference was useless, and that the legislature was ready to take cognizance of the grievances of the Catholics, if it was proper to do it. The vote on this resolution stood 25 to 10. it was the very vote that rejected the remedial order. It was known that the local legislature did not even intend to take cognizance of the grievances that had been set forth. The position as between the Government and the minority in Manitoba was therefore clear; it was known that the Manitoba legislature would refuse to remedy the grievances. It was known likewise that the order was peremptory; these things were so well known that Parliament was called in order to pass the law which they now decline to pass. Why do the Government refuse now to pass the law they promised and which they pledged themselves to bring before the House during this session through their members in the various counties of the Dominion? We know why and we did not want the statement of the chief Ministerial whip (Mr. Taylor). We know that there is a corporation outside of this House which controls the hon. gentlemen opposite. We know that there is in the county a secret corporation whose deliberations are kept secret. We know that there is a political organization working in the interests of the hon. members who now control the Government. We know that forty members of this association among the hon. gentlemen opposite have presented the Government with a serious ultimatum to which they would have stuck thick and fast. This ultimatum was to the effect that as soon as the Government would venture to keep the word of honour which they had given, as soon as the Government would bring up a remedial Bill, the forty members of this association who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, should withdraw their confidence in them and pass to the other side, that in such a case the Government would find themselves in the impossibility of having the Bill passed with the only support of their friends and would possibly be compelled to step out of power. When the representatives of the Catholic minority in the Cabinet found that the word of honour given to them and communicated to the people would not be kept, they likewise made a receding move, intending thereby to show their dissatisfaction, and the three French Ministers, the hon. Postmaster General, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Agriculture, withdrew, threatening to leave the Government and to take away from them the confidence of all the French-speaking Ministerial members. During three days these gentlemen have resisted; but three days were enough to exhaust their patience, with the exception of one of them. Although he is far from being a man whom I respect and esteem and in whom I have any confidence, I must say that he has taken to-day a position which should cause to blush those who did not follow him. The two others have come back to their treasury benches. Have they brought anything with them, can they show to their friends any concessions, any guarantees or advantages they have secured from their colleagues? We have heard the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. the Minister of Public Works this afternoon. According to what they say, there was a misunderstanding as to the meaning of the Ministerial statement. They had not read it properly, I presume, they had not apprehended the whole extent and tenor, and after three days of cogitation, of moving about, of negotiations and procrastination, they at last opened their eyes and found out that this declaration contains all that is required to guarantee the rights of the Catholics of Manitoba and give satisfaction to their friends in this House. Is it surprising, in the face of such a back-down, in the face of a movement which I do not want to qualify more severely, but to which the province of Quebec will give the proper qualifying I am sure, is it surprising, I say, that among the friends of these gentlemen, there should be not only hesitation, but a feeling of indiscretion and contempt, and that the people should withdraw from them the confidence which had been bestowed on them to such a large extent? What is surprising is that among those who profess to be the friends of the cause of the minority in Manitoba, among those who profess to be anxious for a remedial law, there should remain a single one to follow them in their back-down and applaud their surrender. The more accomplished by the hon. gentlemen, I have just referred to, is from any point of view a calamity for the cause of the minority. If the Ministerial statement was good and sufficient Monday last, there was no reason for the seditious move to which they committed themselves. They have acted rashly like thoughtless people, they have endangered the interests of the minority. If they had good reasons, as I have no doubt they had, and if, without obtaining anything, they come and take back the seats which they had left in compliance with a public duty, I say that it is such a degrading example for the House and for the people at large that it will provoke not only the indignation, but the wrath of the House and the whole country. Why, Sir, political men occupying the highest positions, the recognized representatives of a whole race, of a great religious body,

are agreed that the statement made by the Government was not satisfactory ; they have sent in their resignation, considering that the interests which they had undertaken to protect were being sacrificed ; and, now, the same hon. gentlemen, without having secured any new pledge, have decided to remain at their posts in the Cabinet, and they stand up here and tell us that they did so for the sake of their co-religionists. Well, Sir, I say this was not a decent course for them to pursue, as they went back without having bettered the condition of the Catholics in Manitoba. Now, what will be the practical outcome of this double move on the part of the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Postmaster General ? The result is that the settlement of the question has been adjourned to six months from now. Now, Sir, all the members have noticed how the Government supporters have accepted the solution without a dissentient voice. All the hon. members have been edified as to the genuineness of the hopes entertained by the Government of introducing and enacting a remedial law, next session. No sooner had the hon. the Minister of Justice attempted to offer an excuse, when the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), one of the leaders of the Conservative party in New Brunswick, rose from his seat and declared that, should the Government introduce a remedial law, he would oppose and record his vote against the measure. He was followed by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison), and by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), both of them devoted supporters of the Government, who made similar statements. And if the forty subscribers of the famous declaration of war against the Government had manliness and backbone enough to stand and state to the House their feelings on the matter, they would repeat the same declaration as the one we have heard from the lips of the hon. members I have just mentioned. Still, one of them, whose word has more weight in the party than any other, and who occupies the position of chief whip for the Government, Mr. Taylor, said a little while ago, that, if they had introduced their remedial legislation two years ago, he would have voted against it ; that if they had introduced it a year ago, he would have done the same ; and had they introduced it this session, he would also have voted against them ; but, when pressed for an answer to the question which was put to him whether, in case Manitoba should decline to take any action in the matter, and the Government should introduce a remedial legislation, whether, I say, he would vote against the Government, he declined to answer ; but I am positive he would vote against them, because the combination will then be twice as powerful as it is now. In my humble opinion, the Government are trying to slip out of their promises made to Parliament. They have not now, nor ever had, the intention of introducing a remedial legislation. Finding themselves driven into a corner, they are now looking for a back door, and as the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) so nicely put it, the other day, in his paper, the delay now asked for is but a subterfuge, or means devised to escape ministerial responsibility, and to gain time, in order to get rid of Parliament. And then, once the hon. gentlemen will be closeted in the Privy Council chamber, whether the hon. the Postmaster General or the hon. Minister of Public Works be willing or not, the majority of their Protestant colleagues will readily find out a pretext for dissolving Parliament and holding a general election, without calling another session. With the co-operation and help of the Orange Association, which is so largely represented in the Conservative party, the Government are in hopes of securing an easy victory and obtaining a new lease of power. The members of that association will set themselves about agitating public opinion throughout the country, and will render impossible the settlement of the question, either by a Liberal Government, should they come into power, or by the Conservative party, for the reason that the people, roused by their inflammatory language, would refuse to render justice to the Catholic minority. It might perhaps be found impossible for any government whatsoever to muster a majority willing to impose upon the province of Manitoba a just and fair settlement of the question, based on the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order. Such is, Sir, the probable outcome of the present state of affairs. I wish my forebodings may prove wrong ; I earnestly hope so. I sincerely wish events may take a better turn, and that peace may reign once more in the land. I wish the members of the Orange Association may draw in their horns : and after the great celebration of to-morrow is over, as also that of the victory they have just won in this House. I wish they may display a little more generosity and justice than they have done in the past. But, as I said, it is a forlorn hope. Now, Sir, I come to some remarks fallen from the lips of two hon. gentlemen who taunted the Liberal party for not having stated their policy on the school question. I hardly believe these hon. gentlemen have paid any serious attention to the course of political events ; otherwise, they would have read what the hon. leader of the Opposition said on the question, when addressing public meetings in the cities of Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg and throughout the province of Ontario and Quebec. The policy of the hon. gentleman is a well defined one, and one that leaves no room for doubt. The hon. leader of the Opposition has over and over again stated that this was not a party issue. He has declared that he did not want to use it as a foot-stool to reach power. Let the Government introduce a measure to settle the question, and he was ready to support it,

and endorse it, should it prove to be a just, honourable and fair settlement. He was not, to quote his own words, responsible for the Government of the country; he was a mere member of the House of Commons, and as such, he had a right to appreciate the policy of the Government, and he pledged himself to co-operate with the Government and help them to carry out a remedial legislation. Can the hon. gentlemen expect the hon. leader of the Opposition to go beyond that? If the hon. leader of the Opposition meant to use this question as a footstep to climb up to power, his course would be quite different. He would then try to make obstruction and embarrass the Government. He did no such thing, for the reason that, to his mind, this is not a party issue, but a question of justice about which both parties should agree. The hon. leader of the Opposition having thus stated over and over again his intention of co-operating with the Cabinet, outside of his right of judgment on the matter, the Government should have felt encouraged by such a generous declaration to introduce such a legislation as would have afforded an adequate measure of relief to the Catholic minority, without wounding the feelings of the other creeds and races throughout the Dominion. It would be a serious mistake on our part, were we to allow this question to assume the complexion of a creed or racial issue. The great majority of our Protestant fellow-countrymen are actuated by the love of justice and British fair play. There are found among them some who, for instance, like the Episcopalians, are in favour of separate schools. There are those who though they favour, on principle unsectarian schools, at the same time admit that the grievances complained of by the minority exist, and that justice should be meted out to them. We should rise above party considerations and consider the issue that confronts us from the standpoint of justice, fair play and constitutional rights which should be guaranteed to all, to whatsoever party, race or creed we may belong. For my part, Sir, I have before now, had the opportunity of explaining my attitude on the Manitoba school question. Here is what I stated on the floor of this House, in 1893, on the motion of my hon. friend the member for l'Islet (Mr. Tarte). In order to avoid any ambiguity, I shall quote verbatim, from "Hansard," 7th of March, 1893, what I then stated.

Our position is well and clearly defined, as I shall endeavour to point out as briefly as possible. We contend, first, that the Catholics in the province of Manitoba have certain rights which have been outrageously infringed upon; secondly, that it was the bounden duty of the Government as soon as they received the Greenway acts, to disallow and annul them. That this power of disallowance may be exercised within twelve months is admitted beyond dispute, nor can it be questioned, as this power is vested in the Dominion under the constitution. In the third place, we contend that the time for disallowance having once expired, it was the duty of the Government to enact such remedial law as were calculated to redress the grievances complained of by the Catholics in Manitoba, instead of resorting to various devices, now as in the past, to avoid dealing with the just claims of the latter. I say the Government are open to censure and condemnation at the hands of this House and the country for the policy of deception they have pursued up to now. I, for one, Sir, am ready to assume my own share of responsibility, and to support any government whose first article shall be the redress of the wrongs inflicted upon the minority of Manitoba; on the same ground, I would pledge myself to support no government whose programme would be to withhold from the Catholics of Manitoba the just treatment they are entitled to and which they are now being denied. On the other hand, should the hon. the Minister of Justice pledge himself to enact such remedial legislation as might be calculated to redress the grievances complained of, in accordance with the report of the 21st of March, 1891, I am ready, with a large number of my friends on this side of the House, to give him a fair support, thus making up the loss of a few votes among his supporters brought about by this honest course.

Now, Sir, we take the same stand on the question that we took in 1893. Now, as in the past, we ask the Government to do their duty, and we reiterate our offer to co-operate with them as a set-off for the loss of votes among their followers. At the time the Government turned a deaf ear to our offers, just as they do now; they would not listen to the voice of honour and justice. They did not dare introduce a remedial legislation. In 1893, the hon. members are well aware what an outcry was raised by the Orange lodges in this country; and it was to obey the orders of the lodges that the Government at the time did not take any action in the matter, just as they do now. And they will likely remain mute and will not recover their power of speech until the people shall have rendered their verdict, which will allow the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, I hope, to cross over to the other side, in order to restore the harmony and good understanding which should prevail among different elements of our population, to ensure the respect of all the rights of the people, and to give satisfaction to those who want justice to prevail in our midst. I believe the majority of the people of this country want fair play for all, and to see justice and peace prevail here. I believe the great majority of our people want the constitution and the treaties to be obeyed to the letter, and justice done to every one of the provinces in the Dominion. Then only shall it be possible for us to be the great nation, which it is the fondest dream of our ambition to establish upon this continent; then only shall this dream materialize and evolve into a tangible reality in the future. I hope the result of the popular verdict which is to be rendered at the next election will be the consolidation and not the disruption of confederation. I hope, then,

we shall have seen the last of the race and creed wrangles, of that war of races, and that far from being intensified, our dissensions will gradually die away ; if not, then, we must forego all hopes of ever becoming a great and prosperous people. It is still within our power, as I said, to escape those evils which would precipitate the ruin of confederation, if we only make up our minds to get rid of the clique that now governs the country and in putting the reins of Government into the hands of men in whom the people repose confidence.

House divided on motion (Mr. Laurier) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allan,
Bain (Wentworth),
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Belley,
Bernier,
Borden,
Boston,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Dawson,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Frémont,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Harwood,
Innes,
Jeannotte,
Joncas,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lépine,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lowell,
Macdonald (Huron),
McCarthy,
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Martin,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mulock,
O'Brien,
Perry,
Préfontaine,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Turcotte,
Vaillancourt, and
Yeo.—82.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Baker,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blanchard,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Bryson,
Burnham,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carscallen,
Chesley,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davis (Alberta),
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grandbois,
Grant (Sir James),
Guillet,
Haggart,
Haslam,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Lachapelle,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Leclair,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Macdowall,
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton)
McGregor,
McInerney,
McKay,
McLean (King's),
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Patterson (Huron),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Pridham,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Simard,
Smith (Ontario).
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westm'd).—116.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Bergin,	Charlton,
Adams,	Bowman,
Corby,	Paterson (Brant),
Metcalfe.	Welsh.

Motion negatived.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Bill (No. 129) to amend the law respecting superannuation of judges of provincial courts (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was read the second time and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. Minister explain what changes are proposed ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is only to make clear the reading of the law. We had a lengthy discussion on the subject when the resolution was under consideration. At that time the hon. mem-

ber for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) raised a point which made it necessary for me to look into the subject a little more carefully. I have looked into that question in order to see that no radical change was being made, but that the Bill was, as I first stated to the House, merely to make clear the rights of the judges in admiralty. And I will just state succintly for the information of the committee the clause of the existing statute to show that there is nothing here in reality new. So far as the Department of Justice is concerned, this Bill was not absolutely necessary; it was the construction placed upon the existing statute. But one of the judges, a judge of the maritime court, suggested that, in consequence of the new statute, or rather the institution of the admiralty courts under the Canadian system, or under the Exchequer Court of Canada, this Bill would make the position absolutely clear. Under the Consolidated Statutes, chap. 138, the superannuation of judges of the courts of vice-admiralty was provided for. The Act constituting the maritime court, the Revised Statutes, chap. 137, makes it also a superior court; and the Revised Statutes with respect to provincial judges provides that all judges of superior courts are entitled to pensions. So that, before the admiralty jurisdiction was given under the Exchequer Court Act, the judges of the admiralty and of the vice-admiralty courts, as such, were entitled to superannuation. Then there was Imperial legislation under which this Act in Canada was passed, and it was provided that their position should be in no wise impaired. And the clause in the Imperial Act, the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, makes every judge affected by that entitled to a pension. So this Bill now follows these two Acts and the Exchequer Court Act, and makes it clear that these judges of vice-admiralty, these local judges in admiralty, are the judges of a superior court in the sense of the Superannuation Act. And I would say to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that, so far as the other powers that he feared might be involved here are concerned, there is this distinction—that any new judges who are constituted the local judges in admiralty hold their position as other judges of the land, but that provision under which no action has been taken and no action is likely to be necessary, for appointing deputy or surrogate judges is one that makes their tenure different from that of the admiralty judges. They hold office only during pleasure of the local judge who appoints them. So, we are not enabling a large class who may be appointed as deputies to come in under the provisions respecting superannuation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What do you call a local judge?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Now judges of the old vice-admiralty courts. There were none others constituted. There are two local judges of admiralty under the Exchequer Court Act.

Mr. MULOCK. Are there vice-admiralty judges?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All the vice-admiralty judges are local judges in admiralty.

Mr. MULOCK. Do they all hold other positions?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All except Judge Irvine in Quebec.

Mr. MULOCK. This in no way enlarges the superannuation?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; the law at present is in the same line—there is no change.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire, with the consent of the House, to move that Government Orders have precedence on Mondays for the remainder of the session.

Mr. McCARTHY. After questions put by members?

Mr. FOSTER. After questions put by members, and also saving the hour for private Bills.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that is passed, I want to call the attention of the Minister of Finance, as leader of the House, to a certain statement which I find in the report of the Senate Debates on Monday. A question was put there by the Hon. Mr. Scott with respect to the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway, in these terms:

> Before the House rises, will the hon. Premier be in a position to inform us whether it is intended to bring down legislation with regard to the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway? I understand it is proposed to bring down some legislation with regard to it.

To which the Premier replied:

> No, I think not. My impression is that the Finance Minister stated there was to be no further legislation of an important character except, of course—he did except at the time—remedial legislation. I am not aware of it.

I find in our notices of motion on the same day that the Minister of Railways introduced an Act respecting the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway Company, and I would like to be informed whether there has been any misunderstanding, because the statement made by the Premier and the

action of the Minister of Railways, hardly accord.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice my hon. friend read an extract from the Senate "Hansard," in doing which I think he was quite out of order. However, as he has drawn attention to a proceeding which took place in our own House, I will look into it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would like to know what business the leader of the House proposes to go on with to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. We will go on with the general business—inside the House—the Bills, and we have Ways and Means, and some supplies yet ungranted. We will take some Bills, and probably after that, Supply.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to give notice that when the hon. gentleman moves the House into Committee of Supply, I will call the attention of the House to the action of the Government with reference to the Manitoba school question, and move a resolution.

Mr. LAURIER. I have also been waiting for some time for the same opportunity.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, has priority.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 12th July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

12th JULY PROCESSION.

Mr. CASEY. Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works about a matter which almost amounts, I think, to a question of privilege. Was it with his permission that members approaching the House this afternoon were obstructed by a procession crossing the parliamentary grounds?

Mr. OUIMET. No provision was made by me, and I do not think that any provision was necessary.

REPORT.

Mr. TAYLOR, from the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Reports of the Debates of the House during the present Session, presented the Fifth Report of the Committee, as follows:—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

The Committee recommend that Messrs. A. N. Montpetit and F. Hughes be paid the sum of $500 each for services performed by them during the Session in connection with the translation of the Official Report of the Debates.

Report concurred in.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the Orders are called, I would like to ask the Secretary of State if he has yet been able to produce that return that has been promised?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I had it, Mr. Speaker; but I did not want to present it until I should have an inquiry from my hon. friend. I beg to lay the return upon the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the Minister just been able to lay his hands on those documents as to which some discussion arose the other night and which were referred to by the Controller of Customs?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On the third reading of the Bill during the discussion of which this subject was referred to, a full statement will be made.

SUPPLY—TENURE OF OFFICE BY THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS.

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

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I purpose submitting to the House, Sir, the following resolution:—

That, in the opinion of this House, section 59 of the British North America Act of 1867, which prevents the removal of a Lieutenant-Governor of a province for five years from the date of his appointment, except for cause assigned, and communicated to the House of Commons by Message, was intended to prevent the undue influence of Federal Ministers in provincial affairs; and the practice which has become prevalent, of permitting Lieutenant-Governors to continue in office for long periods of time after the expiry of their commissions, by which they become removable at any time, without assignment of cause, is an abuse of authority calculated to impair responsible government in the provinces of the Dominion.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in the various provinces which constitute the Dominion of Canada that existed prior to the union parliamentary government had been established. The same principles of ministerial responsibility which prevailed in the mother country had already become well recognized in the provinces which were embraced within the federal union. The British North America Act makes provision for the principle of parliamentary government as it relates to this Parliament. The provisions of the Act do not refer to the provinces in this regard at all. It is declared in the preamble of the Act that:

It is necessary or desirable, that the provinces should be federally united under the Crown of

the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to the United Kingdom.

All the declarations of the preamble relate solely to the constitution of this Parliament; they do not at all refer to the constitution of the provinces, and for the reason that I have given—because the provinces already had their political institutions, the principles of which were well settled, those principles being similar to those of the Government of the United Kingdom. The rule well recognized in the relation between the Imperial Government and the colonies is a rule perfectly consistent with provincial autonomy; it is a rule under which the English parliamentary system is established. And the existence of that system, wherever it has been introduced into the colonies of the Empire, depends solely, according to the intentions of the constitution, upon Imperial abstinence from any interference with the manner in which the government is carried on and the legislative policy is marked out. Now, Sir, we are protesting in large degree against Imperial interference by the indifference of the people of the United Kingdom to all matters which specially concern ourselves. It is only when the legislature of a province or the executive government of a province are disposed to cross the boundary which the Imperial Government has marked out between those powers and functions which are specially assigned to each province, and those which are retained possession of by the Imperial Parliament and the executive government of the United Kingdom. The Imperial Parliament, or the Imperial Government is not likely, I say, to abuse its authority to the same extent as is the Federal Government in Canada. The Imperial Government does not draw its support from the same constituent body as that which maintains the Government in the various provinces, so that there is never anything like the same community of interest between any political party of any province and any party existing in the United Kingdom. But, Sir, that is not our position in Canada. We who sit in this Parliament have the sympathy and support of our respective parties, which have the same constituents that support the legislature and the administration in the provinces. There was, at one time, a strong disposition on the part of Ministers in this Parliament to seek seats in the local legislature. Every one saw how extremely improper that was, for it was not an impossible thing for a Minister of the Crown in the Dominion to obtain a seat in the local legislature, and sit there in Opposition, and, though in Opposition, controlling, in no small degree, the Lieutenant-Governor, who was being advised by his political opponents. We carried through this Parliament a measure which prevented members of this House from being eligible for seats in the local legislature. We did that for the purpose of protecting parliamentary government in the provinces, for the purpose of securing the same freedom, the same independence to the members of any local administration that are possessed in provinces not so constituted. Now, Sir, by the provisions of the British North America Act, section 59, to which I have referred, the Government here may advise the Crown to appoint the Lieutenant-Governor who holds office during pleasure. He is, nevertheless, not removable for the period of five years, except for specific cause; and when such cause arises, it is the duty of the Administration to report the fact to both Houses of Parliament. Now, the objection I make to the existing condition of things is that in the case of many of the Lieutenant-Governors of provinces, they have been permitted to hold office for several years after their commissions have expired, and at the moment the commission expires, it is in the power of the Government to remove a Lieutenant-Governor without assignment of cause, and without any report to either House of Parliament. Now, I say that this is a highly objectionable condition of things. If it is proper, during the five years that the commission is in existence, that the Lieutenant-Governor shall not be removed without adequate cause being assigned, and without that cause being reported to both Houses of Parliament, it is obviously improper that the Lieutenant-Governor should continue to hold office after that period has expired. If the Government desire that the Lieutenant-Governor shall hold office for a longer period than five years, they should issue to him a new commission, they should put him beyond their power of removal for any subsequent period, just precisely as he was beyond their power of removal for the period for which he was appointed in the first instance. What is the object of this provision of the law? The object is to make the Lieutenant-Governor independent of the Government here, and solely subject to the advice which his constitutional advisers may think proper to give him. Now, let me mention two or three instances in which this rule has been departed from. Mr. Robinson, a Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, held office from 1880 to 1887, a period of seven years, two years of which he held liable to removal at any moment, upon the advice and instruction of Ministers here. Sir Leonard Tilley held office in the province of New Brunswick from 1885 to 1893, a period of eight years; so that for three years of his term of service he was liable at any moment to be removed from office by the Administration; and, therefore, if the Administration had chosen to interfere in local affairs, they could have brought pressure to bear upon the Lieutenant-Governor, if he desired to continue in office, which was altogether inconsistent with the duties that are assigned to him, under the law, to dis-

charge. In 1888, Mr. Schultz was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, and now, in 1895, at the end of seven years, he is Lieutenant-Governor still. For the past two years he has held office by the suffrance of the Ministry, he is liable at any moment to be removed without assignment of cause; and that being so, I say that this condition of things has become an abuse which ought to be corrected, and for that reason I put into your hands this resolution.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If I may be allowed to say so, it is a pity that the hon. gentleman, who has made an exceedingly moderate argument upon an admittedly important subject, has chosen this occasion to bring forward the question. The motion before you was that this House should resolve itself into Committee of Supply, and, of course, on that occasion, the amendments which are presented constitute a direct challenge of the conduct of the Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As a rule.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, the hon. gentleman will remember that Sir John A. Macdonald accepted a motion, in 1891, that I proposed from this side of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Perfectly so. The hon. gentleman did not do me the favour of waiting until I finished my sentence, and the exception he happens to mention, I think, supports the statement which I made, that these motions, as a rule, involve an attack upon the Government; and I was going on to answer that in the language of the resolution in your hands, and in the argument of the hon. gentleman, there is no mistake whatever as to the challenge contained both in the resolution and in the argument. The hon. gentleman, within his right, of course, contends that a practice has grown up in connection with the appointments of Lieutenant-Governors, and their continuance in office after the expiry of the five-year term, that amounts to an abuse. The hon. gentleman's language was that this practice also had become prevalent. I think the hon. gentleman's motion is to the same effect, and I shall refer to that. In his argument he describes this practice as amounting to an abuse, and, therefore, whatever there may be in the merits of the question when discussed on another occasion, and whatever opinion might prevail as to the question in general, this is an amendment so framed and so supported that the Government cannot accept. I think that this statement in the resolution:

That the practice has become prevalent of permitting Lieutenant-Governors to continue in office for long periods of time after the expiry of their commissions, by which they become removable at any time without assignment of cause,

is a statement that history does not support. One of the first cases in which a Lieutenant-Governor was permitted to remain in office over the five-year period, if I recollect aright, was the case of Lieutenant-Governor Archibald, during the time of the Government of which the hon. member for Bothwell was a member.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He was appointed a second time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He was appointed afterwards a second time. The hon. gentleman is quite correct, but months had intervened during the tenure of office by hon. gentlemen and the incoming of the succeeding Cabinet of Sir John A. Macdonald, and during that period this wrong upon the constitution as the hon. gentleman argues, was committed. But what I wish to say is this, that the cases to which the hon. gentleman has referred, extending over a long period of years, are not many, and this is the first occasion upon which the practice has been formally challenged in this House; and again I say that under these circumstances it is hardly a fitting opportunity to make the challenge, and it is not one of those opportunities when the arguments that may be brought forward can be expected to receive their due weight. The hon. gentleman spoke of the spirit of our constitution. He referred to the language of section 59 of the British North America Act, and in the short time that I have had the opportunity of looking into a question of such importance, I am not able to agree with the hon. gentleman that the practice, in the few cases to which he has referred, is in any respect inconsistent with the spirit of that Act. But I will mention how many gentlemen have occupied that position in the different provinces since 1867, and the record seems to show that the practice has been absolutely in accord, not only with the terms of the British North America Act, but, as I think, with the spirit of that Act. Section 59 is as follows:—

The Lieutenant-Governor shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor General, but any Lieutenant-Governor appointed after the commencement of the first session of the Parliament of Canada shall not be removable within five years from his appointment, except for cause assigned, which shall be communicated to him in writing within one month after the order for his removal is made, and shall be communicated by Message to the Senate and the House of Commons within one week thereof, if Parliament is then sitting, and, if not, then within one week after the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

So that there is the term and there is the provision for occupancy of the office over the term. In order to fully understand what degree of importance is to be attached to the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) at this period of our history, I propose, though it may be somewhat tedious, to men-

tion the names of the Lieutenant-Governors and their terms from 1867 down to 1893, as given in "Todd's Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Four in fifteen years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Here is the record :

Ontario.—1867-68, Major-General H. W. Stisted; 1868-73, Hon. W. Pearce Howland ; 1873-75, Hon. J. W. Crawford ; 1875-80, Hon. D. A. Macdonald ; 1880-87, Hon. J. B. Robinson ; 1887-92, Sir Alexander Campbell ; 1892, Hon. G. A. Kirkpatrick.

Quebec.—1867-73, Sir N. F. Belleau ; 1873-76, Hon. R. E. Caron ; 1876-79, Hon. Luc Letellier de St. Just ; 1879-84, Hon. Theodore Robitaille ; 1884-87, Hon. L. F. R. Masson ; 1887-92, Hon. A. R. Angers ; 1892, Hon. J. A. Chapleau.

Nova Scotia.—1867, Sir William F. Williams ; 1867-73, Major-General C. H. Doyle ; 1873, Hon. Joseph Howe ; 1873-83, Hon. A. G. Archibald ; 1883-88, Hon. M. H. Richey ; 1888-90, Hon. A. W. McLelan ; 1890, Hon. M. B. Daly.

New Brunswick.—1867, Major-General C. H. Doyle ; 1867-68, Colonel F. P. Harding ; 1868-73, Hon. L. A. Wilmot ; 1873-78, Hon. E. B. Chandler ; 1880-85, Hon. Sir L. Tilley ; 1893, Hon. John Boyd ; 1893, Hon. J. J. Fraser.

Prince Edward Island.—1873-74, Hon. W. C. F. Robinson ; 1874-79, Sir R. Hodgson ; 1879-84, Hon. T. H. Haviland ; 1884-89, Hon. A. A. Macdonald ; 1889, Hon. J. S. Carvell.

Manitoba.—1870-72, Hon. A. G. Archibald ; 1872-77, Hon. A. Morris ; 1877-82, Hon. J. E. Cauchon ; 1882-88, Hon. J. C. Aikins ; 1883-93, Hon. J. C. Schultz.

British Columbia.—1871-76, Hon. J. W. Trutch ; 1876-81, Hon. A. N. Richards ; 1881-87, Hon. C. F. Cornwall ; 1887-92, Hon. H. Nelson ; 1892, Hon. E. Dewdney.

North-west Territories.—1876-81, Hon. David Laird ; 1881-88, Hon. E. Dewdney ; 1888-93, Hon. J. Royal ; 1893, Hon. C. H. Mackintosh.

That list of cases seems to answer the very strong resolution, a resolution entirely too strong in its terms, moved by my hon. friend. But in most of those provinces, since 1878, the Lieutenant-Governor has been appointed by a Federal Government not in political accord or harmony with the local legislature, or rather the local government, and this House has yet to learn of any case where there was the slightest objection raised to extending the term of office of the Lieutenant-Governor holding this position at the pleasure of the Governor General. That seems to me also to afford some answer to the hon. gentleman's motion. Looking through Todd, I have curiously observed cases of several governors holding their commissions direct by Imperial commission of the Imperial Government in the Australian colonies, whose terms seem to run to seven years. From 1855 to 1862, for instance, in South Australia, the position was held by Sir Richard Graves Macdonnell. From 1872 to 1879, in New South Wales, the position was held by Sir Hercules Robinson. The general practice in colonies under the Imperial Government, as in Canada under the Governor General, is, no doubt, the five years term ; but I have been endeavouring to insist that there has been no abuse, and that the hon. gentleman's resolution is, to say the least of it, premature. Having admitted the general principle, having shown, as I think I have shown, that the exceptions in Canada are as contemplated by the Act, and have not become anything like a practice, that no general complaint from the local government has been made, the resolution which the hon. gentleman has to-day placed before the House should be voted down as being premature, as not being supported by the facts.

Mr. LAURIER. I rise simply for the purpose of calling the attention of the Minister of Justice to the erroneous, if he will permit me to say so, view which he has taken of the amendment to go into Committee of Supply. The hon. Minister has taken the ground that almost of necessity such motions carry with them a vote of want of confidence in the Government. This assertion can be maintained neither in law nor in the practice of this Parliament. Of course, there are motions which by themselves carry censure and such motions would necessarily imply want of confidence in the Administration. But when the motion presented is such as this motion, affirming a general principle, not particularly calling in question any practice or any action of the Government, it does not carry with it want of confidence, unless, indeed, it is made so by the will of the Administration. If the Administration cares to do so, it always has the power to declare that a motion moved in amendment to go into Committee of Supply is a motion of want of confidence ; they have the power, and it follows they can take that course. But I dispute altogether the proposition that this is such a motion as to involve want of confidence. I know this is a weapon often resorted to by the Administration in order to defend a rather dubious course where the existence of the Administration is dependent on such a vote, and I remember more than one occasion when hon. members have been placed between their conscience on the one side, and giving support to the Administration on the other, and as a rule their conscience has given away to their confidence in the Administration. But this is not necessarily the case to-day, and I think my hon. friend is unwise, if he permits me to say so, in not inviting a proper discussion and taking the feeling of the House upon this question. He says that no complaint has been made and that no evil has resulted from this practice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman hardly puts that right. I have denied the practice existed. I said the cases were exceptional.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman said that no evil has resulted from the practice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. From even the exceptional cases.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of my hon. friend to a case with which I know he is familiar, but which he seems to have forgotten. In 1882, on motion to go into Supply, the question of the dispute as to the boundaries between Ontario and Quebec was brought in in the form of an amendment, moved by a prominent supporter of the Administration at that time, the late Mr. Plumb. The amendment read as follows :—

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved : That in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the western and northern boundaries of the province of Ontario should be finally settled by a reference to, and an authoritative decision by, either the Supreme Court of Canada or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Great Britain, or by the Supreme Court in the first place, subject to a final submission to the Judicial Committee, as the province of Ontario may choose ; that such decision should be obtained either on appeal in a friendly action, brought for the purpose, or by reference to the said courts, or either or both of them, by Her Majesty, under the powers conferred upon her by the Imperial and Canadian Parliaments, as the government of Ontario may prefer, and that the said reference should be based on the evidence collected and printed, with any additional documentary evidence—if such there is—and that, pending the reference, the administration of the lands shall be entrusted to a joint committee appointed by the Governments of Canada and Ontario.

Now, strange to say, this motion was presented by a prominent member of the Administration, was supported by the Administration and resisted by the Opposition, and it was carried in the House by a strict party vote. The motion of the Government to go into Supply was defeated by the Government itself. Surely in view of such a case, it cannot be said that an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply carries with it the character of a motion of want of confidence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not necessarily.

Mr. LAURIER. Then is there any reason why this motion should be made a want of confidence motion ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I argue so.

Mr. LAURIER. At this very moment there is a case in point before the country. The Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba has for some time occupied his position by suffrance of the Administration and not by his commission upon which he was appointed. He can be dismissed to-morrow and a successor to him can be appointed the day after to-morrow. He may be retained for one day or for one year, just as suits the convenience of the party in power. I ask the Minister of Justice, is that a practice which should be tolerated ? The hon. gentleman says that so far no evil has flown from this, but does my hon. friend argue that because no evil results follow from the breaking of a law, that it is right and proper that the law should be broken ? Will he maintain that because no evil results have followed, that therefore we should go on without any rules whatever. If the provision of the constitution, which says that the Lieutenant-Governor shall be appointed for a term of years by commission, can be violated with impunity, and if no evil results flow from such violation of the law, the law might as well be dispensed with at once. But, Sir, laws exist in all cases because if there are no laws abuses may result, and I call the attention of my hon. friend, that he has given no reasons whatever why such a practice should be defended. Indeed he has not defended it. His only argument is that no evil results have flown from it and I submit that is no argument at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would not take part in the debate, Mr. Speaker, but for the fact that I think it is too important a matter to go, as it were, by default. I do not care whether the Government treat this matter as a want of confidence or whether they do not treat it as a want of confidence. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman who has spoken on behalf of the Government has announced, contrary to the intention and will of the introducer, that the Government treat it as a want of confidence motion. What I think is, that, recognizing and regarding the tenure of office which the Lieutenant-Governor holds under our federal system, this House ought not so long to have tolerated the abuse of the continuance of the system which is complained of. Why is it that the British North America Act has distinctly defined the tenure of office that the Lieutenant-Governor holds. He is not appointed during good behaviour, he is not appointed during pleasure ; but he is appointed for a definite fixed term of years, and he is not to be removed except by the Government for cause assigned which must be communicated to this House. This all goes to show that in the experiment which was made of a colonial government appointing Lieutenant-Governors, that the Act defines that the Lieutenant-Governor should hold a position of independence and should not be in any respect beyond what the law requires him to me, subservient to the central power. Therefore, Sir, where it is brought to our attention, I think we would be derelict in our duty, if we allow this question to be treated as of no importance whatever. I did not understand the Minister of Justice to justify it, or if he does justify the departure from the plain terms of the law, he does it but faintly indeed. But what may be said, if this matter does not now engage our attention, and does not receive from us that consideration that its importance demands ? It may be felt that when it was brought to our notice that Lieutenant-Governors have been permitted to hold office, after their terms had expired, and

during pleasure, and subject to removal of course without notice; that we did not think it of sufficient moment to give it any attention. I therefore desire to say that I believe it to be a matter of the very gravest importance that this provision of the statute should be definitely adhered to. It does not prevent a gentleman who is Lieutenant-Governor being reappointed, for we know that in the case of Sir Leonard Tilley that was done twice, or thrice, but what is calculated to degrade the high and important office of the representative of the Crown in the provinces is, that he should be in the position that at any moment he could be recalled; and that in that sense he is put in a position to perhaps obey directions from the central body, which in his duty to his province he should wholly and absolutely disregard. The case that has been referred to in the province of Manitoba is a very striking one, and one which exposes the mischief and the danger to follow from a continuance of this practice. We are told in this House, and we have been told elsewhere, that the gentleman who holds the office, is most anxious for reappointment. We were told not very long ago, that this gentleman had come to Ottawa for the purpose of trying to be continued in his office and was willing under these circumstances to bargain away his functions and the rights of his province. I do not know whether these charges are true, but this I do know: That the fact that these charges could be made tend to degrade and lower the dignity of the high office which the Lieutenant-Governors occupy. For that reason and that alone, I think that we should require that the statute should be adhered to, and that the abuse should not be allowed to continue to exist. So that, speaking on behalf of myself—I have no right to speak for anybody else—on a question of this importance, I could not give a silent vote, and, in voting for the resolution—if a division is called for, I shall certainly vote for it—I do not treat it as a vote of want of confidence or blame the Government. Attention has not been directed to the matter before, and we are perhaps as much to blame for the past as the Government. But in the future we ought not to continue a practice which seems to me to be at variance, not simply with the spirit, but with the plain letter of our constitution.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not at all understand my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, to argue against the advisability of carrying out the law as a general rule; I think my hon. friend made that admission. It is an important question, there is no doubt. What I have noticed in this discussion is that the variation from the rule has not been challenged, because of any special instance of harm having resulted from the commission of any Lieutenant-Governor running over its time of five years. At the present time, as my hon. friend said, there is but one instance of such.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are four.

Mr. FOSTER. There is but one existing at present. Frankly, I think we are all agreed that the law binds, and that the principle of the law is a good one. But I want to take exception to two points. My hon. friend argues that necessarily the independence of a man is entirely destroyed when his term of five years is over, and he is then liable to be removed at any moment at the pleasure of the Administration. Although theoretically that may be maintained, I do not think that practically it has any appreciable effect. A person who has held such a high and honourable position, and is worthy of holding it—who has done that for a period of five years, and done it to the satisfaction of the country as a whole, and the province over which he is Lieutenant-Governor—does not feel for a single moment, if for reasons of state his term is prolonged for an indefinite number of months, that therefore his independence is in the least at stake. He will act just as independently and will feel himself just as honourably bound to fulfil the duties of his office according to his oath as he was before his term had run out, and as he would be if his term had not run out. There is also another view which may be held. It might sometimes be not for the benefit of the state, but quite the opposite, that a man should be taken from the gubernatorial office immediately upon the expiration of his term of five years. There might be some important business of negotiation which was current during his term, which had not been finished, which was still in negotiation, which he was thoroughly conversant with, and which it might be considered best should be finished before he left the gubernatorial seat. Such a case as that is quite conceivable. Outside of these considerations—and they are practical considerations, which any Administration has to take into account—I quite subscribe to the doctrine that the term of the governor of a province should conform to the legal limit, and that, if there is any intention that he should be continued in office any length of time beyond his term, outside of the considerations I have mentioned, it would be far better to give him a second term at once than to keep him on for a large number of years. A few cases have occurred sufficient to emphasize the rule, I am ready to acknowledge; but no case that I know of has occurred as to which condemnation could be based upon ill results that have followed from the temporary prolongation of the term.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has carefully avoided two views of the case which I think may well be brought to the attention of this House

For several days past this House has rung with denunciations of those who would not obey the constitution. No language too strong could be used in denunciation of those who would not obey the remedial order or the judgment of the Privy Council. We were almost rebels because we would not obey the constitution. But where, for reasons of state, as the hon. gentleman says, it suits the Government to violate the constitution in regard to the term of a Lieutenant-Governor, nothing is to be said about it. It is just as much a violation of the constitution to set aside and deliberately disobey the clauses of the British North America Act in regard to that as to violate any other provision of the constitution. But for reasons of state in one case the provisions of the constitution are to be insisted upon, and in the other case they are not to be considered of the slightest importance. There is another view of the case. It may be true that the hon. gentleman who occupies the position of Lieutenant-Governor is perfectly independent; there may be no question of his independence; but what have we to say of those numerous applicants to whom the office is held out as a bait to induce them to support the Administration when otherwise they might not do so?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing personal in that, I hope.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It does not apply to the hon. Minister of Finance undoubtedly. But one can easily imagine a case where gentlemen, either in this House or outside of it, might have the temptation held out to them year after year and month after month; and, at a critical time in the history of an Administration, it might be considered exceedingly convenient for some such reason not to fill the office. But I do say that for hon. gentlemen who have insisted so loudly upon the necessity of obeying the constitution, coolly to argue that for reasons of state, as they term it, they may deliberately set aside the clauses of the British North America Act, is a little too much for those who have heard the speeches that have been made in this House in the last few days.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend has argued that the constitution has been violated. As I read the constitution:

> A Lieutenant-Governor shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor General.

That is an absolute statement; and what follows is a qualification of that:

> But any Lieutenant-Governor appointed after the commencement of the first session of the Parliament of Canada, shall not be removable within five years from his appointment, except for cause assigned, which shall be communicated to him in writing within one month after the order for his removal is made.

Mr. MULOCK. That qualifies the pleasure.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend, I apprehend, is quite mistaken as to the significance of this language. A general statement is here made that a Lieutenant-Governor shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor General; and then comes a limit in favour of the appointee—that for five years he shall not be removable, except for cause assigned.

Mr. McCARTHY. Therefore he holds office during pleasure?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, certainly he does.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Five years, certainly.

Mr. DAVIN. During pleasure, and then comes the qualifications, so that what the hon. member for Bothwell aims at is a thing which should properly be attained by revising the British North America Act; but so long as the British North America Act remains as it is, I hold that no charge can be brought against the Administration, Liberal or Conservative, which may happen to advise His Excellency to continue a Lieutenant-Governor in office longer than five years, because, according to that rule, he is appointed for that term, and then there is a qualification in favour of the appointee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I listened to the remarks of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance with some regret. In particular, I thought that the Minister of Finance, who admitted substantially the correctness of my hon. friend's position, was exceedingly weak when he contended that no man's impartiality, no man's independence was liable to be impaired by the fact that he was a mere occupant at pleasure. Why, one merely needs to state the proposition to know that such a person must of necessity forfeit his independence pro tanto when he ceases to be an officer holding his position for a term of years during good behaviour; and the hon. gentleman knows quite well that the value of the whole of these officials depends entirely on the belief of the public, the legislature, the Ministers with whom they act, that they are impartial and independent. There can be nothing more calculated to degrade the office of Lieutenant-Governor than to allow those who hold that office to remain there at the mere pleasure of the Ministry of the day. And I am very far indeed from believing that no evils have arisen when Ministers, as we have seen on various occasions, hold their office to a certain extent at the mercy of the Lieutenant-Governor, who in turn holds his absolutely at the mercy of the Government here. Because no evil has been stated to have occurred, it does not at all follow that no evil has occurred. If the hon. gentlemen choose to reappoint a man whose term of office is completed, we have nothing to say. It may or may not be expedient, but

it is, at any rate, within their discretion, and a thing for which they are properly held responsible; but if they choose, under circumstances such as have occurred in other provinces, and more particularly under circumstances such as are occurring to-day in Manitoba, to keep in office a gentleman who holds it absolutely and mainly at their pleasure, they will expose themselves very justly to the charge of having interpreted for purposes of their own, the plain intent and spirit of the British North America Act in a manner in no ways contemplated by the constitution, and utterly repugnant to the spirit of the constitution; and their action may produce very grave and mischievous results. We know perfectly well that in this particular case it has been asserted publicly—I do not say that we have the evidence to prove it here—that the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba came down here with the proposition, neither more nor less, that if things were made pleasant for him, and he got an extension of his term, he would dismiss his Ministers. That may or may not have been the case, and under the peculiar circumstances of the case there was ground for suspicion that some such intrigue was going on; and it is in the highest degree important for the usefulness of any officer, that his tenure of office should be of such a character that no such suspicion could arise about it. If it is of any use to have Lieutenant-Governors—a thing which may be doubted and which is under discussion at present—if these officers are of any value, if it is desirable that they should be continued, if it is desirable that these petty mock courts should be maintained at considerable cost to the country, then at least the men who preside over them should be independent of the Government here, or at any rate only subject to removal under such circumstances as the constitution prescribes. It is an evil—and one which may prove to be a serious one before we meet again—that the Governor of one of our provinces should be in a position entirely fatal to his independence; and this Parliament will be false to its duty unless it expresses a strong opinion as to the inexpediency of allowing such a state of things to continue for one hour.

Mr. COCKBURN. While I sympathize to a considerable extent with the feelings which prompted the hon. member for Bothwell to draw the attention of the House to this matter, I do not think he has brought forward sufficient evidence to establish the fact that there has been so prevalent a contravention of the constitution that it behooves us to act in such a manner as really to pass a verdict of blame upon the Ministry. I am anxious that so honourable an office should be left free, as far as possible, from the control of the Dominion Government; but at the same time, we must all feel that in a large Dominion, such as it is our privilege to rule, there are many cases in which it may be inadvisable, in the public interests, to remove a Lieutenant-Governor. I have no sympathy, I may say, with my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) in his remarks with reference to the numerous applicants who may be knocking at the door which leads to the office, for I should rather read the argument in this way, that if there are so many applicants among the supporters of the Government ready to take that office, they will bring such influence to bear upon the Government as to prevent this practice becoming so very general as it is hinted it might become. I think, on the contrary, that there is a great safeguard in the fact that there is a sufficient office-seeking spirit on both sides; and I cannot but feel that as long as we have so strong a feeling in Canada to grab public offices, we may rest assured that very few Lieutenant-Governors will be allowed to continue in the position beyond the appointed term unless there be strong reason in the public interest why they should not be removed. I hope that the advice given by the hon. philosopher from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will be accepted by the Government in a spirit of resignation—not that I mean they should resign—but that they should take his advice to heart. I feel, however, that the philosophic spirit which characterizes the hon. member for Bothwell has perhaps led him somewhat astray in the matter. If he desires to preserve that philosophic unity in his discourse, and in the rules he has laid down, he should not allow himself to be carried past the boundaries—I will not say of common sense—but of that sense which makes us give and receive a little light. I trust a matter of this kind will not be trusted to a vote, but I hope, if the Government have seen fit to unduly prolong the office of any Lieutenant-Governor, they will take every opportunity, as speedily as possible, to remedy that condition.

Mr. WELDON. I am in favour of the practice recommended by the hon. member for Bothwell, but he has not made out a case which calls upon me to vote for the resolution. I am asked to declare by my vote that:

> The practice, which has become prevalent, of permitting Lieutenant-Governors to continue in office for long periods of time after the expiry of their commissions, by which they become removable at any time, is an abuse of authority calculated to impair responsible government of the provinces of the Dominion.

The hon. gentleman draws an inference which cannot logically be drawn, and he winds up with a declaration which I, for one, cannot make. I did not think that a case of abuse of authority has yet been made out. If I understand the Minister of Justice and the leader of the House, who spoke

afterwards, they agreed that the common rule should be to give a Lieutenant-Governor a fixed term, but they also pointed out that the reading of the constitution is clear enough, and that no very good reason has been given for putting a hard and fast limit upon it. The constitution simply says in substance, that the Lieutenant-Governor shall have a minimum term of five years. It is a grave thing to alter the constitution, to tie the hands of the Administration with a hard and fast rule; and I do not think that a case for so doing has been made out. Much as I would like to see the practice followed, in every possible case, of having a new commission made out when the five years' term comes to an end—and the House, on both sides, is pretty much agreed that such is a sound practice—there may be unforeseen cases in which it would be hazardous to have the constitution altered as proposed.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Mills, Bothwell):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Guay,
Bain (Wentworth),	Harwood,
Beausoleil,	Innes,
Béchard,	Landerkin,
Beith,	Langelier,
Bernier,	Laurier,
Borden,	Leduc,
Boston,	Legris,
Bourassa,	Lister,
Bowers,	Livingston,
Brodeur,	Lowell,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bruneau,	McCarthy,
Campbell,	McGregor,
Carroll,	McIsaac,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McMillan,
Casey,	McMullen,
Charlton,	Mignault,
Choquette,	Mills (Bothwell),
Christie,	Monet,
Colter,	Mulock,
Davies (P.E.I.),	O'Brien,
Dawson,	Perry,
Edgar,	Proulx,
Fauvel,	Rider,
Featherston,	Rinfret,
Flint,	Rowand,
Forbes,	Scriver,
Fraser,	Semple,
Gibson,	Somerville,
Gillmor,	Sutherland,
Godbout,	Vaillancourt, and
Grieve,	Yeo.—66.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Amyot,	Lippé,
Bain (Soulanges),	Macdonald (King's),
Baird,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Baker,	Maclean (York),
Bennett,	McAlister,
Bergeron,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bergin,	McDougald (Pictou),
Blanchard,	McDougall (Cape Breton)
Boyd,	McGreevy,
Burnham,	McInerney,
Cameron,	McKay,
Cargill,	McLean (King's),
Carignan,	McLennan,
Carling (Sir John),	McLeod,
Carpenter,	McNeill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Madill,
Carscallen,	Mara,
Chesley,	Marshall,
Coatsworth,	Masson,
Cochrane,	Miller,
Cockburn,	Mills (Annapolis),
Corbould,	Moncrieff,
Costigan,	Montague,
Curran,	Northrup,
Daly,	Ouimet,
Davin,	Patterson (Colchester),
Davis (Alberta),	Patterson (Huron),
Denison,	Pelletier,
Desaulniers,	Pridham,
Dickey,	Prior,
Dugas,	Putnam,
Dyer,	Robillard,
Earle,	Roome,
Fairbairn,	Rosamond,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ryckman,
Foster,	Smith (Ontario),
Gillies,	Sproule,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Stairs,
Grandbois,	Stevenson,
Grant (Sir James),	Taylor,
Guillet,	Temple,
Haggart,	Tisdale,
Haslam,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Henderson,	Turcotte,
Hutchins,	Weldon,
Ingram,	White (Cardwell),
Jeannotte,	White (Shelburne),
Joncas,	Wilmot,
Kaulbach,	Wilson,
Lachapelle,	Wood (Brockville), and
	Wood (Westm'd).—105.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Wallace,	Paterson (Brant),
Metcalfe,	Edwards,
Fréchette,	Lavergne,
Macdowall,	Préfontaine,
Barnard,	Bowman,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),	Devlin,
Corby,	Sanborn,
Smith (Sir Donald),	Delisle,
Bryson,	Geoffrion,
Hazen,	Martin,
Leclair,	Harwood,
Craig.	Tarte.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Mr. McDonald) came in while the motion was being put in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. member hear the motion put?

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). I did.

Mr. CASEY. Is it not required that the hon. gentleman should hear the whole question read?

Mr. SPEAKER. My ruling, given in 1891, is that a member must be in the House, and hear the whole of the question read, either in the French or in the English language.

Mr. McKAY. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) did not vote.

Mr. HAZEN. I did not hear the question put.

SUPPLY—THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. MULOCK. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of this House, and more particularly of the Government, to the vacancy in the Cabinet. I understand that we no longer have a Minister of Agriculture. Now, there are reasons why this important department should not be left without an efficient head for any considerable length of time. And in view of the statement that has just fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Centre Toronto, that there are any number of office-seekers in the ranks of gentlemen opposite, it can hardly be pleaded in justification of a long-continued vacancy of the office that there is any difficulty in getting a fit and proper person to fill it. For instance, we have the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). He has been certified to by a large section of his constituents as well qualified. And I believe that there is evidence that he is personally willing to undertake the job. I suppose that the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) would also offer his help. I will not take time to refer to the qualifications of all the gentlemen who might be considered eligible. But I venture to say that there are certain duties attaching to this office that are of such an important character that there should be no delay whatever in placing that department in commission. I mean, not to have it a branch of some other department, not to have it attached to another department for the time being, but to have it properly organized to meet any contingencies that may arise. The particular interest to which I call the attention of the House which will not admit of any laxity of administration, is the observation of the complete quarantine between Canada and the outside world in respect of cattle. We have a long frontier to guard. We are told from the official reports that there are stations at different points from ocean to ocean guarding that frontier. The least slip, the least oversight, the least indifference on the part of any official may be conducive of serious injury to the agricultural interest. Therefore, I offer the suggestion at the earliest possible moment, that every precaution may be taken to guard this industry. For my own part, I do not understand how this department can be efficiently managed or the work of guarding the frontier carried on unless there is at once an appointment to the head of the department of a person in every respect equal to the responsibilities of the position.

Mr. FOSTER. I have but little to say in reply to my hon. friend. He was good enough to point out several gentlemen on this side who might be looked to to fill that position. The gentlemen whose names he mentioned are men of ability and capacity who would perform the duties of that department, no doubt, very well. The hon. gentleman was too modest to speak of sundry persons on the Opposition side of this Chamber who might also have aspirations to fill such an office as this—himself included. But I would like to caution my hon. friend that he must temper his aspirations to that high office with the recollection of certain contingencies that might occur. Strange things might take place in his own constituency. With reference to my hon. friend's laudable anxiety that the office of Minister of Agriculture shall be properly looked after, and carefully administered, I think he need not give himself any trouble in that respect. The office has been vacant only two days, and the Government will see that, in the meantime, it is properly administered, as it always has been; and at a convenient opportunity will fill the office by a man of capability, who will be acceptable to the country.

Mr. CASEY. I think it is not at all out of place that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House should trouble themselves about this vacancy. The office is a very important one, and although it has only been vacant for a couple of days, it is not too soon to ask that it should be filled. If this Government is as strong as it professes to be, it should hail with pleasure the first opportunity of opening a constituency, and having an election, and showing that it is strong, not only in the House, but in the country. By doing so it would also accomplish what we have long contended they should have done in regard to the Minister of Agriculture, it would secure the presence of that Minister in this House. This is the House in which he should sit, this is the House in which the farmers of the country are directly represented, this is the House where explanations on such important matters ought to be made. We have laboured for some time under the inconvenience of having a Minister who was not only a lawyer, and unacquainted with agriculture or its needs, but who was in another place. We have had to get explanations second-hand. My hon. friend the Secretary of State has had to make the explanations this year, and has done very well, considering that he was only the mouthpiece for another Minister, and that he had not the information first-hand. But that department is one which should be repre-

sented in the people's House by a Minister who is an authority himself, a farmer, or, at all events, one who is intimately acquainted with farmers, and with their needs. I think it is quite in place to urge upon the Government the propriety of immediately filling this office, and of filling it by a member of the House of Commons, both to accomplish the end which I have last referred to, and also to show triumphantly their strength in the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish only to say a couple of words, and those shall be more particularly in reference to the hon. gentleman who administered the Department of Agriculture up to a couple of days ago. It is true that that hon. gentleman is a member of the legal profession, and it has been said by the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that on account of that fact he did not administer the department in the interest of the agriculturists of Canada. I have only to say that although that hon. gentleman is a member of the legal profession, he did secure a very wide knowledge of the affairs of his department; and whoever looks into the affairs of that department, and whoever carefully goes over his management of the department, will find that he initiated very many steps for the advancement of agriculture and of the dairy interests, and that, during his term of service, he did excellent work for the farmers of Canada. I think it my duty, as having represented him in this House during this session, to say now, in his absence, that he did excellent work in administering the affairs of that department.

Mr. CASEY. I did not say that the hon. gentleman, the late Minister of Agriculture, had not administered the office properly, I merely said that on account of his ignorance of the subject he was not able to appreciate the needs of the farming community as it is desirable that a Minister of Agriculture should be able to do.

Mr. McMILLAN. In connection with this subject, I wish to say that, during the incumbency of the late Minister of Agriculture, neither the experimental farm at Ottawa, nor the other experimental farms in the Dominion, have been as successfully administered as they would have been had a thoroughly trained agriculturist presided over that department. I fear not to state that up to this period there has not been a thoroughly practical agriculturist to carry on the operations of the central farm, one who is thoroughly acquainted with the raising and care of stock, such as has been attempted on that farm. It is of the utmost importance that the man who holds that important office should be acquainted with the feelings and aspirations of the farmers, and that acquaintance can only be obtained after a long and practical experience. There are a number of very important questions to be settled in the interests of the agriculturists of this country, and one of them is the quarantine regulations that exist between the United States and Canada. I believe that it would be in the interest of the farmers of Canada to-day if regulations were adopted providing for a complete system of inspection and abolishing quarantine. The regulations should be so changed that both our fat and lean stock could be taken into the United States markets. At the same time, existing conditions should be so changed that our great stock-raisers can enter the American market with their cattle. I hold that it would be a great benefit to a great many of the farmers of the province of Ontario, yes, and of the Dominion of Canada, if arrangements could be made to have proper inspection so that our stock could get into the American market. I am perfectly certain, as a farmer myself, and largely engaged in fattening animals, that if we had had proper inspection so that our fat stock could go to the United States, within the last twelve months we would have enjoyed nearly $1 per cwt. more for our cattle than we have been getting. It is therefore of the utmost importance that there should be a practical man, one who has a seat in this House, to hold the office of Minister of Agriculture, so that he may sit here and hear all the discussions that take place with reference to the agricultural business of Canada.

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

(In the Committee.)

Public Works..... $174,650

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In this item of $99,800 for repairs and working expenses for harbours, docks, and slides, what have they got to do with booms and slides? How much goes for harbours?

Mr. OUIMET. It is an old form. There is a vote for general repairs, maintenance of harbours and rivers, slides and booms, and the work done is put under the heading of general repairs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. State generally what you want to do with the appropriation.

Mr. OUIMET. This expenditure includes amounts paid for making good damages not provided for in the Estimates for the works, different amounts being spent for wharfs and other structures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe with respect to the graving docks that a total vote is asked of from $30,000 to $40,000, $13,000 being required for Esquimalt, about $10,000 for Lévis, and $8,000 for Kingston. What receipts have been obtained

from each of these docks, and why is it necessary to ask for $11,000 for repairs when these are practically new works and are presumably in fairly good order ?

Mr. OUIMET. At Kingston we have to pay for the staff, including the engineer, assistant engineer, foreman, night watchman and labourers. Then there is an expenditure of $1,400 for coal, and $600 for repairs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I recommend that the phraseology of the vote be changed, as an amount of $1,400 for coal is placed under the head of repairs.

Mr. OUIMET. There are only two columns, one for expense of staff, and the other for repairs. This system applies very well as regards slides and booms where no coal or other supplies are furnished. No doubt the language could be more accurate, but the system would have to be changed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many men are on duty at the several graving docks?

Mr. OUIMET. I have already given the number at Kingston. There are nine at Esquimalt, and six at Lévis.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What income has been received from these graving docks, respectively ?

Mr. OUIMET. From Lévis during the year 1893-94, $13,310 ; from Kingston, $7,453; Esquimalt, $10,786.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that, entirely apart from the cost of construction, the receipts at Esquimalt and Kingston do not equal working expenses ?

Mr. OUIMET. The revenue will about meet the expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a deficiency as regards Esquimalt and Kingston.

Mr. OUIMET. Some years there is a surplus ; during other years there are fewer accidents to vessels, and consequently less revenue for the docks.

Mr. McMULLEN. I observe that $24,850 is required for the Ottawa district staff. What does that staff consist of, how many compose it, and what are the salaries paid ?

Mr. OUIMET. The revenue of the Ottawa district slides and booms is over $63,000 annually. The staff is required to keep the slides and booms in working order and collect the revenues from them. The staff consists of one superintendent at $2,500, and accountant at $1,600, paymaster, $1,200, six deputy slide-masters, five boom-masters, and two or three other officials and labourers. The general repairs last year cost $14,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. What does the district embrace ?

Mr. OUIMET. All the slides and booms on the Ottawa River and its tributaries.

Mr. McMULLEN. The repairs cost $14,603. The staff will number nearly a hundred, I think.

Mr. OUIMET. Twenty-four men are employed on the regular staff for the purpose of maintaining the slides and booms and collecting the revenue. The cost of general repairs, maintenance of dams, slides and booms at different stations was $7,000. The general repairs on the tributaries cost $8,000. The amount collected last year was $63,151.38.

Mr. McMULLEN. What about the St. Maurice district ?

Mr. OUIMET. There are very considerable works on that river, and they used to cost $26,000, but they are now reduced to $18,000, including repairs which were very extensive last year and will be this year on account of the increased quantity of timber produced in that district. Last year the revenue was $14,371, and it will probably reach $18,000 this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the revenue was $14,000, and we paid the staff nearly $8,500, it would, therefore, appear that it cost 60 per cent of the revenue to collect it.

Mr. OUIMET. That staff is not altogether for the collection of revenue, but for repairing and maintaining the slides.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me we must keep a very excessive staff there.

Mr. OUIMET. These works are not for the purpose of obtaining revenue but for the purpose of accommodating the timber trade, and if we can make ends meet it is all that is required. They are built just as if we erected public works for the general good on any highway. They have not been built for revenue. These men are not supposed to be paying taxes to the country, but only what is equivalent to the maintenance of these works, and when they are no more required they will be abandoned.

Mr. BOWERS. There is a continuous line of telegraph now from Digby to Westport, a distance of about forty miles, and I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the necessity of extending it to the lighthouse at the west point of Briar Island, a distance of one and a half or two miles. At this point nearly all the vessels pass in and out to the Bay of Fundy, and in case of wreckage, it takes a very considerable time for a person to come to the village to get help as the road is a very bad one. In consequence of this delay life and property might be lost at that point, which might not occur, as help could be obtained by telephone, if the line were extended to

the extreme point of Briar Island. Another reason for erecting the telegraph is, that sometimes the whistling buoys go adrift from Trinity Rock and the Lurcher Shoal, and come around Briar Island when they are towed in. If there was a line extended to the lighthouse, there would be continual communication with the village, and if the buoys went adrift, vessels could go out and get them. There is now a risk of them drifting ashore and breaking up, which would entail quite a loss upon the department. The expense would be small. I think the company would build the line and run it, and keep it in repair for a very small yearly stipend. I would ask the Minister to take this into his consideration, and see if he cannot provide a small grant for extending that line and opening up communication with Westport. Not only the lightkeeper but the engineer of the fog-alarm live there with their families, and in case of accident, it is very inconvenient at times for them to leave and go for help, as there might be stormy weather or a heavy fog. I think it is very necessary that this line should be extended, as it would afford great facilities not only to the inhabitants of Westport, but often to the owners of shipping at St. John and other parts of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. OUIMET. This matter will be attended to. I will instruct my superintendent of telegraphs to make a report to me on the matter. As he is within hearing, he will know all about it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that there is an increase of $1,500 this year for cable and telegraph lines on the coast. Will the hon. gentleman explain why this increase is asked ?

Mr. OUIMET. Whenever repairs are required to be made to the cables, we employ the steamer "Newfield," which is a Government steamer, and whatever our department pays for it goes to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which owns the steamer. This $1,500 additional, as I understand, is required to put in new machinery for the general purpose of repairing cables.

Excise $472,953 75

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that the Controller proposes to make a reduction of $11,700, largely in the preventive service. Will he be good enough to explain whether this reduction arises from the fact that he did not require to spend the money before, or whether he is attempting to economize ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Two years ago it occurred to me that a good many of the officers belonging to the regular staff in the different revenue districts throughout the country might do a good deal of the work then done by the preventive staff. The expense on that account was larger than it ought to have been ; and, as one very good result of my visiting most of the districts and talking with the collectors, I came to the conclusion that we could effect a saving of this $6,800 in the preventive service. I am satisfied that the service can be effectively performed with the amount I ask.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is an item here of $5,000 to pay collectors of customs allowance on duty collected by them. I think collectors of customs, when called upon to discharge the very slight duty in connection with the Inland Revenue Department, might very well do it without additional wages. If they cannot, a change should be made in the law. Our Civil Service, both inside and outside, are better paid than any other class in this Dominion, and I cannot understand why men should be allowed to draw double pay simply because they are required to do some little extra duty. They are still the servants of the country ; they are not the servants of one department only ; and they should be ready to serve their country as they are required by the several departments. Why is this system continued ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I can only say that it has always been considered that this mode of collecting the revenue is to be commended for its cheapness. As a matter of fact, no officers are appointed for the smaller places, but a very small percentage on the collections are allowed to the officers of the Customs Department. If the hon. gentleman is justified in saying that the officers belonging to the different departments in the outside service are overpaid, I am bound to say that that does not apply to the officers who collect our revenue in this way. In all places of any consequence where there is sufficient work for an officer of each department, two officers are appointed. But these small percentages are only allowed in the smaller places, where the customs officers are invariably paid very small salaries. If the hon. gentleman examines into the matter, he will find that what they receive from both departments combined amounts only to a small salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not saying that the hon. gentleman is responsible at all, neither do I say that the staff was overpaid, but I merely say that they are as well, if not better paid than any other class in the outside service. But I contend that if the Act, as it now stands, prevents any officer doing something in connection with the Department of Inland Revenue, it ought to be altered. If there is more work than can really be done by one man, and an assistant is required, let one be appointed ; but this system of paying officers simply because they are called upon to do some little work in addition to their ordinary routine

duties is a bad precedent. I would like to learn from the Controller whether the payments are in the shape of commissions, or in what way these officers are paid.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). On collections up to $3,000, 5 per cent is paid. That is less than any collector's fees I ever heard of. From $3,000 to $5,000, $150 per annum is paid. From $5,000 to $10,000, $200 per annum is paid. Over $10,000, $250 is paid. It appears to me that we are conducting that branch of the service very economically, and I have a great deal of difficulty trying to get along without making new appointments.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am pleased to see the reductions which are being made, and no doubt the Controller of Inland Revenue is doing the best he can. But, in my humble opinion, if the statute prevents civil servants doing this additional work, it ought to be changed. The commissions paid may be low, but after all, if a man is getting $1,200 a year for doing one work, and then is called on to collect $3,000 for the Inland Revenue Department—and I presume his work consists chiefly in receiving the money—$150 a year is just that much addition to his salary.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). He has really to do considerable work. He has to make all the entries for the bonding warehouse, and do a great deal of work beyond collecting the money.

To enable the department to supply methylated spirits to manufactories, the cost of which will be recouped by manufacturers to whom they are supplied; and to pay for rent, light, power, freight, salaries, &c..... $75,000

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Some years ago it was found that to allow methylated spirits to be manufactured outside was to give encouragement to a certain class of low whisky vendors who use it for bonding purposes, and the policy was adopted of the Government manufacturing these spirits and selling them to the trade. The reason for this item is as follows:—A year ago, when the Minister of Finance was preparing his Estimates, he adopted a change to which I was then, and am now, opposed, because it is not fair to the Estimates I have under preparation. Previous to last year, we asked for the sum of $5,000 merely to come and go upon in order to carry on the work of manufacturing methylated spirits. We showed by our business report at the end of the year, a profit of some $30,000. The Minister of Finance adopted the new policy, not only with regard to this department, but other institutions, such as the manufacture of binder twine in the penitentiaries, and made us ask Parliament for what was required to carry on the business each year. Therefore, it is that last year the sum of $85,000 was charged against our expenditure, but the $30,000 profit we made went into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and did not appear to our credit in the report at all. I wish to point out that the addition of $75,000 to our expenditure is not really an expenditure for the purposes of the Inland Revenue Department, but is a sum which we ask Parliament to give us in order that we may give back, not only that amount, but $30,000 more.

Culling Timber..... $2,950

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will be glad to understand exactly what has been done in respect to this item, which previously amounted to $27,950. Have these various persons, who have been in the habit of receiving something like a pension from us, been wiped out altogether, or been transferred to some other department?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The Bill which stands in my name on the Order paper provides for the substituting of a system of voluntary inspection in the case of lumber so as to make it analogous to the system adopted in the inspection of staples of other kinds. The prime object in introducing that change was one of economy. There did exist a very great necessity for some change in this branch, because it was a non-paying branch. For some time, the expenditure had been some $10,000 to $15,000 in excess of the revenue, and a great many people could not understand why the general tax-payers of the country should contribute for the payment of inspection fees in a service which belonged peculiarly to the buyers and sellers of lumber. That commended itself to me. My opinion is that in all matters of inspection, the voluntary system should be adopted; that is, if men wish to have anything inspected, they should pay for it, as they do now in the case of fish and wheat and other staples. But when it became known that the Government contemplated a change, the trade made certain representations to the effect that the system which it was proposed to adopt would result in bringing back the old state of things which existed a great many years ago, when the present Act was introduced, when the inspectors were appointed. Difficulties of such a grave character arose between the buyers of square timber and the producers that, many years ago, the Cullers' Act was introduced, under which the cullers were independent of both these parties. It was pointed out to the Government that while those who contended for the revision of the present system conceded that they could not ask that the deficit of revenue should be made up out of the public chest, nevertheless they were of opinion that the system might be retained with the reduction of the staff, while the trade could not possibly suffer; at all events, there would be no loss to the revenue. Of course, the chief object the Government had in view was to make both ends meet. But while the

Government wished to economize, they did wish to make everything out of the system. The whole subject was gone into very carefully to find out if some arrangement could not be made which would be reasonably satisfactory to all. The Government has changed its policy in regard to this branch. When I asked this $2,950 of the Finance Minister, it was intended that this Act should be put through the House this session, substituting the system I have spoken of for the one now in force. After this, on looking into the matter, it occurred to me and to the Government that it would meet the wishes of the trade, and, at the same time effect a saving of some $10,000 or $15,000, and make both ends meet, by asking the House to grant an additional sum of $14,550.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does that come in? It is not before us, and we are to have no Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The object is a good one. If it takes money out of the public chest, it is only that it may be paid back. I do not see where the difficutly is. I will ask the committee to vote this sum, and will leave it to my hon. friend——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But how is to be done? We are to have no Supplementary Estimate, and you cannot use a Governor General's warrant for this purpose without utterly disregarding both the spirit and the letter of the statute.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Why cannot we have Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. McMULLEN. I commend the effort of the hon. gentleman to reduce the expenditure upon this branch. A return brought down last year in response to a motion that I made gives the expenditure of the cullers' offices at Quebec and Montreal for ten years as $265,000, and that for wages alone; while the amount collected in fees during the same period was $200,000. So, in addition to the fees received, the country had to pay out $65,000 to make up the bill for wages alone. For years we pressed upon the Finance Minister and this Government that reductions should be made in this branch. Every year the amount of money paid for the staff has been in excess of the revenue collected. The Government must have been aware of this, and yet not until the fact is publicly exposed is any effort made to effect a saving. Last year I drew the hon. Controller's attention personally to the discrepancy between the amount collected and the amount paid out.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That was for Three Rivers.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, for Quebec and Montreal.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not remember that.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman may not remember it, but it is a fact. His reply to me was: What are you going to do with these men who have been employed a long time in the public service? I am glad to know that the reduction is to be made at last. But it should have been made long ago instead of waiting until the matter became so glaring that it could not possibly be further defended.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understand the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue to say that he proposes by a vote of $14,550 not yet in the Estimates to provide for this service which formerly cost $27,950. I see that in the present expenditure are included items of $6,000 for superannuated cullers, pay of cullers, $8,300; contingencies, $6,000; Montreal office, $900 and Quebec office, $6,750. How are the reductions to be effected so as to bring the expenditure within the $14,550 proposed? And why was not that $14,550 included in the Estimates with the $2,950?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. gentleman was not present when I made my previous explanation, so I will recapitulate briefly. The object, when the Bill was introduced, was to have the system of inspection voluntary. But this would not meet the objections which the Cullers' Act was originally passed to meet. The Government, after full consideration, and after consultation with those in the trade, concluded that we could retain the present system and yet greatly reduce the expenditure.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then, the details of these changes were not decided upon in time for the Estimates?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). No.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the pensions paid to superannuated cullers are suppressed?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). No.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that two of these cullers were superannuated up to the 30th December last year. Have there been any more superannuated since that time? What is the intention of the Government with regard to the rest?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The intention is to superannuate those whose services will not be required after the first of next month.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many of them will be put on the superannuation list in this way?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Six, at an average of $200 each. Their salaries while so engaged have been $700 per annum.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that one was superannuated last year at the age of 37. What is about the age of those he intends to place on the list?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I have not that information, as I did not know that a discussion would come up to-day with regard to cullers. I do not know the names exactly of those whom we shall superannuate, for we have not yet decided upon those whose services will be retained. However, on Monday I will supply the hon. gentleman with the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Minister say whether the staff as well as the cullers are eligible to be superannuated? I see you have nine cullers at Quebec. How many of a staff have you in addition, and are they eligible to be superannuated?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The cullers do not contribute to the superannuation fund, but the staff does.

Weights and Measures, Gas and Electric Light Inspection..... $99,800

Mr. BOWERS. About the salaries of these officers who go around inspecting weights and measures, when they visit a place to inspect scales or to inspect weights and measures, do the parties owning the scales or the weights and measures have to pay them any fee for carrying around the standards? Does the party that has his weights and measures verified pay the inspector anything for carrying around the standards?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Yes, cartage fees.

Mr. BOWERS. If a scale is a little out of order and these officers make it right, are they supposed to get paid for that, besides verifying the weights?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). No weights and measures official is allowed himself to try the scales.

Mr. BOWERS. Suppose there is a platform scale for weighing hay or coal, and the officer finds, upon verifying it, that it is not just right, and he goes to work and makes the scale right, perhaps lowers the balance a little or raises it, has he a right to fees for that?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think so, yes.

Mr. CASEY. Does the inspector claim cartage fees from the person whose weights and measures are inspected?—because I find that the Government pays the transport.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That is what the item is made out of.

Mr. CASEY. For instance, I see that the Government paid J. Egan, London, $257 for the cartage of weights. Now, does he charge extra fees to persons whose scales are inspected?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). He returns to the department the fees that he collects for that purpose. He collects fees averaging about 25 cents.

Mr. CASEY. In the Auditor General's Report, I see a charge for transport of weights. Is he paid twice for transport of weights, once by the department and once by the individual?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Certainly not. That is part of his return which he makes to the department.

Mr. McNEILL. I want to ask the Controller whether it is illegal to use a spring balance as a scale?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. May I ask why it is illegal? Why is it that the public are prevented from using these scales? Is it not a fact that in the Post Office Department these scales are used? Speaking from my own view of the subject, I think it is a great grievance that people are not able to use a scale which is a perfectly good scale, and is a cheap one.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They do not remain good.

Mr. McNEILL. I suppose no scale remains good after a certain length of time. After a certain time every scale requires to be examined and adjusted, and as soon as these scales are shown to be untrustworthy, then they should be set aside. But as long as they are good, as long as they weigh properly, it seems to me a hardship that people should be deprived of the use of them. I would earnestly bring the matter to the attention of the department, and ask them to consider it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would say to the hon. gentleman that that matter has been brought to my attention. In matters so technical I rely altogether upon the judgment and experience of those who are well versed in those matters. Balances are liable to be influenced by temperature, they are liable to get out of gear to a certain extent. The experience of my predecessor and officers is, that where they are used for purposes of weighing they are liable to get out of gear very quickly.

Mr. McNEILL. It seems very strange that scales should be liable to get out of gear so quickly, especially when so much reliance is placed upon them in the post office.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). They are not generally used.

Mr. McNEILL. But they are frequently used. In the old country such scales are very frequently used.

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

After Recess.

SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill

(No. 78), respecting the South Shore Railway Company (Limited).

Mr. FLINT. I desire to offer a few observations on this Bill in order that when it comes to the committee, attention will have been called to several salient points as to what is asked by the promoters. The very large amount of public interest felt in the measure is my principal excuse for detaining the House a few moments while I call attention to some phases of this matter which have not yet been sufficiently presented to the attention of hon. members. I very much regret that a motion which I placed on the Order paper some time ago, in which I asked the Government to bring down the correspondence and papers on file with the Government in connection with the application for a subsidy for this road and with respect to subsequent matters, has not been acceded to promptly by the Government. The conversation which took place on that motion being presented to the House has given hon. gentlemen considerable insight into the matters which will form part of our discussion this evening. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, on that evening a large amount of matter foreign to the subject of the South Shore Railway was interjected into the debate by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who called the attention of the House to important matters in connection with railway construction in his county. The hon. gentleman went into those matters at great length, I do not say at unnecessary length, because he felt them to be important in connection with matters in hand regarding railway undertakings in his own district. My hon. friend took up some of the time of the House, but I presume hon. gentlemen interested in railway construction in that portion of Nova Scotia considered the time was well spent. The South Shore Bill, to which some amendments were made by the Railway Committee, I need hardly say is not an original Act of incorporation. The company was originally incorporated by the legislature of Nova Scotia on 30th April, 1892. That Act constituted certain gentlemen a corporation for the purpose of building a railway from Yarmouth to Shelburne, in the county of Shelburne. Those gentlemen were E. Franklin Clements. Wm. V. Brown, Frederic Nichols, Charles F. Medbury, Albert M. Perrin, Harvey B. Doane, John F. McLarren, Henry I. D'Entremont, John McDonnell, T. Wishart Robertson, Thomas Robertson, Edgar M. Clements. The history of this company shows that those gentlemen subsequently sold out whatever interest they may have had in this work to other gentlemen, some of whose names will be mentioned in the course of my observations. But there is a matter to which I should like to call attention, that the Bill before the House does not mention the name of any incorporator. It simply asks the House to revive the charter of 1892, which is a local charter of the province of Nova Scotia, and extend the powers conferred by it in several directions. One of these directions was that the road instead of ending at Shelburne, may be continued along the south coast of Nova Scotia to Halifax, with a branch to Lockeport and in other directions. It also asks very extraordinary powers, and they will appear to be very extraordinary when the true history of the company is recited. It asks power for the company to build wharfs, warehouses, hotels, to construct steamship lines, and enter into most extensive business arrangements, involving almost every branch of commercial enterprise except that of keeping a retail grocery store. The original capital of this company was $100,000, with power to increase it to a certain amount upon the vote of the company. I will call the attention of the House to one particular proviso of the local Act incorporating this company, because it will throw some light on the position of the company seeking to have the charter amended, and it will enlighten the committee as to part of the true inwardness of the company's intentions. Clause 28 of the Act says:

> The portion of the company's railway lying between the town of Yarmouth and the town of Barrington shall be begun and completed within four years after the passing of this Act, or reasonable progress towards the completion, satisfactory to the Governor in Council, shall be made within two years by the company, to ensure such completion; otherwise this Act shall cease and determine.

In other words, this company had to complete its road to Barrington, which is about forty-seven miles, within four years of the date of the charter, or it had to begin colnstruction within two years of the passage of the Act, and make reasonable progress towards construction, satisfactory to the Governor in Council. Now, what are the facts of the case in connection with that particular clause? The company not only did not begin to do any practical work on the road until about six months after the expiration of the two years. It is contended that the company was never properly organized, that the amount of capital stock required was never paid into any bank, and that the company never got upon its feet in a legal and constitutional manner. But this fact is admitted on all hands, that the charter has lapsed if that proviso is held to mean what it says, that the road must be commenced two years after the date of the Act, and progress made satisfactory to the Governor in Council. For six months after the expiration of the two years the company had scarcely begun operations. The company as then constituted did begin operations about October, 1894. They entered upon the work with a great flourish of trumpets and the Yarmouth "Times," the organ of the company, informed the good people of the western part of Nova Scotia that the road was now in the hands of a first-class commercial corporation, that con-

tracts were made, and that it would be constructed at the rate of ten miles every thirty days, and be completed in a very short time. A large number of men were employed upon the road. A company was engaged to supply the plant and other things necessary to carry on its construction. It was not given by contract, but there was simply an arrangement made with a company for the hiring of the men and animals, and so on. They went on with the work from October until the middle of February, when the whole thing collapsed. Operations ceased entirely, and the labourers, many of them from the eastern part of the province were dismissed. The people living along the line could not get paid for the supplies furnished by them. We witnessed the extraordinary spectacle in the streets of one of our most thriving towns, of hundreds of men almost upon the verge of starvation crowding around the offices of the company demanding their wages and unable to obtain them. The clamour was so great that finally some of the supporters of the company raised sufficient money to pay these unhappy labourers at the rate of 33 cents on the dollar. They were told if they did not take that they would get nothing. They took it, and about 640 were dismissed. The merchants in the town who supplied goods to the amount of seven or eight thousand dollars each, and the farmers and fishermen who supplied to the extent of from $300 to $1,000 each, were left without their money. Some were compromised with at the rate of 30 cents on the dollar, and others were not paid at all. Many of the engineers and foremen were unable to obtain their salaries and were compellel to sue the company in the courts. Judgments were entered against the company to the extent of $60,000 or more, and the contractors who supplied the workingmen and the animals necessary to carry on the work also got judgments for a large amount. In addition to that the company collapsed in another direction. In fact, perhaps the collapse in this direction occurred just previous to the other collapse. Among the directors of the company whose names were heralded with a great deal of unction by the local organ of the company, were Mr. Frederick B. Farrar, of Boston, and Mr. Alexander, of New York. These were held out to the world as bankers of great means and almost unlimited wealth. You, Mr. Speaker, and almost every hon. gentlemen in the House, are familiar with the extravagant claims made for gentlemen (particularly those belonging to the United States) if they happen to have their names on a banking sign in New York or Boston. The word banker signifies unlimited resources to the uninitiated, and when a good-looking gentleman is pointed out as an eminent financier from New York who could build miles of railways without thinking anything of it, the unsophisticated mind is easily deceived. So the good people down there were deceived in this manner. Mr. Farrar, who is a very respectable gentleman indeed, turned out not to have the unlimited financial standing he was represented to have, and the same might be said of Mr. Alexander. Mr. Alexander was treasurer of the company, Mr. Farrar, vice-president, and a gentleman whose name will occur frequently through the debates, and who is quite well known in financial circles in New York, Mr. Tunis G. Bergen, was a member of the company. There is no indication from the papers produced that Mr. Bergen ever paid one dollar into the company of which he was president, or ever had one dollar stock in it. Mr. Farrar had, if his own affidavit is correct, one share, and Mr. Alexander had one share. Five hundred and three shares, a little over half, were placed in the hands of Mr. Alexander, as trustee, in order to retain the control of the stock in the hands of the company. The company borrowed the money of Messrs. Farrar and Alexander with which they started operations, and the public were grossly deceived by this appearance of wealth at the outset of operations. I will read the affidavit of Mr. Farrar, vice-president of the South Shore Railway Company, and which was taken in proceedings which he and Mr. Alexander initiated in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia in order to wind up this company. This affidavit will show more clearly than any of the papers yet produced the financial status of the company, the rotten condition of the company, which started to build 45 miles of railway and ignominiously failed in grading more than 11 or 13 miles. That is the company which now comes to this House and by this Bill asks the privilege of building 230 miles of railroad, and of establishing steamship lines, and great hotels, and other undertakings which would demand from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 capital. I will read the affidavit of Mr. Alexander, the treasurer of this company. These proceedings occurred about at the close of the transactions to which I have referred, and they revealed a state of affairs which demands that this House should pause before it gives its sanction to the reconstruction of a company which would give us a state of things ten times worse than before, if we again allowed it to deceive capitalists or the public with these bogus claims of unlimited wealth and ability to construct the railroad. Here is the affidavit.

IN THE SUPREME COURT.

I, Henry E. Alexander, of New York, in the state of New York, U.S.A., being sworn on oath, depose and say: that I am the treasurer of the South Shore Railway Company, Limited, of Nova Scotia, now in process of construction;

That the capital stock of said company is $100,000, each share of the par value of $100;

That there have been issued, to the best of my belief, 514 shares of said stock of the par value of $51,400 ;

That of the said 514 shares, I, as trustee, own 503 shares, the certificates of which stand in the name of G. B. Bard, trustee, which certificate was duly assigned and transferred to me, on its back, on 1st September, 1894. Of the remaining eleven, one share is owned by each of the following persons :—Jacob Bingay, Yarmouth, N.S. ; E. K. Spinney, Yarmouth, N.S. ; F. B. Bard, Brooklyn, N.Y. ; Tunis G. Bergen, Brooklyn, New York ; Frederick A. Farrar, Boston, Mass; W. C. Clarke, Wakefield ; H. E. Alexander, New York ; C. S. Keene, Newton, Mass. ; W. L. Newcombe, Brooklyn, N.Y.

I am ignorant as to who own the remaining two shares.

I am informed and believe, that 25 per cent of the par value of said shares, to wit, something over $12,500, has been paid to the company upon them, and no more paid in ;

That said railway company owes debts amounting to more than $100,000, which it is unable to pay ;

That it has no money in its treasury and no assets excepting its capital stock, unissued bonds, franchise and roadbed so far as graded and ironed, and such interest as it may have in the grant or subsidy from the Dominion Government, to which it will not become entitled until the rails are laid on 10 miles of its roadbed, no rails being owned by the company at the present time ; and said company is unable to pay its debts in full, and is insolvent, and is not able, and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, said company and its officers do not intend, to proceed further with the undertaking of constructing the said railroad under existing conditions.

And I further depose and say, that within the past six months I have advanced to said railroad in money the sum of $56,500, which sum has been in no part repaid, and said railway company owes me that amount with interest to date ; and I desire and request to become a party plaintiff to the proceedings instituted in the Supreme Court at Halifax by Frederick A. Farrar, or, on his behalf, one of the stockholders of said company, which proceedings have been instituted for the purpose of winding up the affairs of said company in accordance with the provisions of the laws of Nova Scotia.

(Signed) HENRY E. ALEXANDER.

This affidavit has the usual certificate, and is dated the 20th of March, 1895.

Mr. BORDEN. Was that after the date at which application was made to this House for the Bill which is now before us.

Mr. FLINT. That was after the date of the notice given in the "Gazette" and other journals of the application to this House for the charter which we are discussing. Now, the company through its promoter, the hon. gentleman whose name is on the Bill, has denied that it is insolvent. And yet I hold here the affidavit of the treasurer of the company that it is insolvent and unable to pay its liabilities, in addition to the vast quantity of other evidence that is before the House. Now, let us glance over the affidavit of the vice-president of the company, and see what he says of the financial condition of a company which has undertaken to construct 230 miles of railway ; to establish a line of steamships, to build wharfs and hotels, and to carry on operations demanding the expenditure of many millions of capital. Seeing that no names are given in this charter, it is, so far as appears on the surface, a purely speculative concern. Certain persons whose names are unknown, and whose financial qualifications are unknown, are coming here and asking the sanction of this House to operations demanding an enormous amount of capital, in the face of a failure the most scandalous, the most iniquitous and the most distressing that has occurred in almost any portion of the Dominion, which has carried untold miseries into a great many homes in the western part of Nova Scotia. Mr. Farrar, the vice-president of the company, makes this affidavit :

IN THE SUPREME COURT.

I, Frederick A. Farrar, of Boston, in the county of Suffolk, make oath and say as follows :—

1st. I am the Frederick A. Farrar above named and named in the petition, copy of which is exhibit "A" to this affidavit ;

That is, the petition asking that the company be placed in liquidation.

2nd. That W. B. Olmanditchie, of Halifax, in the county of Halifax, N.S., solicitor, was duly authorized as my solicitor and agent to sign my name to said petition, and to present said petition to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia or a judge thereof ;

3rd. That such of the statements in said petition as relate to my own acts and deeds are true, and such of said statements as relate to the acts and deeds of any other persons I believe to be true ; and the ground of my belief as to matters contained in said petition which are not herein sworn to, is information to that effect received from reliable persons, which I truly believe to be true ;

4th. That the said the South Shore Railway Company, Limited, was incorporated on the 30th day of April, A.D. 1892, by Act of the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia, being chapter 130 of the Acts of the said legislature of the province of Nova Scotia, made and passed in the year 1892 ;

5th. That I am a shareholder of said company, and hold one share therein of the par value of $100, upon which I am informed and believe that 25 per cent only is paid up, and that I am a contributor of said company and a person liable to contribute to the assets of said company, under the Companies Winding Up Act, in the event of the same being wound up, as owner of said share;

This is the vice-president of the company, and he is informed and believes that 25 per cent of his one share is paid up. This is one of the great Boston millionaires whose names have been heralded to deceive the poor people of the western part of Nova Scotia, the constituents of the hon. member for Shelburne, who are to-day suffering for want of railway communication, owing to obstacles which have been placed in the way of railway construction by a gang of financial shysters :

6th. That I am, and have been, a director and vice-president of said company from August, 1894,

to the present time, and have a fairly intimate knowledge of the affairs of said company and its financial condition ;

7th. That the capital stock of said company is $100,000, divided into shares of $100 each ; that I am informed and believe, that $51,400 only of said capital stock is subscribed, and that only 25 per cent thereof, or less than $13,000 thereof is paid in ;

That is, the capital with which they were supposed to commence work.

8th. That, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the names of the stockholders of said company other than myself, with the number of shares held by each and the amount paid in thereon, are as follows :—Jacob Bingay, Yarmouth, N.S., 1 share ; E. K. Spinney, Yarmouth, N.S., 1 share ; F. B. Bard, Brooklyn, N.Y., 1 share ; Tunis G. Bergen, Brooklyn, N.Y., 1 share; H. E. Alexander, New York, 1 share ; W. C. Clarke, Wakefield, R.I., 1 share ; C. S. Keene, Newton, Mass., 1 share ; W. L. Newcombe, Brooklyn, New York, 1 share ; H. E. Alexander (trustee), New York, 503 shares, in one or more certificates duly assigned and transferred to him upon the back thereof as trustee for F. B. Bard, trustee, in whose name the certificate stands ;

9th. As the record books of the company are kept at Yarmouth, I am unable to state with certainty exactly when the company was organized.

I may say this is a point now in the courts of Nova Scotia for elucidation. One of the points taken by the hon. member for Queen's, N.S., (Mr. Forbes) in the motion which he will place on the Order paper, and which, when this Bill reaches committee, he will move as an amendment, in order that the rights of litigants may be protected :

The company, for the purpose of carrying out the undertaking for which it is chartered, has secured land and locations, the extent of which I am unable to state with certainty, but I am informed and believe, has 15 or 16 miles of its location substantially graded for the purpose of its railroad ;

10th. That the property and assets of the company consist of its land and locations, franchise, its capital stock and bonds unissued and its right, whatever it may be, to a subsidy from the Government, which, I understand, is to be paid when the construction reaches a certain stage which it has not yet reached, and probably some other assets of which I have no definite knowledge ;

11th. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the funds of the company have been expended in the expenses incident to its organization, in acquiring of land and locations, in the cost of grading 15 or 16 miles of its location, and, generally, in the expenses of acquiring and constructing its roadbed. As the books and accounts of the company are chiefly kept at Yarmouth, I am unable to state with certainty the names of all the creditors of said company or the amounts due to them respectively, but I am informed and believe that said company is indebted to Edgar K. Spinney, of Yarmouth, for supplies furnished, $7,000, more or less ; to the firm of Parker, Eakins & Co., of Yarmouth, for supplies furnished, $7,000, more or less ;——

I believe that Mr. Spinney has obtained judgment in the Supreme Court for his claim, and that the firm of Parker, Eakins & Co. has also obtained judgment in the Supreme Court, for the amount due them, which is something under $8,000.

—to the firm of Messrs. Strong & Lee, contractors, or to Strong, of said firm—I am unable to state the amount of said indebtedness of the company to him, but I believe it to be more than half the amount claimed in his suit ; to Jacob Bingay, for money said to have been advanced by him, to what extent I cannot say with certainty, but I do not think for more than $2,000 ; to Henry E. Alexander, of New York, in a large amount, alleged by him to be $56,500, and to the firm of Burdett, Farrar & Co., of Boston, of which I am a member, the sum of $30,436.32, subject to additions on interest account.

Now we really find where the bulk of the money came from to make the show of work which deluded the unfortunate creditors of the company ; $30,000 was provided by the banking firm of which Mr. C. Farrar was a member, and about $60,000 was provided on the credit of Mr. Alexander, making nearly $90,000 loaned to the company by these two gentlemen, or through their influence. Mr. Farrar and Mr. Alexander both became insolvent in consequence of the advances they made to this insolvent concern, and the whole thing became insolvent together. Mr. Alexander goes on to say :

But that at the present time the said company is unable to pay its debts, and, in my judgment, and as I verily believe, it is impossible for said company at the present time to carry on the undertaking for which it is incorporated ; that the grounds for my belief, as stated in this paragraph, are stated in the next succeeding paragraph ;

13th. That the grounds for my belief and opinion, stated in the next preceding clause, are, as I am informed and believe : (a) the company owes considerably more than $100,000 ; (b) that it has no available funds with which to pay its indebtedness ; (c) no property, to the best of my knowledge and belief, to apply thereon, except its real estate locations and franchises, which are of uncertain value, and its unissued bonds and stocks, for which, at the present time and under present conditions, there is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, no market and no market value, and (d) its right or interest, whatever it may be, to the subsidy granted, or to be granted, by the Dominion Government, which is uncertain and contingent, inasmuch as the road has not reached that stage of construction which, I am informed and believe, is a condition necessary to said subsidy ; (e) that I am informed and believe, that suits have been brought against said company by Edgar K. Spinney, Parker, Eakins & Co. and Munro, Strong & Lee, or some member of said firm, and by Jacob Bingay, seeking to recover judgment against it upon their claims hereinbefore stated ;

14th. That no portion of said company's railway has been actually completed, and, as I am informed and believe, not more than 15 or 16 miles of its location substantially graded ; that no rails have been laid upon its location, and none are owned by the company.

15th. That no resolution of the said company has been passed to the effect that it has been proved to the satisfaction of the company that the

company cannot, by reason of its liabilities, continue its business, and that it is advisable to wind up the same, so far as I am aware ;

16th. That, in my judgment and as I verily believe, by reason of the fact hereinbefore stated, the said company cannot, under present conditions and in the interest of all the contributors, as well as of all other persons interested, it is advisable and is just and equitable, that said company should be wound up ;

17th. That I have no object in making application for the winding up of said company other than a desire that the assets of the said company should be applied to the payment of its liabilities, and the business of the said company, which cannot be carried on under existing conditions at a profit, stopped.

(Signed) FREDERICK A. FARRAR.

Sworn, &c., before

SAMUEL JENNISON,
Commissioner for Nova Scotia

15th March, 1895.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think you all agree with me that a body of men asking Parliament for the privileges asked for by this Bill, never came before this Parliament with such a record under their own hand—a record of debt and disaster. They come here asking, not that they be revived for the purpose of carrying out the original work for which they were chartered by the provincial legislature, but for extending their work fully two or three times more. Had they asked Parliament to place their company under the jurisdiction of the Dominion, had they come here with a clean financial record, showing that they had met their obligations honourably, showing that they were possessed of ability to carry out their contract with this Government—a contract which may be alluded to later in the debate, a contract made as late as the 28th February, after the company was notoriously unable to carry on its work—had they come here with a colour of financial credit they might have had some face to ask this Parliament to extend its jurisdiction over them. But they were not content with that. The real reason underlying this application is that litigation was pending in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, at the suit of the province, by its Attorney General, to declare the original charter of the company void, to declare its organization improper, and to prevent the company continuing the career which it had continued up to that date. The real object of this application here is to remove the case from the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, where it ought to be settled, and where these accounts can be settled, and involve the province of Nova Scotia in heavy costs for its temerity in undertaking to claim that the charter of this company is void. I believe that this Parliament will pause long before it undertakes to exercise its power and jurisdiction and remove this case, in which a province is the plaintiff, from the jurisdiction of the courts of that province. This is a point which should be pressed earnestly upon the attention of hon. members, whether Parliament should exercise its power to commit an outrage of that kind. Certainly, Nova Scotia has some rights, and among these is the right that this Parliament should hold its hand from interfering with the courts of that province. The reason why the province took this action was this : There is another railway being constructed in Nova Scotia over the same line of country as that over which the promoters of this Bill desire to construct their road. That other company is meeting all its obligations, and has continually worked, with the exception of two winter months, when it ceased operations on account of the inclemency of the weather, steadfastly in constructing the road. It is working today. Contracts have been undertaken for the bridges with an eminent firm in Ontario, in the city represented by my hon. friend the member for Peterboro' (Mr. Stevenson). The other road is being constructed with the consent and assistance of the local authorities along the line. The town of Yarmouth has given the right of way within the limits of the town. The municipality of Yarmouth has given the right of way, Argyle, Barrington, and Shelburne have given the right of way as far as the railway has gone. The company is building the line in good faith, and meeting its obligations. The company under consideration proposes to carry its line through the suburban parts of Yarmouth, and the people there find their lawns, gardens, and fields ploughed up by the contractor's workmen. They ask themselves if this company has the right to run a road through their lands. Consulting authorities they were informed, rightly or wrongly, it is not for me to say, that the company's charter had expired, and that they had no right to carry their line through the town of Yarmouth and a large portion of the municipality of Yarmouth and Argyle. And these owners, many of whom have not been paid for the land taken from them, have appealed to the Attorney General, and, later, after a long and patient hearing by the provincial authorities, have appealed to the courts to find if they must submit to outrage at the hands of a moribund and insolvent railway. All that the people of Yarmouth ask is that the matter be left to the courts, and that this effort to remove the question from the jurisdiction of the courts by the side wind of appeal to this House be not allowed to succeed. This is admitted to be an insolvent concern. It has judgments entered against it by almost every one who supplied it with the funds by which the work, so far as it has gone, has been carried on. The company has not even kept faith with the railway navvies who did the hard work in the inclement months of December, January and February, but sent these men adrift, to find means of subsistence where they could. Sir, I be-

lieve the spectacle has scarcely ever before been presented in this country of men responsible for such a situation, having the courage to come before the representatives of the people with such an impudent demand as this, to be placed upon their feet by this Parliament to go forth as they did before, to rob and swindle the people. A peculiar feature of the case which, no doubt, will receive considerable attention, is the connection of my hon. friend from Shelburne (Mr. White) with these various railway undertakings. There is a company called the Southern Railway Company, chartered to build a railway from Shelburne to Halifax. That company was chartered, I believe, largely through the influence of the hon. member for Shelburne. That hon. gentleman advocated the claims of the company to encouragement at the hands of the Government of Canada, and the Government has made a contract with the railway company for the building of this road from Shelburne to Halifax. The application for the subsidy, I believe, was made by the hon. gentleman. And yet the hon. member for Shelburne appears as the promoter of this Bill to enable the South Shore Railway Company to construct a road over almost identically the same country, and thus destroy the opportunity of building the railway, aid for which he had secured. Is not this a most extraordinary situation for a gentleman to appear in? Railways are not so common in this country, these works are not so easily built that we can afford to have two railways building lines over the same country——

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman; but it is nine o'clock, and I suppose the termination of the hour to be devoted to the consideration of Private Bills. And as my hon. friend (Mr. Flint) seems inclined to take up a good deal of time on this, and as there are eight or ten private Bills to follow, if the intention is to take up the hour for Private Bills every day with this debate, the House will be face to face with a difficulty for which it must find a solution.

Mr. CASEY. Adjourn the debate on this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. That will not be done.

Mr. FLINT. I do not wish to take up the time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. Fifteen minutes more is allowed for the consideration of Private Bills.

Mr. FLINT. I do not wish to take up time, but this is a very important matter to my constituents. I was endeavouring to show the disastrous consequences to the people of the South Shore that must follow the encouragement of rival claims of this kind by this Parliament. We all know the anxiety the people in various parts of the Dominion have shown to secure railway communication. I suppose there is no subject in which the people between Yarmouth and Halifax around the south shore are so deeply interested, or any upon which they are so united as in the desire for railway construction. Their means have been expended, through proper channels, in encouraging railway construction all over the country. The local legislature has assisted railway construction in all other parts of the province. It has become a by-word there so that certain counties are called non-railway counties. The local government has always expressed the greatest anxiety, apart from all political considerations, to assist with any means at their command, the construction of railways in these counties. The Dominion Government has done the same, and the resources of the people of that part of the country have been expended through the Dominion treasury, to which they contribute as largely, if not more largely, than any equal number of people in any portion of the Dominion. Their means have been expended in assisting the Dominion, and they ask themselves if they, too, are not to share in those advantages. They, too, have looked with anxiety to the operations carried on by the promoters of these various roads, and they have felt that success was almost within their reach. They see the Coast Railway, now a standard gauge road, paying all its obligations, its lines surveyed to Shelburne, its roadbed almost ready for the rails over 20 miles of its length, its iron bridges ordered for the two large rivers, the Tusket and Salmon; they see that this road will have trains running, if they are not interrupted, before the snow flies this winter; they see the promoters of the Southern Railway Company actively engaged in securing the necessary capital, they see the work going on in the county of Shelburne, and they ask themselves if, after all, another and rival undertaking is to be chartered by this Parliament to come into the field to interfere with the credit of the men at the back of the Coast Railway, in order to be ahead of them in their application to this Government and other localities for public assistance. They realize that if this Parliament places a rival in the field, their chances of securing a speedy railway communication, a communication which they deserve, and which they will certainly have if they are not interfered with, will be very materially injured if this Bill were allowed to pass. Now, the hon. member for Shelburne appears again in a railway role in connection with the Coast Railway Company. He it was who was the original solicitor of the Coast Railway Company, he it was who drafted the charter enacted by the legislature of Nova Scotia, he it was who agreed with the promoters of that road that if, after 12 months delay, the South

Shore people did not start their road, if the people were ever to secure railway communication, then was the time. And so they took up the idea of a narrow gauge road. I will not occupy your time by going over the history of the arguments as between the advocates of the narrow and the broad gauge roads, but the narrow gauge was advocated by the hon. member for Shelburne and by the leading men of his county, and the county of Yarmouth, simply as the best thing they could get under the circumstances. The promoters of the standard gauge had failed to come to time, and so my hon. friend, as it was his right to do, supported before this Government the idea of a narrow gauge road. Here is a letter to the late Premier, written by the hon. gentleman on the 2nd March, 1893:

Adverting to the personal application recently made to you by Mr. Leonard Atwood, of Philadelphia, for a subsidy of fifteen hundred per mile for a line of narrow-gauge railway, 91 miles, from Yarmouth to Lockeport, in the county of Shelburne, I beg leave to recommend this application to your most favourable consideration.

The contemplated road will pass through almost a continuous settlement, connect with the Western Counties Railway, now happily joined with the railway system of the province by the completion of the missing link, and at last, after the people of the county of Shelburne have agitated for some years, they will be afforded the advantage of railway facilities for travel and traffic.

A careful survey has been made of the contemplated line by the provincial engineer of Nova Scotia, who has given the proposed system his unqualified endorsement as suitable for this section of the country, and the councils of the several municipalities through which the road will run, after having fully inspected the working of similar lines in the United States, have unanimously agreed to assess the ratepayers for land damages and right of way.

Mr. Atwood and other gentlemen associated with him have taken the necessary steps to obtain a provincial Act of incorporation, and desire to commence work as soon as the spring opens; and, considering the utter want of railway facilities in the district and the necessity for the immediate encouragement of this work, I trust this application will receive your prompt and favourable consideration, and that, in case no railway subsidies are granted at this session, some assurance will be given that the road, if proceeded with, will be subsidized next year.

This letter was dated nearly a year after the Coast Railway had got their charter. The late Premier replied on the 6th March, 1893, in these terms:

My dear Mr. White,—I have received your favour, confirming your verbal application for a subsidy for a line of railway between Yarmouth and Lockeport. I shall submit your application to the Minister of Railways without delay, and request for it as favourable consideration as possible.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in common with everybody, supported the idea of a narrow gauge road, which was subsequently so much abused by him and his friends. No one favoured the narrow gauge road in the abstract as the best possible road, but they favoured it as the best possible road under the circumstances. But since the South Shore road came into the field and insisted that only a standard gauge road should be built, in order to meet the strong expression of public opinion from the hon. gentleman who abandoned the narrow gauge road at that time, and in order to meet the objections that were made from many quarters, the promoters of that road induced the capitalists who were behind them to increase the amount of their assistance, and, at the last session of the provincial legislature, they obtained permission to construct a standard gauge road. They went to the legislature of Nova Scotia and got an amendment to their charter, permitting them to change the narrow gauge to a standard gauge, and they subsequently made an arrangement with the Government of Nova Scotia to alter their contract in order to secure the subsidy of the local legislature to a standard gauge road. The Coast Railway is now a standard gauge road, subsidized by the local legislature of Nova Scotia, given a free right of way by the town of Yarmouth and all the municipalities for its lines, it is in the hands of capitalists who are meeting all their obligations, abundantly able to complete their work, as demonstrated by the fact that they have filed satisfactory bonds of eminent bankers with the Government of Nova Scotia for the sum of nearly $400,000, and have contracted to build the road to Lockeport within a given time. Sir, no company has ever given stronger assurances of its determination to carry out its work than has the Coast Railway Company. Yet in face of this fact, my hon. friend is urging upon this Parliament to charter a company to build over the same territory another standard gauge road. Can it be conceived that Parliament would be so unjust to men who are carrying out their work in good faith, who are under heavy bonds to the provincial government, as to charter a rival road in that sparsely-settled country, the plans of the two roads being almost parallel, as was shown in the Railway Committee room within the past two weeks, where it was shown that the line of the South Shore Railway crosses the line of the Coast Railway in four places, and that for many miles they ran side by side. I believe I can appeal to every hon. member not to support such a monstrous proposition. But if hon. gentlemen consent to support such a proposition, I trust they will so guard and check the operation of those financiers that no injury will be done to any interest in the western part of Nova Scotia, that they will protect the province and the litigants before the Supreme Court in the action before that court, that they will compel this company to have sufficient capital to carry out their undertaking, that

they will insist on there being in the charter, clauses which will ensure payment by the members of the new company or those who intend to undertake the construction of this road for the rights of those parties who have already been financially interested, that they will admit that the 66⅔ per cent of the obligations which remained unpaid as liabilities on the road shall be paid by the new promoters, that the bills for supplies furnished by farmers and tradesmen and also amounts due to labourers shall be paid.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for private bills has expired.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Weights and Measures, Gas and Electric Light Inspection..... $99,800

Mr. CASEY. In regard to the inspection of electric light, how long has this been in force, and is it being successfully carried out ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The Acts of last session with respect to the inspection of electric light, as well as regards the establishment of electric units, came into force generally throughout the country on 1st July last, by proclamation. The Acts have been carried out by the officers of the department in connection with the inspection of gas, and it is intended that the inspection of the department as regards electric light and gas shall be worked together. It is too soon to see exactly what the effect will be. The time between the passage of the Act and that when it went into force was occupied in instructing the officers and inspectors in their duty.

Mr. CASEY. Does the Act take cognizance of electricity used for other purposes than lighting ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). No.

Mr. CASEY. It is important that the Act should be made to apply to the measurement of electrical power as well as that for electric lighting.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The meters can be worked as effectively as gas meters, and electricity can be accurately measured.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Controller will do well not to make this Act too expensive in the case of the smaller companies. Electricity is being used for a great many purposes, and I have had a good many complaints made as to the excessive charges levied by inspectors. The amounts levied on small companies seem to be altogether out of proportion to those levied on the larger companies in cities. The Controller would do well to be rather cautious about requiring a minute system of inspection outside of the chief cities, and this applies both as regards electricity and gas, more particularly as regards electric light. The electric system is in its infancy, and is liable to be introduced for a variety of purposes, but if suddenly young companies are burdened with unnecessary expenses for inspectors, and I think such officials are liable to magnify their office, progress will be retarded. The hon. gentleman is aware that in a good many cases these companies pay very small dividends, or no dividends at all, and while there should be inspection, it is not desirable that the companies should be loaded down with inspection fees.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). In regard to the inspection of gas, that system has been in operation for many years, and it is now carried on under the same methods. I dare say in some cases where the operations of the gas companies are limited, they may complain of the fees ; the public, on the other hand, are very much interested in having the quality of gas kept up to the requirements of the law. The operation of the electric light inspection Act is tentative, and as the use of electricity is still in its infancy, the department is exercising great caution in applying the inspection system.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that as regards the inspection of electric lighting, he will endeavour to apply it at present chiefly to the large centres ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Yes ; that is what we have done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be the more sensible course, because it is not desirable that in a comparatively new enterprise which is likely to be extended in many ways, it should be burdened with heavy inspection fees.

Mr. RIDER. When electricity is furnished by a company by the horse-power, is there any means of ascertaining if they supply the proper quantity ? Horse-power represents a certain mechanical force. It is not a certain voltage or amperage of electric force. It seems to me it should be tested in some practical mechanical way rather than by voltage of electric current. Has the Controller considered the matter ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It has been very carefully considered and the operation of the Act has worked satisfactorily, and I have no doubt will work satisfactorily. I am assured by electricians and those learned in the subject, that the whole subject of measurement in every form can be correctly ascertained.

Mr. RIDER. The hon. gentleman will see that there is quite a difference between the inspection of electricity for lighting purposes and for power. If electricity is sold by the horse-power, I fail to see how it can be inspected under the same system as if sold for lighting. The determining of the

horse-power supply must be quite different from the inspection of the quality of electricity for lighting purposes.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If you are speaking of electricity for other purposes than lighting it does not come under the operation of the Act.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend will see that electricity, whether supplied for lighting or for motor power, is measured by units of volume and by units of intensity. These units are used in measuring electricty for lighting purposes or for any other purpose. In the absence of any system of inspection, electricity has been sold hitherto by the horse-power. and the point I wish to make is, that that is a very unsatisfactory way of selling it. An electric company says: We will supply you with so many horse-power, and the user pays for that, but there is no means of ascertaining whether he gets the power that he pays for. What I urge is that meters should be put in to measure electricity sold for motor purposes, in the same way as in the case of electricity used for lighting, so that a man may know how much he gets and how much he has to pay for. From what I know of electricity I am prepared to bear out the Controller's assertion that it can be measured very accurately indeed. There should be a way of determining the quantity of electricity delivered. The application of that method should be enforced as between buyer and seller, and when electricity is sold for motor power, the meter should be inspected by Government in the same way as gas meters. The use of electricity for motor power is growing, and I believe it would grow much faster if there were some satisfactory way of showing consumers that they got value for their money.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the Controller some changes which I think ought to be made in the Weights and Measures Act. The present Act was passed a good many years ago, and I find by it that vegetables; for instance, potatoes, turnips, carrots, parsnips, onions and beets are set down at 60 pounds to the bushel. I do not know by what means it was ascertained that this was the proper weight. From tests that have been made—I think by the department—or at any rate by friends of mine, I find that potatoes weigh 54 pounds, turnips about 52 pounds, and carrots, parsnips and beets about 48 pounds, and onions about 46 pounds to the bushel. This Act also provides that these articles must be sold by weight unless a special bargain is made to sell them by measure. I think that is unfair to the producer. If he sells a bushel by measure he is entitled to be paid for a bushel. I know of a case in which a man sold 18 bushels of onions, which he measured and delivered; and the man who bought them weighed them, and the result was that the producer got paid for only 11½ bushels. This provision specially affects the section of country from which I come, because the farmers there go more largely into the raising of vegetables than they used to do, and they are anxious that the bushel by weight and the bushel by measure should be made to agree, or that the Government should abandon the bushel by measure altogether and have everything sold by weight. I would like the hon. Controller during the recess to prepare a measure for next session of Parliament to meet this difficulty, so that when a farmer sells vegetables he would not be obliged to give five pecks to the bushel.

Mr. RIDER. So far as my experience goes, vegetables are sold largely by weight, and the price is based on the weight.

Mr. WILSON. I would ask the hon. gentleman if it is not customary in his section of the country to sell potatoes by the bag?

Mr. RIDER. I know that is the rule in Montreal, but they count on 90 pounds to the bag, or a bushel and a half, and the price is based on the weight. Very often we find that the weight varies according to the quality of the article; the poorer the article, the lighter it will be. Therefore the safest and fairest way, and the way generally adopted, is to sell by weight.

Mr. WILSON. That is what I ask the Government to provide for, so that that will be the law. I quite understand that at certain periods of the year certain vegetables weigh more than at other times, but that does not help us under the present law, because a man is obliged to sell by weight if the purchaser sees fit to require it. In that way a sharp dealer can easily get an advantage over a producer who is not sharp. He may buy three or four hundred bushels of vegetables; nothing is said about whether he is buying by weight or measure, and when they are delivered the dealer, understanding his business, insists on weighing them, whereas the producer expected he was going to get so much per bushel by measure.

Mr. RIDER. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that a bushel of potatoes will not weigh 60 pounds?

Mr. WILSON. I mean to say that in winter time, or after they have been dug a while, they will shrink in weight.

Mr. RIDER. That depends on the quality and the size. Potatoes of good size, rounded measure, will weigh 60 pounds to the bushel. Oats are 34 pounds to the bushel. In the province of Quebec they are sold on the basis of 32 pounds to the bushel, and the price is for 32 pounds. But when we buy oats in Ontario, we expect to get 34 pounds, and the price is fixed accordingly. So that I do not see any objection to selling by weight.

Mr. WILSON. I do not object to selling by weight, but I wish that to be done uniformly. What I do object to is that when a man sells by the bushel he is only paid for three-fourths of the quantity.

Mr. RIDER. I hope the Controller will bear in mind that it is very inconvenient to have changes made in standard weights of staple articles. When the trade are accustomed to certain standards, it causes a great deal of disturbance to have them changed.

Mr. WILSON. I fail to see how it will disturb trade or anything else to provide that everything shall be sold by weight, and not at all by measure.

Mr. McMILLAN. As a farmer I am perfectly satisfied with the present system. I am convinced that farmers, as a rule, are better satisfied to sell by weight than by measure. For instance, our oats are sold as 34 pounds to the bushel, but sometimes they go 36 pounds to the bushel. The same is the case with potatoes. If they are grown in good strong soil they will go 60 pounds to the bushel; while if they are grown in black muck or in sandy soil they will weigh less. The present system of selling by weight is understood by the farmers, and is generally acted upon.

Mr. CASEY. I think the most solid amendment to the Weights and Measures Act in this respect would be to provide that these articles should be sold entirely by weight. About twenty years ago we did pass an Act providing for selling by weight; and that no particular weight could be called for in case anything were sold by the bushel. A bushel was only to be a bushel by measure, and not to be any particular weight, and I think that is the right way to have things sold. I do not think it is rational at all to provide that when we sell a bushel, it should mean any particular weight. The weight of grain varies on two adjoining farms, and if a man sells at a price per bushel, and a bushel is taken to weigh a certain number of pounds, the purchaser may be getting a superior class of grain at the same price as ordinary grain. I think the word bushel should either be left out of contracts altogether, or be taken to mean a bushel measure. On the London market in Ontario, the custom ever since the time I speak of has been to sell grain by the cental, 100 pounds, and that is a great convenience to everybody. I think the attempt to keep up a constant relation between the bushel measure and the bushel weight is as absurd as to try to keep up a constant relation between the value of a certain weight of gold and that of certain weight of silver.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I quite appreciate all that has been said, and I think I have represented almost everything that has been advanced here to-night to my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson). The whole question, if there is a question, at all worthy of consideration is whether the custom of purchasing by the bushel ought to be abolished, and the custom of purchasing by weight established. I thoroughly appreciate the advice tendered by the hon. gentleman, that changes in laws of this character should not be hastily made, because they do lead to disturbances in trade which is sometimes fraught with a good deal of mischief. No doubt the weight of a bushel of vegetables depends, first, on the season of the year when weighed, because when taken out of the ground they weigh more than they will some months following; and secondly, on the size of the vegetable itself. I promise, however, that during the recess I shall communicate with the boards of trade throughout the country on this subject. I have already communicated with the boards of trade of Montreal and this city, and they say that no complaints have been made in the direction pointed out by the hon. member for Lennox.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is this difficulty, that the weight has been fixed, in former times with reference to the Winchester bushel, and the Imperial bushel was larger.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville.) This was stated in the Act itself, which was passed some twenty years ago. It is true that the weights of these different articles mentioned in the Act do not bear out the actual measurement of the bushel. For instance, in the Act, potatoes, turnips, beets, parsnips, carrots and onions are supposed to weigh 60 pounds to the bushel, but it is shown by actual measurement that potatoes weigh 52¼ pounds to the bushel, and that weight varies according to the time when they are taken out of the ground. Turnips, 46½ pounds to the bushel, subject to the same qualification; potatoes, 42½ pounds, carrots, 45¼, parsnips 33½ pounds, and onions, 45 pounds. My hon. friend thinks they should all weigh 50 pounds to the bushel. I do not think there would be any great harm done to make it 50 pounds in the case of onions alone; but to alter the whole Act, with the information we have at present, would be fraught with some trouble. I do not know why 60 pounds—unless by analogy to the Winchester bushel—was adopted, but it appears that it was intended to make 60 pounds the standard for a bushel measure. As regards what the hon. member for Stanstead said about oats weighing more than they were actually purchased for, I may say that in the case of Manitoba No. 1 hard wheat, there was not a bushel grown last year that did not grow nearer 64 pounds, yet it was purchased at the rate of 60 pounds to the bushel.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). It was sold by the weight.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I understand that grains generally are sold by the weight, but my hon. friend will find that the custom of trade differs in different localities. I can only say that I shall communicate further with the boards of trade and see what I can do next session in the interests of the trade.

Mr. CASEY. My point is, that you should get rid of the term "bushel" altogether. In the case of vegetables, it is extremely absurd to retain the bushel measure. They should be sold by the weight, but I do not think there should be anything to prevent their sale by the bag. In the latter case, the buyer knows the size of the bag and takes his chances; and if he wants to have them weighed, let him buy them by the pound.

Mr. FOSTER. This discussion is very interesting but we are not now proposing any change in the law, and we are not making any progress with the Estimates.

Mr. CASEY. I hope the hon. Minister will not suppose that, on this occasion. I have been trying to take up the time. I simply have been making what I thought were useful suggestions to the Controller, and the Controller seems to think them interesting.

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with the inspection of weights and measures. I would recommend the Controller to reconsider that whole system. There are country districts where the weights and measures are never inspected. If there is a law compelling inspection, it ought to be put in force. If not, such a law should be passed. I see that the revenue from the inspection of weights and measures is $38,000 and the expenditure $56,000. If there is anything that would be free, in order to secure thorough inspection, it should be the inspection of weights and measures. The seller is interested in this as well as the buyer, and it is absolutely necessary that correct weights and measures should be used. Now, I am informed that in some cases where the people are poor, when the inspector comes to inspect the scales, the storekeeper, in order to avoid the fees imposed, will put part of his scales under the counter and not have them inspected at all. No doubt the inspectors try to do their duty, but every inducement should be offered those who are using scales to have them inspected, and a heavy penalty should be imposed if they do not have them inspected. I would like to know if those who manufacture scales must have them inspected before they are offered for sale.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). They are usually inspected at the factory, but this is not obligatory. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that the public ought to be protected by a measure of this kind. I hold that view. But everybody else does not. Some hold strongly to the opinion that this law should be made self-sustaining. I have never been able to adopt that view since my attention was drawn to the administration of the department. It is really the public that is being protected by this law—sometimes protected against its own inclination. I am bound to say that the department has not enough money at its disposal perhaps, for as strict a performance of all its duties as I would like. When the balance for the administration of a measure of this kind is on the wrong side and we have to come down every year with a deficit, one moves slowly in asking for more money. The officers are paid the lowest of any class of officers in connection with the department. I do not know whether there were any cases of parties putting the scales under the counters in order to avoid inspection. I can only say that, as in other cases where parties try to evade the payment of just dues to the Government, they can be punished, and I do not think that the department would hesitate to enforce the law against any parties so offending.

Mr. McMULLEN. We were speaking of allowing them to charge cartage. I would like the Controller to adopt the system of making them issue stamps for cartage. In some cases they may charge cartage without making any return of it. I do not say that the inspectors are dishonest, but I think in some cases they charge much more than they do in others. In order to secure the full return of the money they receive, stamps should be issued for cartage the same as for the inspection.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Cartage is necessary, because in many cases the instrument must be taken to a certain place. If the scales were brought to the place where the instrument is, the charge, in many cases, would be still greater.

Adulteration of Food and Fertilizers, and the administration of the Act respecting Fraudulent Marking—To meet expenses under these Acts..... $25,000

Mr. McMILLAN. I see an item here with respect to Seaforth. There is a charge of $120 for rent and another for 10,770 pounds of coal, costing $35. Is each inspector allowed to have an office and to charge for rent and coal? The hon. Controller will find the figures I refer to at page S—85 of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The person you refer to is the food inspector of that section, I think. Can the hon. gentleman get an office for much less than $10 a month in Seaforth?

Mr. McMILLAN. I think the inspector's own kitchen is his office.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I will look into the matter now that the hon. gentleman has called attention to it.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, $25,000 is to be voted for this service, and I see that last year it cost $24,007. I do not pretend to go into all the items, but I notice that some of them are very large. The charge for salaries at headquarters is $8,500. I do not know that we have received value for $1,000, so far as the reports sent out show. We have a report, from time to time, upon a few hundred samples analysed in the course of the year, and consisting mainly of milk, wines and spirits, and a few classes of groceries, such as pepper, mustard and a few other things most commonly adulterated. Judging by the reports sent out, no results are achieved that could not be achieved by one chemist with a properly equipped laboratory. I, perhaps, put the cost too low when I said $1,000. But I am sure that one efficient chemist at $2,000 a year could do all the work that is done in this department that is of any real value to the public.

I notice that the amount of fees collected is about $9,000, leaving about $15,000 to be met out of the general revenue. I will ask the Controller to do what, perhaps, he has not had time to do—look over the work done by the department and see if the public gets value for the $15,000 it is called upon to pay. I do not think he can reasonably contend that the public gets value for one-half, or even one-quarter of that amount. The salaries at Ottawa alone are $8,500. Surely that sum should pay for all the analysing that has been done in connection with the whole service. They cannot require a staff in Ottawa paid at that figure and all these other local analysts besides. The local analysts are necessary, no doubt, for convenience in the different provinces, but with such analysts as Mr. Ellis, in Toronto, and the analysts at Montreal, Quebec and elsewhere, you do not require an $8,500 staff in Ottawa to carry on any analyses required in connection with the adulteration of food. Perhaps the Excise Department may require the services of these gentlemen in other capacities, but they are all charged to this item. I must urge the hon. gentleman to look into this matter very seriously, because it is perhaps the grossest item in the Estimates in respect of comparing the amount with the extent of the work done. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman has the least idea of how much money is being wasted on this branch of the department.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I cannot accept what the hon. gentleman has said as to the uselessness of the branch, and the cost of the branch, as compared with the amount of work done. I have looked into the cost of the branch, and I try to keep the cost within bounds, and not to exceed the Estimates in any way. But making an analysis of any article is not the work of one day, it is not the work of two days. It requires some times a great many days to bring about what appears to be very small results. Has the hon. gentleman ever visited the department ?

Mr. CASEY. I have visited it in the old days.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If the hon. gentleman would honour the laboratory with a visit, and have a talk with the chief analyst and his assistant, and call there day after day when Parliament is in session, he would be considerably enlightened as to the nature of the work. As I said a moment ago, these duties cannot be discharged by everybody ; it is only skilled and technical persons who can do this kind of work. It is a work that requires the utmost caution. The ingenuity of men's minds is directed to no one thing more intensely than to the adulteration of food, in order that the product itself may be cheapened and put upon the market, however spurious it may be, at a price which will enable the fabricator to make money out of it. Take the case of fertilizers alone, take the case of Paris green, if you will. I introduced into this House last session an Act to place that article on the list of those to be analysed under the Act providing for the prevention of adulteration of food. It was discovered that poor men who had scarcely anything else to live upon but their garden stuff and potatoes, were using Paris green which was of no use. Every day we are adding to the work of that branch, and it is one in which the work is well worth the money paid for it.

Mr. CASEY. Though I have not lately been in the department here, I am far from being ignorant of the process of chemical analysis. I have seen a good deal of it elsewhere, though not much here. I am aware that one analysis occupies considerable time, but I am also aware that a hundred such analyses may be going on at the same time under one man's charge, and are so going on.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. gentleman is decidedly mistaken.

Mr. CASEY. I take the liberty of contradicting the hon. gentleman in that respect. I say that a hundred different analyses may be carried on under one man's charge at the same time. The solutions have to be made, and they are set to stand for a certain number of hours before the reaction is complete ; but a large number of these can be set agoing at once and mature together, and the results be obtained at the same time. When I say under one man's charge, I mean under the charge of one chemist, with two or three students, perhaps, who are learning the business. The analyses of fertilizers referred to by the

Controller have not really amounted to a great deal as a means of public protection. The total amount of fertilizers imported into Canada is so trifling that the amount spent in this department alone would more than pay for all, I fancy.

Mr. FOSTER. Most of them are produced in Canada.

Mr. CASEY. With regard to the inspection of food, I am inclined to agree that it is a most important subject, and that the analysts employed are capable men, but I think the hon. gentleman has far too large a staff at work at Ottawa. The list of analysts on these two pages includes a large number of the best chemists in Canada.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not think I have made an appointment under that Act since I have been in the department.

Mr. CASEY. I say that too many appointments have been made, if the hon. gentleman did not make them. There are enough analysts on these two pages to do all the analysing that is required in all the departmens. My own impression is that the analyst should be almost exclusively made by local men, one for each province, or two for each province. I hardly see the need of any more than the one superintendent for the whole business in the department at Ottawa, and the work would be just as well done by these other eminent gentlemen. It is only a few articles of groceries, milk, spirits and wines that we see reported upon, and taking the total number, I do not see the results for the money. I have no doubt the Controller has looked into the expense, but I think he has not made himself as familiar as he ought to be with the amount of output for the expense.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). How do you know that ?

Mr. CASEY. I judge it from the explanation given by the hon. gentleman. I have not been able to get any satisfactory explanations from him and the publications of the department do not show value for the money. I will leave it to any chemist or even to any man of common sense to say whether there is anything in the report like value for the money spent. This item of $25,000 is more serious than are many of those discussed at great length in the committee, and the money is in very great part wasted. I shall probably take the opportunity next session, if the hon. gentleman still occupies his present position, to call attention to it at greater length, and to prove in full what I have stated to-night and what is the fact.

Mr. McMILLAN. There are four food inspectors. I observe that only one charges for fuel, &c. Are his duties in any way different from the other inspectors ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The other men are excise officers and this man is not.

Post Office—	
Mail service	$2,125,000
Salaries and allowances	1,193,515
Miscellaneous	207,120

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this item I desire to make one remark to the Postmaster General of the expenditure on mail service absolutely no detail is given, while four or five pages are taken up in giving salaries and allowances. It formerly was the custom to give details in regard to the principal amounts paid for mail service. We want to know how much has been paid to the principal railways and to steamboat service and other services. There should be stated in some detail how the vote of $2,125,000 is distributed, and especially how much goes to the Canadian Pacific Railway, Grand Trunk Railway and Intercolonial Railway.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I should like to make a statement which possibly might expedite the passing of the estimate. The amount for post office for the year ending 30th June, 1896, shows a reduction of $18,075. The amount for mail service is simply that for which the department is liable under existing arrangements, and no provision has been made for any additional service during the coming year. For salaries and allowances the amount is $17,965 less than we voted last year. The difference it is proposed to save by reductions in the outside service. In miscellaneous expenses the amount asked for is $98.75 less than last year. The amount asked for next year is the same as the amount actually expended during the last year. The hon. gentleman by referring to the report of the Postmaster General will find that the details of expenditure for mail service cover upwards of 100 pages, and I do not see how it would be possible to place them in any form to convey more information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A great many old estimates contained those details. How much has been paid to the Grand Trunk Railway, for instance ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There are so many services connected with the amounts paid to the Grand Trunk Railway that they would have to be summed up. All the details, however, will be found in the report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The committee should know how much has been paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway, Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway and the balance for land service might be lumped together.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They are detailed in the report.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for South Oxford has evidently not read the report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have something else to do than to read a thousand pages of a Minister's report. If I were to spend all my time in looking over this, it might be very convenient for the gentlemen who are passing these Estimates, but we have a right to have this information boiled down in the Estimates.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will get the details from the Auditor General's Report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to have from my hon. friend some general statement as to this very important department. I think he has now been there three years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Less three days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Less three days, as my hon. friend observes. By the way, was the pay stopped then? However, we will not grudge it to him. Probably it is only a compensation for the strain of mind that the hon. gentleman may have been put to. There is a deficit of about $700,000 in this department. I have myself been of opinion that particularly under present circumstances, we ought to be rather more cautious than we have been about extending our post office service. I do not want to deprive the public of any reasonable accommodation in that way, but it does appear to me that in a great many of those outlying districts we have been altogether too profuse in the service, and that a very large amount of money has been spent which it is not convenient for us to spare. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if he hopes, within a reasonable time, to equalize our expenditure and our receipts. Our receipts have increased largely within the last dozen years, but unhappily our expenditure has also increased enormously. It seems to me there ought to be a halt called. We have gone on spending a good deal more money than is really required for the efficient conduct of the service, and we ought to try to bring about an equalization between the outgoing and the incoming in this department. It seems to me that three-quarters of a million a year spent over and above our receipts is more than ought to be spent in any department, and more than we can really afford.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am quite prepared to state that the service in Canada is superior to the postal service in the United States or in any other country, except perhaps, possibly, England. The great extent of our territory and the sparseness of our population is a source of very considerable expense in Canada. An enormous amount of territory has got to be covered, and the expense is very much larger than in a country where the population is more concentrated. Under the present system, if the expenditure is increasing, it is caused by the development of the country. The hon. gentleman must consider the great cost of providing mail service through the western country, such as the Kootenay district of British Columbia, where the revenue from customs and other branches of the service is largely increasing. Those who are investing their capital in developing mines there demand a postal service which permits them to be in intimate communication with the sources of supplies, and it would be impossible for them to carry on their business otherwise. As the country is growing in those far distant regions it becomes necessary to establish a service which certainly is very expensive. I think, however, that from the benefit the country at large gets, there is no reason of complaint here. In almost every country the postal service has never equalized the revenue with the expenditure. The records of the last ten years shows that while the revenue has been continually increasing the expenditure has not increased in an equal ratio. Having some knowledge of the department now, I must frankly state that I do not see any possibility, within a good number of years, that the revenue and expenditure of the department is likely to be equalized.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware that there is a great deal of pressure brought upon the hon. gentleman by both sides of the House, but making allowance for the necessity of supplying the outlying districts, I think we have been yielding to that pressure a good deal more than we ought. Fifteen years ago our total expenditure was $1,700,000. During that time we have unfortunately not increased very much in population, although we have increased in area, but we have added rather more than 100 per cent to our post office expenditure. I think that $2,000,000 added to the post office expenditure within fifteen years is rather too large an addition, when we remember that the population of the country has hardly increased 20 per cent. If the hon. gentleman were to curb the expenditure for two or three years, I think there would be a fair chance of the revenue overtaking it. With all possible desire to assist those outlying districts, I think that old Canada has been milked quite enough, and in nothing more than in the huge sums that have been expended for post office accommodation. They have the right to post office accommodation, but they have not quite the right to have all these large sums expended upon them. I am not quite satisfied either as to the extent to which our railway subsidies have gone, and that is one reason why I wanted to get the details of the amount paid to these various great railway corporations.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor General's Report he will find the sums set forth there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the information we should have in the Estimates.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is all in the Auditor General's Report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very likely. I think, however, that both the hon. Minister of Finance, and the hon. Postmaster General should understand that it is not our business on this side of the House to make ourselves acquainted with the details of the money they are proposing to vote. It is their business, when they come here to ask for money, to be prepared to give these details in full, and it is not an answer which we on this side can accept to tell us that the information will be found in the Auditor General's Report, or anywhere else. The place to have it is here, and it ought to be placed in the Estimates in some detail. Moreover, the Auditor General's Report does not refer to these particular sums at all. It shows what was expended, not in the year 1895-96, for which you are asking the vote, but in the year 1893-94; so that, while it may be useful to aid us in cross-examining the hon. gentlemen, it does not answer the question I am putting.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there is no increase at all in the amount. I hope the hon. gentleman did not understand me to say that it was his duty to look into the Auditor General's Report; but if he will refer to that report, he will see that it requires several pages to give these details. When I stated that the information was in the Auditor General's Report, I did not mean to say that I should not give the information, but that it would be almost impossible to get up the Estimates for the Post Office Department if all these details were to be put in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want the hon. gentleman to give what would be entirely unreasonable; but I think either he or his predecessor made a considerable mistake in omitting the usual details which formerly appeared. I have here the Estimates for 1880-81, and I will give the hon. gentleman an idea of what I think would be sufficient. We have here heads of expenditure for mail service; by Grand Trunk Railway, by Great Western Railway, by Intercolonial Railway, by other railways, by steamboat and sailing crafts, by stage coach, and other conveyances. These are given in detail—the Grand Trunk for Ontario and Quebec, the Great Western for Ontario, the Intercolonial for all the provinces in which it runs, and so on. These are very proper things to put in the Estimates, and they are very convenient, and afford information which I think we ought to have.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman, I think, is quite right.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am pleased that the hon. member for South Oxford has not asked for any reduction in the salary of the hon. Postmaster General for the days he was absent. To do the hon. gentleman justice, I think he went out only to bring back those who were lost; I think that was his object. The hon. gentleman manages the mails. I suppose, therefore, he manages the daily "Mail," and I will read a sentence of the daily "Mail" of to-day:

> The first desire of the Government seems to be to keep the federal finger out of local legislation, and, although, through the eagerness of some public men, it may yesterday have suffered the loss of a Minister, moderate opinion will sustain it in the pursuit of that important object.

I have no time to read the whole article.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is a well-written article.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, it is a well-written article. I would like to know if the hon. Postmaster General agrees with it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It does not come in the Estimates, and I am not bound to answer that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The daily mail belongs to the hon. gentleman's department, and I think we might get an answer now from him whether he is going to put his finger any further into provincial legislation, or not. This is a good time to have that explained. At any rate, I quite readily concur in the full payment of his salary as Postmaster General; but, so far as the others are concerned, I think I shall have to object.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to make an appeal on behalf of the country postmasters I really think they do not receive that fair treatment in the matter of salaries that is meted out to postmasters in cities and towns. A great many country postmasters are expected to run a post office all the year round for the paltry pittance of $15 or $20 a year, whereas city postmasters are paid $3,000 or $4,000 a year. The Ottawa postmaster receives $3,000; the Montreal postmaster, $4,000; and the Toronto postmaster, I believe, the same amount. One or two applications have been made to me from country postmasters, and I must admit that the hon. Postmaster General treated me with the greatest possible courtesy in showing me how matters were regulated; but I think the system of paying country postmasters should be recast and an additional sum paid to them. I know some people who have, for years, run country post offices, where it takes almost the whole time of one person to attend to the work, for a miserable sum of $30 or $35 a year. This is really taking the labour of these people at far below its actual value. I

think the whole system should be recast, and the country postmasters given a little more and the city postmasters a little less. There is another point on which I wish to obtain information. I notice that there are 375 mail clerks employed in the different districts throughout the Dominion. In the Ottawa district, there are thirty-eight; while in the Toronto district, which includes Hamilton, there are only forty-nine; in the London district, forty-three; in the Kingston district, only ten; in the Stratford district, only sixteen; and in the Montreal district, only thirty-six; in New Brunswick, the number is thirty-eight; while in Nova Scotia, which is a larger province, we have only twenty-eight.

Mr. HAZEN. The New Brunswick one runs all the way to Montreal.

Mr. McMULLEN. That may be, but it appears singular that you should have such a very large number in Ottawa compared with other divisions.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend has been so long lecturing me about economy that I have at last become convinced that we should be as economical as possible. I admit that the country postmasters are paid very little, but I do not see how it is possible, out of the amount voted by Parliament, to pay them more. My hon. friend has spoken of $20 to $30, but some of them are only paid $10 a year. We have 8,000 post offices throughout the Dominion, extending to districts very remote, and in some of which the mail matter is very insignificant; and if we paid the country postmasters more, the department would have to curtail the service which is progressing in the same ratio as the country. As regards disparity in mail clerks between Ottawa and Montreal, the reason is that the mail clerks in the Ottawa district run as far as Port Arthur, and it is necessary that we should have a larger number of men to do that work, because after these long runs it is necessary to lay off a certain number of men and their places must be taken by other men. After a trip to Port Arthur and back, the mail clerks are kept in Ottawa three or four days. Kingston shows a smaller number of mail clerks because the clerks are put down to Toronto and Montreal.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman's explanation with regard to the mail clerks at Ottawa is quite satisfactory. I did not know they go as far as Port Arthur. With regard to the post offices, I did not intend that an increase should be made to country postmasters unless by decreasing the salaries paid in the cities and towns. I contend that $2,000 will be quite sufficient remuneration for a postmaster either at Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Ottawa or Winnipeg, in all of which $3,000 to $4,000 per year is paid. Make the salaries $2,000, and you will get any number of men of experience and ability ready to take the position at that figure. You would then effect a saving of from $5,000 to $10,000, which you could divide among the country postmasters who are working for little or nothing.

Mr. DENISON. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken with regard to Toronto post office. In that office there are 150 to 200 employees, and it requires an extra good man to properly manage such a staff and attend to all the questions that are continually presenting themselves for his decision. Besides, in Toronto $4,000 would not go further than $2,000 in the county of Welland, where the expenses are not nearly as high in rents and everything else. Toronto is the largest office in Canada. More mail matter goes through that office than through any other office in the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. One means of enabling the Government to pay the country postmasters a little more will be to reduce the cost of free delivery in the cities where people receive their mails three or four times a day, and use the savings thus effected in giving the country postmasters a little larger salaries. In the country districts people only get their mails once a week, and the postmasters are paid little or nothing.

Mr. DENISON. In the cities we pay for that free delivery by the extra charge of two cents on every drop letter.

Mr. FRASER. There has been a gross deception practiced on the Postmaster General with regard to the Morrison contract. I asked for a statement, and I find that, without tendering, it cost $9,000 to carry the mails from the railway station in Cape Breton to Sydney, a distance of 100 miles. I asked the Postmaster General before whether the Government have made any extra payments to Mr. Morrison.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There was nothing extra; this is all he received.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the case. As the hon. gentleman knows, the distance from Hawkesbury to Sydney is about 100 miles. At present the principal mails for the island of Cape Breton are carried by railway. And yet it costs $3,000 more to carry the mails than it did before the railway was built. And the mail service is now performed by the contractor with one horse. I have a statement made by a former supporter of the hon. Minister, Mr. Paint, as follows:—

PROTEST against the continuance of a certain contract for the conveyance of Her Majesty's mails in Cape Breton, N.S.

Dominion of Canada.
Province of Ontario.

By this public instrument of protest be it known, to all whom it may concern, that on this 29th day of May, A.D. one thousand eight hun-

dred and ninety-five, before me, Richard John Wicksteed, a public notary in and for the province of Ontario, duly commissioned and sworn, and practising in the city of Ottawa, in the said province, personally came and appeared Henry N. Paint, of Point Tupper Station, Cape Breton, in the province of Nova Scotia, gentleman, who, being by me duly sworn, severally declared on oath :

That in 1889-90, one John Morrison, of St. Peters, Cape Breton, was paid $5,724.88 by the Postmaster General of Canada for the conveyance of the mails between Hawkesbury and Sydney. By the terms of this contract he was required to furnish accommodation for passengers in a stage to be drawn by not less than two horses, &c. In 1890-91, Morrison got $6,270.73, whereas, Henry Archibald, of Port Hastings, C.B., was then and since carrying nearly all the mails for him by railway. In 1891-92-93 and 1894, Morrison got the large and increased sum of $9,000, with extras and perquisites. In the beginning of the year 1894, John Morrison, the father, transferred his contract to his son, Metzler Morrison, the father being then candidate for the local legislature. In January, 1894, a very short advertisement appeared in the columns of three journals in Cape Breton, inviting tenders for the service above mentioned ; these tenders to be received in Ottawa and to be opened on the 26th day of January, 1894, and service to commence on the 1st day of February, 1894. By thus allowing only five days in midwinter to commence a service of greater cost to the country than any other of its kind, it was attempted to avoid competition. But competition did occur, and was bought off. When the valuable and heavy mails for the mining population and interests of Sydney, Cape Breton, were carried by Morrison's coach, for twenty years he received about $5,000 ; now, when the railway carried the great bulk of the mail matter, he receives in the vicinity of $10,000, only a few local mail-bags having to be delivered by him. It may be said that the railway destroyed his passenger business. In reply, I assert that long before the railway was completed, he had disgusted and turned aside the travelling public from his coaches by doubling the fare or largely increasing it in the winter season, when the steamboats were laid up. In consequence, passengers preferred to hire private conveyances and local teams. Morrison for some twelve years did all in his power to destroy the Conservative Government at Ottawa. I would myself be willing to, and do now hereby, tender for the punctual delivery of the mails and the perfect performance of this service between Hawkesbury, or McIntyre's Lake Station, and Sydney, the service to begin on the 1st day of July, 1895 ; the route to be subdivided into five sections, or a less number, as agreeable to the Government and its inspector—for the yearly sum of $4,950.

Wherefore, the said Henry N. Paint hath requested me to protest, and I, the said notary, at such his request, have protested, and by these protests do publicly and solemnly protest, on behalf of the said deponent and the people of Canada, against the payment by the said Postmaster General of any further sums of money to the said John Morrison or Metzler Morrison, under the terms of the contract now existing between the said parties for the conveyance of the said mails between the said termini.

And I further protest, in the said behalf, against the further continuance in force of the said contract, the Postmaster General being, according to law, in duty bound to annul the agreement between the above-mentioned contracting parties, inasmuch as the public interest requires such annulment.

Thus done and protested, in the city of Ottawa, this 29th day of May, A.D. one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, and in testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal, the said deponent having hereunto subscribed his name.

(Signed) H. N. PAINT.

(Signed) R. J. Wicksteed,
Notary Public.

Dominion of Canada,
Province of Ontario.

I, Richard John Wicksteed, notary in and for the said province, duly commissioned and sworn, and practising in the said city of Ottawa and dwelling therein, do certify the foregoing to be a true and exact copy of an original protest on record in my office.

In testimony whereof. I have hereunto set my hand and notarial seal this 28th day of May, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five.

R. J. WICKSTEED,
Notary Public.

The following are the subsidies for some other mail routes in Canada :—

Halifax and Mahone Bay, daily, 62 miles..	$3,100
Gaspé and Pasebiac, 103 miles, daily.....	6,715

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is in Quebec.

Mr. FRASER. Yes ; and they get the best of it there every time, or, if not, they will know the reason why.

Eastern Harbour and Port Hastings, &c., 101 miles.....	$7,475 88
Kingston and Newboro', Ont., 17 miles, daily	1,094 00
St. Peters and Grand River, daily, 17 miles	399 00

This matter has been referred to again and again, and I call the Minister's attention to it in order that he may not be further imposed upon. It is really too bad that the carrying of these mails should cost $3,000 more than before the railway was built, when the work done by the contractor was much greater. This affidavit is made by a reputable citizen who represented the county in Parliament. I trust that now that atention has been called to the matter it will be looked into and dealt with.

Mr. GILLIES. My hon. friend is evidently misinformed, or he would not take the stand he has done with regard to this item. I am very familiar with the route referred to by my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser), and if the hon. gentleman knew the circumstances he would fully and unreservedly endorse the actions of the Post Office Department in passing this item as I do. A daily stage service was established over this road as far back as 1863. It was conducted by the firm of . S. T. Lindsay & Co., of which firm the present contractor was a member. The stage line of the route was run from New Glasgow to Sydney, a distance of nearly 200 miles. That went on until the railway was open to the Straits of Canso in 1883,

when that portion of the route from New Glasgow to the Straits was cut off and Mr. Morrison became the sole contractor from the Straits to Sydney with a pro-rata remuneration for the distance. This went on till 1866, when the daily stage mail line was opened from the Straits to North Sydney by the Grand Narrows route, that is on the other side of the lake, a route running parallel with the route referred to by my hon. friend from Guysboro', but on the other side of the Bras d'Or Lake. The route touched upon by my hon. friend runs between Hawkesbury and Sydney via St. Peter's, and was the only mail route through Cape Breton till 1866, when the opposition mail line by the north side was established at a cost of over $5,000. The transportation of the mails, then, from the Straits of Canso to Sydney and North Sydney, after the establishment of this second route, cost over $11,000. When this route was established it took away a large portion of the passenger traffic that went by the St. Peter's route, and consequently disturbed the calculations made by Mr. Morrison when he took over this route. What was the fact? In 1889, long before the railway was opened, and not after it was opened, and when the county of Richmond was represented by a Liberal, Mr. Morrison represented the facts to the Post Office Department, and stated that he would have to abandon his contract unless a larger sum was given him. He then showed the department that the route could not be continued by him as a stage line unless he was paid at the rate of $9,000 per year. That was long before I came here, and while the county was represented by a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. From then until now Mr. Morrison has not had a single dollar of an increase. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken when he says that the business was conducted by a one-horse team. No better equipped stage line exists in the whole Dominion than that between the Straits of Canso and Sydney. When I came here I insisted that the line should suffer no impairment, at all events, but inasmuch as that stage line was the only means by which the people between the Straits of Canso and Sydney, extending over a distance of 100 miles, could communicate with the railway, especially during winter. I insisted that the stage line as it existed from 1863 till then, should be continued, and it was so continued. Now, in reference to the tenders mentioned by my hon. friend, they were asked for in every paper of any consequence published in Cape Breton, and by public notice posted in every post office from Hawkesbury to Sydney, and only two tenders were offered. One was from Mr. Morrison, the present stage proprietor, who was, of course, in a position to tender, because he had his plant on the line, he had his stables established at different points from Hawkesbury to Sydney, and was therefore in a position to compete, perhaps, on more favourable terms than any one else. However, there was competition, and a man named McGinnis, a very respectable man, tendered for a sum of about $8,000. When he was notified that his tender was the lowest, and when he was given a month to take over the business, the gentlemen who were named as securities for the due performance of that contract, refused to sign the bonds, and asked that their names be withdrawn. What was the department to do? Simply to receive the only other tender, that of Mr. Morrison, who had tendered for $9,000, and who was performing the work, and he has been carrying on the service ever since. I may say that while I am here, I shall insist upon that stage line being continued through that territory in an efficient manner. The route extends over a distance of 100 miles through an important and populous settlement, and it carries a large amount of mail matter, and passed through a territory, the people of which are cut off in winter from railway communication, except by means of this stage line. I am quite sure that after this statement my hon. friend will endorse my action in that respect.

Mr. FRASER. I would certainly endorse the hon. gentleman's action in securing proper mail communication. But I want to call his attention to the fact that in the year 1889-90 Mr. Morrison only received $5,724, and he was willing to carry the mail at that rate.

Mr. GILLIES. No, he was not. At that time he gave notice to the department that he could not continue at that rate, and then it was increased.

Mr. FRASER. In 1890-91 he received $6,270, and in 1891-92 Mr. Morrison changed his politics.

Mr. GILLIES. No.

Mr. FRASER. That is true, and at once up went his salary to $9,000. The hon. gentleman won't deny that in 1890-91 Mr. Morrison changed from being a Liberal to a Conservative. He ran in the Liberal interest, and was one of the strongest Liberals in the county, but in that year a change came.

Mr. GILLIES. Does my hon. friend say that Mr. Morrison ran in the Liberal interest at any time?

Mr. FRASER. My impression is that he ran for the local House.

Mr. GILLIES. In the Liberal interest?

Mr. FRASER. Previous to that year. However, I know this——

Mr. GILLIES. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken.

Mr. FRASER. No, he was the strongest Liberal at that time in the county. I know what his politics was when Mr. Blake was down there. Of course, the hon. gentleman does not know, and the department does not krow, that contemporaneous with his change of faith, up went his salary from $6,000 to $9,000.

Mr. GILLIES. My hon. friend is again mistaken, and he must not repeat that.

Mr. FRASER. I know that is a sore point with the hon. gentleman, and if he will wait until I am through, he will understand it better. I have got the floor. I say that in 1891-92 his pay was raised according to the Postmaster General's Report to $9,000, for the same distance, that he ran before for $5,724. More than that, I say he changed his politics at that time.

Mr. GILLIES. At what time ?

Mr. FRASER. I say that in 1889 he was a Liberal ; in 1891-92 he was a Conservative. That is the statement I make. The rate of payment went up from $6,000 to $9,000, and it was continued at the latter rate down to the present time.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I hope he will change again.

Mr. FRASER. So long as he can get $3,000 a year for changing to the Conservative party, there is no fear he will change again. These are dear men. According to the reply which the Postmaster General gave to me, the work continued to be done during these years without tender or contract. Tenders were not called for until 1893-94. The change was made from $6,000 to $9,000 without tender and contract, and Mr. Morrison never tendered at $9,000.

Mr. GILLIES. He did.

Mr. FRASER. The answer of the Postmaster was that he did not.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. Now, perhaps the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) will withdraw his statement. When the payment went up to $9,000, it was through the influence of the members of Parliament for the island of Cape Breton. There was never a tender for the $3,000 added up to 1893-94, when tenders were asked for. Why was it raised by $3,000 ? The service was not as great as it was before.

Mr. GILLIES. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. No man will travel by road if he can travel by railway. I venture to state, and the hon. gentleman will not make a statement to the contrary and allow it to go to Nova Scotia, that there is as much mail and as many passengers travelling by road now as there was previous to the Intercolonial Railway being built.

Mr. GILLIES. No.

Mr. FRASER. But here are $3,000 more being paid. As the number of passengers and the number of letters decrease, so the salary increase. In 1893-94 tenders were asked for. A short time after this contract was given Mr. Morrison was a candidate for the local legislature, and he got it transferred to his son, a young man, who was not at home at that time, but was at Halifax, and everybody knows the old gentleman has the advantage of it now and that the contract was transferred simply to allow him to run for the local house. I have made a calculation which may interest the hon. member for Richmond. The distance from McIntyre's Lake to Sydney by railway is about 80 miles. The railway subsidy of $3,200 per mile for that distance would amount to about $256,000. Add interest $7,680, and this subsidy given to Mr. Morrison of $9,000 per annum and the amounts would make over one million dollars, that is taking the railway subsidy and the mail subsidy together. This Government can borrow money at 3 per cent. At this rate of interest $9,000 annually paid to this contractor would represent a capital of about $300,000. That amount would build a railway, put down sleepers and rails from the present terminus of the railway to St. Peters. Here is a chance for the hon. member to get the railway extended a distance of 25 miles.

Mr. GILLIES. What would you do with the balance of the road from St. Peters ?

Mr. FRASER. Or provided a subsidy of $3,200 per mile were granted under similar conditions, it would pay for a railway from the same point to Louisbourg. There would be still a balance remaining of $44,000, which if invested as a sinking fund would in 50 years pay the whole amount. This is an admirable way for my hon. friend to get the South Shore Railway built ; and if the local government gave a similar sum. the company he represents would no doubt be very glad to build the road. This matter should receive the serious attention of the Minister. Although the payment of this mail contractor leaped from $6,000 to $9,000 without tender and contract, he does not need to carry the mail so far now, because instead of living at Hawkesbury he is living nine miles nearer.

Mr. GILLIES. He is not paid for as long a distance.

Mr. FRASER. He is under contract for $9,000.

Mr. GILLIES. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. I ask the Minister if anything has been taken off $9,000 because the contractor now carries the mail nine miles less distance ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has submitted some question to me which I have answered.

Mr. FRASER. The Minister says the contract is for $9,000. I see the anxiety of the hon. member for Richmond.

Mr. GILLIES. You have made a statement that the contractor receives $9,000 for carrying the mail from Hawkesbury to Sydney, which is not correct.

Mr. FRASER. His contract is for $9,000 to carry the mail to Sydney. I have not yet received an answer to the other question, but I will allow the Minister to correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. GILLIES. I will correct the hon. member.

Mr. FRASER. I would not accept the hon. gentleman's correction because the Minister would have to correct him. He is too much interested in this to give any correction.

Mr. GILLIES. What do you mean by that ?

Mr. FRASER. As a member for the county. I want the Minister to tell me whether any amount for the nine miles was taken from the contract and the $9,000 was reduced ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman wishes me to reply to that question, I say that from information received from the deputy when the distance was reduced by nine miles a certain amount, a proportionate amount, was deducted from the original contract.

Mr. FRASER. Then he will receive $9,000, less the proportionate amount for the nine miles ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. Perhaps the Minister will give me the amount.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The proportion of the amount paid for 100 miles is deducted for the nine miles on the whole amount of the contract.

Mr. FRASER. Therefore, he received the same amount for the balance as he did before. Has he received any compensation for giving up his building at Port Hawkesbury ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. FRASER. Once upon a time this mail was carried a good deal cheaper than even Lindsay carried it for. Of course, I would not expect that the mail should be carried to-day as cheaply as then. But the point I want to make is: That there has been a gross fraud perpetrated upon the department; that this man should receive, without tender or contract, $3,000 more than he did before. It is certainly not right. I have given the sworn statement here of an ex-member of Parliament. If the Minister looks into this matter, he will find that it is of such a character as to warrant him at once cancelling the contract and calling for tenders. While I do not say a word of general complaint about the Minister, I do say that now, as his attention is called to this, it would be an outrage for him to allow it to continue any longer. I know a postmaster who has not received anything for years because he wanted $40 a year. Mr. McGuire, of Steep Creek, wanted to give up the office, but nobody would take the responsibility, and he has been doing the work all the time in the interest of that section. They reduced his remuneration to $10, and, being a high-spirited man, he would not take a cent because it was nothing like what it should be. This man, Mr. Morrison, was a Liberal, and because he changed his politics he got a premium of $3,000. So far as his influence was concerned, he did use it for them when they got him over, but he ought to have been willing to espouse the excellent policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite for the sake of the truth he received, rather than for the solatium of $3,000 a year. I would ask the Minister to at once cancel the contract, after the statement I have made, and it is a statement unchallenged by the Minister, that Mr. Morrison received $3,000 additional without ever having tendered at all. While I do not hold the Minister particeps criminis with him, I cannot help seeing there is something wrong.

Mr. GILLIES. I am indeed astonished that the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) persists in making statements that are not within his knowledge, and that are not consistent with the facts.

Mr. FRASER. They are sworn to.

Mr. GILLIES. By whom ?

Mr. FRASER. By an ex-member of this House.

Mr. GILLIES. Well, you have not read them. I think that my statement would be taken in this House, or anywhere else, just as readily as the statements of the hon. member for Guysboro', and I am stating the facts and nothing but the facts. My hon. friend does not make his statements upon his own responsibility, and they are wide and far from the facts. Mr. Morrison got this increase in the latter part of the year 1889.

Mr. FRASER. That was the first increase.

Mr. GILLIES. And the only increase that he got, from that day up to this. I make this statement from my place in Parliament, and if I am wrong, I will be quite ready to admit that I have made a misstatement. In December, 1889, or January, 1890, Mr. Morrison got this increase, when he was, as the hon. gentleman said, a supporter of hon. members opposite, and when the county in

which he lives was represented in this House by Mr. Flynn, an uncompromising supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. From the day that he got that increase until this moment, not $1 mo e has been given him than was given in the first instance. I am quite sure that the officers of the Post Office Department will corroborate in every particular, the statement I am here making. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) has admitted that the passenger traffic on this route fell off consequent upon the construction of the Cape Breton Railway. But this stage line had to be maintained intact, and in exactly the same state of equipment, after the railway was opened, as it was before. This railway runs as I have said on the opposite side of the Bras d'Or or lake and is of no local accommodation to the people served by this stage line. Mr. Morrison had to maintain the same number of horses, coaches, drivers and grooms, and his outlay in every respect was the same as before the railway was built and before he lost his passenger revenue. The receipts were less, and, consequently, he had to say to the department that he would have to give up the contract if he did not get the increase. In 1889, while he was an ardent Liberal, he had to give up that contract, or get the increase necessary to enable him to run that line. He got it, although he was a Liberal, and although the county was then represented by a Liberal in this House. From that day to this, he has never been paid $1 more. Some time after the railway was opened through Cape Breton, he changed the western terminus from the Straits to McIntyre's station, making it seven miles less, and the department deducted that proportion of the distance from the whole amount paid him. That is the whole story. A more honest or above-board transaction was never carried out in this country, and I am glad that it was brought up to enable me to make this statement.

Mr. FRASER. When did you say the pay was increased ?

Mr. GILLIES. In December, 1890, or January, 1890. The first payment, I believe, was made in January, 1890.

Mr. FRASER. I will read the Minister's answer to my question :

Mr. FRASER asked : How much has been paid for carrying the mail from Hawkesbury, Inverness county, to Sydney, C.B., during the years 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893 and 1894, giving the amount for each year ?

And the Minister replied :

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In 1889, $5,724.88; in 1890, $6,270.73 ; in 1891, $9,000 ; in 1892, $9,000.

It was in 1891 that the payment of $9,000 was made. I am speaking by the book here. I got the answer from the Postmaster General himself, and I suppose he knows more about it than the hon. gentleman from Richmond (Mr. Gillies). I say that is the reply I received from the Postmaster General, that the year 1891 was the first year in which Mr. Morrison received the increase, and that was coterminus with his change of politics. Now, where is the hon. gentleman, I would like to know. That was the exact year, and, according to the Postmaster General, that continued in the years 1892, 1893 and 1894—those four years. Now, I know that the hon. member for Richmond would not intentionally make a statement that was not correct : but he has.

Mr. GILLIES. I have not.

Mr. FRASER. Well, I put his statement against that of the hon. Postmaster General, that is all ; he will have to settle that with the department and the public records, which show exactly what took place. Now, I ask what credence can be given to the hon. gentleman's statement—not that he would wilfully say anything wrong—when he is two years wrong as to the year Mr. Morrison received his increase. Mr. Flynn did not represent Richmond in 1891. Other gentlemen came here with Mr. Morrison when the change was made, and I think it is exceedingly ungenerous in the hon. gentleman to attempt to show that it was Mr. Flynn who got this done. Mr. Flynn did not get it done, because Mr. Morrison was a political friend of Mr. Flynn at the time the hon. gentleman mentioned. There is something further in this answer of the hon. Postmaster General, and I take it that it is from the records of the department, and is certainly correct :

John Morrison was the contractor from the beginning of 1889 until the 1st of March, 1894.

Then, he did not, as the Postmaster General said, have any contract with the Government for the extra amount, but the old contract was continued with an additional $3,000 added to it ; and it is very curious that the $3,000 was given the year before the railway was opened. If I understand the hon. gentleman's argument, it was that Mr. Morrison received more it was because it was costing more to do the work : but he received the $3,000 before any of the Cape Breton mail was carried by the railway at all, for the Postmaster General answers that the mails have been carried by the Cape Breton Railway since the 1st of June, 1892, a year after Mr. Morrison received the $3,000 increase ; and it is a curious thing that the same amount has been continued when it is stated that another man offered to do the work for less. The hon. Postmaster General states—and I accept his statement at once—that nine miles have been taken off. That fact is bad enough : but here remains the fact that in 1891 the amount was increased, and in that year Mr. Morrison found it useful and expedient to change his politics.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that, so far as the politics of

Mr. Morrison are concerned, I did not know whether he was a Conservative or Liberal.

Mr. FRASER. Was the hon. gentleman Postmaster General in 1891 ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes. The hon. gentleman has given me information, more especially the sworn evidence. which I have no doubt he will not mind communicating to me——

Mr. FRASER. It will all go into "Hansard."

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In order that I may go thoroughly into the history of this contract, I may say that my statement which I gave in answer to the hon. gentleman's question was the official statement placed in my hands by the officers of my department. I will deem it my duty to look into the matter, and if there is anything in the contract which is not in the interest of the public, I shall certainly see that it is changed in such a way as to meet the requirements of the service, and be in the interests of the public.

Mr. BORDEN. There is one consideration in all this which it seems to me should interest the taxpayers of the Dominion generally. I gather from the discussion that some years ago a certain service in carrying passengers and mails between two points in Cape Breton Island was rendered at some $6,000 a year. Subsequently, it seems, a railway was constructed there out of the public funds of the country, and that railway is now carrying most of the mails and all the passengers which prior to that time were being carried by this mail route ; and instead of the change relieving the treasury of this country, the mail route is continued and the amount of money paid to the contractor is increased rather than diminished. This is an illustration of the way hon. gentlemen opposite are guarding the interests of the people of this country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the hon. member for Guysboro' referred to 1891, when the contract was renewed. I became Postmaster General in 1892.

Mr. GILLIES. I am really sorry that I have again to correct my hon. friend from Guysboro', and that he will persist in running in the mistaken groove that he fell into when he began this discussion. Now, I will make the statement again. I will ask the Postmaster General to substantiate it from his place ; and if he is not prepared to do so now, I will ask him to do so, in justice to me, at the next meeting of the House. From the time Mr. Morrison got the first increase, in the early part of 1890, up to $9,000, when he showed he was not able to maintain that service, in the efficient state in which it was then and is now, at the former rate—from that time until the present, he never got one dollar more.

Mr. FRASER. I did not say he gave it from 1891.

Mr. GILLIES. I am saying from 1890, when he got the first increase.

Mr. FRASER. Settle it with the Postmaster General.

Mr. GILLIES. My hon. friend would have this committee believe that Mr. Morrison got an increase in 1889, in 1890——

Mr. FRASER. I did not.

Mr. GILLIES. That he got an increase in 1890 and 1891.

Mr. FRASER. I did not. I said that the increase of $1,300 was given in 1891.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman said in 1889. I want to get him nailed down to some particular time. He now says 1891. In January, 1890, the increase up to $9,000 was given Mr. Morrison, and from then until now he has not received an increase of one dollar, but he has been paid uniformly at the rate of $9,000 from January, 1890, —eighteen months before I came here at all, and while the county was represented by Mr. Flynn, an ardent supporter of my hon. friend opposite. From January, 1890, when he got that increase, he has not received one cent additional ; and the apparent discrepancy between 1890 and 1891 and 1892 is caused apparently by the fact that one year runs into another.

Mr. FRASER. Could 1889 be run into 1891 ?

Mr. GILLIES. The increase began in 1890 at $9,000 a year. From then until 30th June, it appears small in the Auditor General's Report, or the Postmaster General's Report, because for that period it is given as made up of two sums, namely, the old amount of $5,800, and the increased amount of $9,000. When I saw the answer of the Postmaster General, I went immediately to the department, and saw the deputy (Mr. White), and he explained it to me at once. He gave me the statement I give here ; and if my hon. friend will go to the department to-morrow, he will find exactly that matters there correspond to the letter with the statement I have given.

Mr. FRASER. I regret that I have to call the hon. gentleman's attention again to the fact that he is confounding two things, according to the statement of the Postmaster General, given on page 448 of "Hansard." According to that statement, in 1889, $5,724.88 were paid. In 1890 there was a rise to $6,270.73. I am bound to accept the statement of the Minister against any given by his deputy, unless the Minister will rise and say that the statement he gave was incorrect. The hon. gentle-

man is confounding the rise from 1889 to 1890, with the rise in 1891. I want to call his attention to the fact that $500 more were given in 1890, just as Mr. Morrison was running in that direction than were given him in the previous year. But when it came to 1891 and his conversion was complete, the amount reached $9,000. Is it possible that the statement of the Postmaster General could have remained this long without correction? Why did not the hon. member for Richmond put a question, and have the correction made in this House?

Mr. GILLIES. I can show it now.

Mr. FRASER. Yes, when we are debating the item, he tries to introduce a poor sub-official to give his testimony against the Postmaster General. Why did not the hon. gentleman correct it as soon as he saw it, for we have now his statement that he saw it, and made the correction. There was an advance of $500 in 1890, and I will accept the statement of the Postmaster General rather than any other statement made by any deputy.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I see no discrepancy between the answer of the Postmaster General and the statement of my hon. friend. The Postmaster General said that the contract was paid for in 1891 at the rate of $9,000. It seems to me that that is positive proof that the increase must have taken place the year before.

Mr. HAGGART. It is plain as possible that my hon. friend's statement is quite correct, and in strict accord with the Postmaster General. In 1889, the Postmaster General says that he paid $5,924.88. That took him to the 1st January, 1890. The hon. member for Guysboro' says that the increase was from 1890.

Mr. FRASER. Not at all. You are a year out.

Mr. HAGGART. I am correct. In 1889, it is not the fiscal year which is given here. what was the payment during the year 1889? It is $5,724.88. It is the fiscal year that the statement referred to. In the fiscal year of 1889 the payment was $5,724.88. That would take him to 1st July, in 1890, when the amount was $6,720.73. That included the increase for these months, which would be $1,500, or the amount of $9,000 a year from the date the hon. gentleman spoke of.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will see into what an error he has fallen. If he will take the blue-books he will see that the Postmaster General was right and that he is wrong. I have here the Postmaster General's Report from year to year. If the hon. gentleman will take up that report, he will see that the amount paid for the fiscal year 1890 was $5,724. Now, I will go to the next year, 1891. The Postmaster General's Report for 1891 gives the figures for the fiscal year 1890 and the payment on this contract is $6,270. Now, the hon. gentleman from Richmond (Mr. Gillies), said that the increase was made in 1889.

Mr. HAGGART. 1st January, 1890.

Mr. HAZEN. Let us get that right. The hon. member from Richmond says the change was made in the month of December, 1889, and the increased pay commenced in January, 1890.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The first year in which it appears from the Postmaster General's Report that $9,000 was paid in 1892. That, I suppose, means that the payment was made in 1891. Very well, then, we see that, instead of being in 1889, it is in 1891.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, there is no doubt about it. The sum was not paid over till then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. However all this may be, it does not in the slightest degree relieve the department from the statement made by my hon. friend which statement simply was that there has been a gross waste of public money. The Government builds a railway in Cape Breton at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars, I suppose—perhaps a million or so—and the first result is that some trumpery line which used to be run for $6,000 it is now paid $9,000, and I suppose the railway is paid $10,000 or so for carrying the mails. It is no wonder that we are paying hundreds of thousands of dollars more for postal expenses than the whole postal revenue amounts to. This is a good illustration of the point to which I drew the attention of the committee—that there is a great deal of waste in the expenditure of the Post Office. If we are going to increase little post office routes 50 per cent while the work is done by railways alongside, it is not much wonder that we have a deficiency of $700,000 in the Post Office Department. I do not care a straw about the relative merits of Mr. Morrison and these other contractors; but I merely point to this case as evidence of very gross mismanagement and extravagance on the part of the Post Office Department; and no pretense of excuse or explanation has been given by the Postmaster General or his predecessor, the present Minister of Railways. Not one solitary vestige or reason is given for this man's salary, or annuity, or conversion money, or whatever you choose to call it being increased from $6,000 to $9,000. It is clear that the cost of carrying these mails is probably more than 100 per cent more than it was in 1889. What possible explanation or excuse can there be for paying $9,000 for

that which cost only $6,000 before the railway was built? If the Postmaster General or his predecessor has an explanation let him give it. The public outside do not care whether Mr. Morrison became converted or perverted in 1890 or in 1891. What we do want to understand is whether when railways are constructed at great expense to the public and mails must be conveyed by their means, the result is to be that we are to pay 50 per cent more for one-half the service we formerly received.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not know anything about the service in question, but there was one consideration that suggests what may answer the objections the hon. gentleman has raised. It is a well known fact that when tenders——

Mr. CASEY. There were no tenders.

Mr. DICKEY. In tendering for mail routes, one of the main considerations that the tenderer takes into account is the revenue he can derive from passenger traffic along the road. I know men in my own county who are driving mail routes for less than the actual cost of the service; but they make up the balance by carrying passengers and parcels and messages along the road. This man has a long route. He formerly carried all the passengers between these points and received a large revenue from that source. When the railway was built that source of revenue would be cut off, and when the department called for tenders, a person tendering would have to throw the whole cost of the mail upon the mail itself, instead of being able to count upon help from the other items I have mentioned. This is a large contract which requires a vast equipment of horses and carriages which probably only two men in the locality would be able to furnish. Without saying that the increase was not excessive, it is quite evident that there must be some increase when all the passenger traffic was taken away from the contractor. And it is quite a matter of indifference, so far as that is concerned, whether the passenger traffic is taken away by a Government railway or by anything else. This mail route, I understand, serves a county which cannot be reached by the railway itself. It is simply a question of passenger traffic that gives revenue being taken away, making an increase to some extent necessary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The strength of the hon. gentleman's argument is turned to weakness when we find that the railway was not open until a year after the increase was made.

John Morrison was the contractor from the beginning of 1889 until the 1st March, 1894; since that date Mr. J. S. M. Morrison has held the contract. Mr. John Morrison acquired the contract originally in 1885 by transfer from Mr. P. S. Lindsay, and on its expiration in 1889, the service was left in Mr. Morrison's hands under yearly agreement.

And at that time the sum paid was increased $3,000.

Mr. CAMERON. In 1889?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Militia prefaced his remarks by saying that he did not know much about this matter, and I think if he had followed the course of the debate previously, he would have known more about it. But we were all of us in the position of knowing nothing about this matter until it was brought up by the member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser). And if the discussion had been limited to his statement, and to a temperate reply from the Postmaster General and the local members on that side of the House, we would not have concerned ourselves so much about it.

But the excitement of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) and of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies), and of the ex-Postmaster General, have made it clear to us that there is an extremely big nigger in the fence, whether his name is Mr. Morrison or not. It has been made perfectly clear, from the report and from the admissions of the Postmaster General himself, and by the language of the hon. gentleman who became so intensely excited over the matter, that this man Morrison is being paid 50 per cent more for doing much less work than he was doing some years ago. When his change of politics took place, it seems to have made a great difference to the hon. member for Richmond. But it is no matter to us. The fact remains that he got increased pay for doing increased work, and that he changed his politics either at the same time or a little later. In fact, he has become one of the friends of the Government, and even one of their very dear friends, for he is dear at $9,000 a year. I think we must all admit that we are aware of the existence of a nigger there, though we may not be able to draw his picture.

But I would emphasize the fact, as the hon. member for South Oxford has done, that it is in these directions that the waste occurs in the Post Office Department. Now, I do not fully agree with the hon. member for South Oxford that the time has come for extreme economy in providing mail service to the small post offices in the country. I agree that we must not give extravagantly dear postal service to small places; but I would remind the Postmaster General of a fact that he may not be aware of, that there are many sections in the older parts of Canada, old settled places, which have no better mail service now than they had twenty years ago. My own constituency is an example. It has but very little better mail service in the way of frequency than it had twenty years ago. I suppose that is due to the fact that the riding has had the misfortune to be represented by a mem-

ber who had not the ear of the Minister as fully as if he had been a supporter. However, I am bound to say that when ever I have brought anything before the notice of the Minister, he has given it fair consideration; but these matters have not been brought to his notice in the same way as they would have been had the county been represented by a supporter of his. Now that same thing may have happened elsewhere. There are many parts of the country where, from what I may call quasi natural causes, the development of the mail service has not kept pace with the increased population. His attention has been called to a question of mails on the Michigan Central Railway to St. Thomas.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The present arrangements have been accepted by them, and they are running an increased service.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the hon. gentleman will find that his county has been treated very well.

Mr. CASEY. I am not complaining at all, but I am making the point, rather in support of the Minister than in opposition to him, that it will be necessary for him, notwithstanding the general cry of economy, in many of the older parts of the country, to make little improvements here and there in the mail service, in order to overtake the increased population. But I say that it is in such cases as this Morrison job, where, probably without the knowledge of the Minister at all, a job has been perpetrated, that the waste takes place, and not in providing the necessary accommodation for well settled districts. Now, I find that in the London district, with a population of a couple of hundred thousand or more, there was only $54,700 paid for land carriage of mails; while in British Columbia, with a population very much less, with a railway and a navigable river going through the most of it, there was $58,450 paid. Of course there are several reasons why British Columbia is expensive, but I do not think the mail service in the older districts, such as London and Kingston, has been kept up to the same relative pitch as it has been in the newer country. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has espoused the cause of the country postmasters. I am with him in that, too. I believe that there is room even there for economy in one direction, with liberality in another. I am not willing to state my conviction that no more expansion should be given to our local mail service. I believe that in many districts it is absolutely necessary, in the interests of justice. In regard to salaries, it has been generally stated that some changes have been made in the salaries of the postmaster or his subordinate, at St. Thomas. Some weeks ago I asked a question on this point, and the Postmaster General said that no change had been made up to that time. Since then I have been assured locally that some changes have taken place. I now repeat the question and ask has any change taken place up to the present date? In regard to allowances to the country postmaster, I have been told to ask how often the salaries are revised, and I should like to know what proportion they bear to the revenue of the office.

Mr. CAMERON. Before the Postmaster General answers those questions I desire to say a few words in connection with another question which has not been sufficiently thrashed out. We want to ascertain the facts. The hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) made statements which were said to be somewhat at variance with the facts. Considerable discussion arose in that connection. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has in my opinion to some extent settled the facts; he has shown to this House that the increase in the cost of the mail service from Hawkesbury to Sydney was made in December, 1889.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think in the beginning of January, 1890.

Mr. CAMERON. And that payment for that service commenced in January, 1890.

Mr. FOSTER. On the 1st May.

Mr. CAMERON. We have ascertained two main facts: First, that the change was made in December, 1889, second, that payment commenced in May, 1890. At that time the contractor was, I am informed, a Liberal, and at that time I know from my own personal knowledge that Richmond was represented in this House by a Liberal. In May, 1890, to my personal knowledge Richmond was still represented by a Liberal. So at the time the increase was authorized Richmond was represented by a Liberal, and at the time the increase was given it was so represented. I was astonished to find in view of these facts the hon. member for Guysboro' become so very much excited. He was very much like a great many of my own countrymen who do not become good converts, except they are caught young. So the hon. member for Guysboro' cannot see as clearly as some of us who were politically caught young, but now that the hon. member for Queen's has removed the cloud which overshadowed that hon. gentleman he will realize two facts, first, that the change was authorized in December, 1889, and, second, that the increase commenced on May, 1890. I hope the member for Guysboro' understands these facts, and that no other increase has taken place up to the present time. The hon. member for Richmond, who is a Conservative, was not elected until March, 1891, so all those corrupt practices, if they were corrupt, were carried on while Richmond was represented by a Liberal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman want to hold me responsible for all the political rascalities done in the county I represent ?

Mr. CAMERON. No. While all on this side of the House failed to convince the hon. member for Guysboro' that he was wrong, the hon. member for Queen's enabled him to sit down quietly. Then we saw a general attempt made by hon. gentlemen on his right and left, by the financial authorities, to divert the attention of the committee from the great question as to the contract being given to Mr. Morrison while Richmond was represented by a Liberal, and whether the increase was given while Richmond was represented by a Conservative, and they fastened the whole case on an hon. member who was not elected until a long time after the transaction occurred. The mail route between Hawkesbury and Sydney is a very important one. Before the railway was built there was a competitive mail line established in 1866, which carried a large number of passengers formerly carried from Halifax to Sydney, by what was called the central route, which has since become the route of the railway. When the term of Mr. Lindsay's contract in 1889 terminated, no one would undertake to carry the mails from Hawkesbury to Sydney for the former amount, owing to this central mail route having been established and the large curtailment in the carriage of passengers. There was nothing corrupt in that, and I do not care whether Richmond was represented by a Liberal or a Conservative at that time, or whether the contract was given to a Liberal or a Conservative. It is not very complimentary to intimate that a leading Liberal in Richmond could have been purchased for so little money. There may be some other grave reason for the change offered. When the railroad was built there was an additional reason why the amount paid should be increased, because a larger number of passengers were then carried by the central mail route. There was, however, no increase after 1891, even after the railroad was built. But when the starting point was changed from Hawkesbury to McIntyre's Lake, nine miles nearer Sydney, the Post Office Department very properly reduced the cost of service pro rata for the nine miles as compared with the 100 miles. Now, we understand the facts thoroughly, and there is no disagreement about them, and I am sure the House is very much obliged to the hon. member for Queen's for illuminating the case so strongly that immediately afterwards there was an attempt to make a diversion from the subject altogether by honourable gentlemen opposite.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The House is very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for thinking that when a Conservative Government commits indescribable folly in its action in the county it is quite sufficient to say that the county at that time was represented by a Liberal. Such are the hon. gentleman's political ethics. Does he not know that under the beautiful system of government that prevails, the representative of a county, if he is not a follower of the Government, is not allowed to have any influence with them whatever. The patronage of the county is given to a defeated candidate or to some other prominent Conservative. The repetition of the statement that the county was represented by a Liberal at the time that this improper and indefensible change was made, is irrelevant to the arguments adduced by hon. members on this side of the House. The Postmaster General has promised that if the facts are as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) he will have them remedied, but his supporters behind him do not seem to like the announcement. They want this $9,000 continued and they argue that it should not be cut down because the county was represented by a Liberal when the change was made.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In reply to the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey), so far as St. Thomas is concerned, no change has been made whatever, but an investigation is being gone on with by the inspector so as to ascertain whether these changes will be made or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is stated to me on authority which I take to be reliable, that it is the intention of the department to divide the province of Nova Scotia into two districts, the eastern and western, and to appoint an inspector for each. At present there is but one inspector, Mr. Charles J. Macdonald. If this is the intention what is Mr. Macdonald's salary to be, and what will be the salary of the other inspector ? Is it true that the present member for Colchester (Mr. Patterson) is to receive the appointment for one district ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman can find the reply in the Estimates which have been submitted to the House. There is no appropriation taken for a new inspector, nor an increase or reduction in the salary of the present inspector. That could not be done unless the department asked for an appropriation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It could be done by dividing the salary.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am afraid it could not be done that way.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it to be done ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have told the hon. gentleman that I cannot create a new district without having the money voted by Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Unless you cut down the salary of the present inspector.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am afraid I could not do that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not asking you to do that, I am asking for information.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to a matter connected with the mail carriage in the North-west Territories. The price paid for the service, according to the last report of the Minister, between Battleford and Saskatoon, is $7,049 a year. The service is twice a week and the distance ninety miles. I am informed that when this contract was let to Messrs. Leeson & Scott, in November, 1890, a tender was sent in by Mr. Thomas Dewar, of Battleford, to do the work for $30 a round trip, or $60 a week, or $3,120 a year. The contract with Leeson & Scott expired in 1894, and without tender it was renewed to them at the same price. It is perfectly absurd for the Government to give as much for carrying mails in the North-west Territories in 1894 as they did in 1890, because the price of everything has been enormously decreased since then. We have the statement of Ministers that great saving has been made in the cost of supplies in the mounted police since 1890. Mr. Dewar was perfectly competent to do the work, and in 1890 he tendered to do it, for $3,900 a year less than Messrs. Leeson & Scott offered to do it for, and less than their tender was renewed for in 1894. I have this on substantial information, and it certainly seems impossible to believe that the Government would pay to one firm about $4,000 a year more than the work could be efficiently done for by another responsible person. If I am interrupted by the leader of the House and other Ministers in this way I can keep on for five or six hours. I am, at least, entitled to ordinary civility.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman had a mind to go against all that his leader promised me this afternoon and to obstruct the supplies, he can do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to a point of order. He has a perfect right to bring this matter before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that he has not, but because some person makes a remark to his neighbour here, he gets up and says he will occupy the House four or five hours. That is what I object to.

Mr. MARTIN. I think there should be ordinary decorum in the House when a member is speaking.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will get the decorum he deserves, and no more.

Mr. MARTIN. Then the leader of the House justifies his incivility to me by saying that I broke some promise.

Mr. FOSTER. The leader of the House was not addressing the hon. gentleman. I was addressing the hon. Postmaster General, and I will listen to the hon. gentleman or not, just as I please.

Mr. MARTIN. I found fault with the gross incivility of the leader of the House in interrupting me in my remarks.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is the last man in this House who should talk of incivility.

Mr. MARTIN. That may be, but if I am uncivil, that does not justify the hon. gentleman's incivility to me.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. leader of the House addressed a remark to me which had nothing whatever to do with what the hon. member for Winnipeg was talking about.

Mr. MARTIN. Then why does the hon. gentleman interrupt me in my remarks?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is not so important as to demand the attention of every member in this House when he is addressing the Postmaster General.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not ask the hon. gentleman to listen to me, but I say that it is very uncivil to me for Ministers of the Crown to take the attention of the Postmaster General when I am asking him a question.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is wrong again. The Postmaster General was all attention to him.

Mr. MARTIN. I certainly found it very annoying.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw his remark in reference to the leader of the House.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not withdraw, because the leader of the House charges me with obstructing.

Mr. FOSTER. I took the hon. gentleman's own words. He said he would keep us five or six hours on this Estimate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He said that if interrupted he could keep the committee.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to convey this intimation that if the hon. Minister thought by the method he was pursuing, that he was going to prevent me——

Mr. FOSTER. I was not noticing you. I would disdain to do it.

Mr. MARTIN. You were making a great deal of noise and preventing me speaking.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not propose to be bull-dozed, either, by other members of the committee.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman thinks he can bulldoze the whole House.

Mr. MARTIN. I have my rights that I am going to assert; and this is not the first time, when I have attempted to address remarks to the committee, that the Finance Minister has acted in the same way.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way?

Mr. MARTIN. By being very noisy and interrupting me. The hon. Minister knows perfectly well that he was very offensive, and interrupted me very much. I brought this matter up with no idea of obstructing the committee. I brought it up because I was asked to do so, and get an explanation, and I propose to get it. As I was saying, Messrs. Leeson & Scott had been very large contractors for the mail service in the North-west. They were contractors for the service between Calgary and Port Saskatchewan, a service which cost the Government between $12,000 and $13,000 a year. If the other contracts were given on the same principle on which this contract appears to have been given, without any reference to the other tenders that were received, and at prices so extravagantly beyond what the department might have had the work done for, the amount lost by the Government would be very large indeed. Under these circumstances, I would like to know from the Postmaster General whether the facts which I have alleged, and which have been communicated to me, are correct or not.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I take it that the hon. gentleman is discussing the contract between Battleford and Saskatoon. It is a very old contract, and when Mr. McLellan was Postmaster General, he visited that section of the country, and personally looked into the matter.

Mr. MARTIN. In what year was that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In 1886 or 1887. And from the information he personally obtained, he considered that the contract should be continued to Leeson & Scott, who were the best contractors, and were doing their work very well. Subsequently, on more than one occasion, the matter was referred to the inspector for that division, and the report which he sent to the department was that the contract should be continued to Leeson & Scott.

Mr. MARTIN. What year was that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. About two years ago. The inspector's report convinced the department that the contract should be continued, and it was continued.

Mr. MARTIN. I must say that the explanation of the hon. Postmaster General is very unsatisfactory indeed. Here is a contract which is costing the country $7,049 a year. It is, I fancy, the largest contract in Manitoba or the North-west Territories for carrying the mails. I understand the Postmaster General to say that in 1886, the then Postmaster General, Mr. McLellan, went up there and looked into the matter himself, and came to the conclusion that the contract should be given these people for the amount that was then given. That is surely a very poor explanation, in view of the fact that the work could be done for so much less. In 1890 tenders were advertised for, amongst these sent in was that of Mr. Thomas Dewar, who was just as competent to carry the mails as Leeson & Scott. No doubt Leeson & Scott do the work satisfactorily, but no doubt also Thos. Dewar would be able to do the work just as satisfactorily. How can that question be determined except by the course, adopted in 1890, of asking for tenders? What excuse then was there for the department deliberately giving $7,049 to Leeson & Scott when Mr. Dewar was willing to do the work for $3,120? Again in 1886, everything was very much more expensive in the Territories than in 1890, and in 1890 things were very much more expensive and this work was worth very much more than in 1894. But while in 1890 the department went through the farce of calling for tenders and then gave the contract to the highest tenderer, Leeson & Scott, for $7,049, in 1894, after everything has gone down and when the cost of doing the work was 20 to 40 per cent less, the department did not even take the precaution of asking for tenders, but deliberately reawarded this contract for another period of four years, at $7,049 to Leeson & Scott. Thos. Dewar was at that time prepared to send in a tender if he had the opportunity, and he is ready at twenty-four hours notice to do the work for $3,120.

Mr. DALY. Neither Mr. Dewar nor anybody else could possibly undertake that work and carry out its contract for the sum mentioned by the hon. gentleman. The first thing that the Post Office Department has to do is to look to the responsibility of the men who undertake the contract and to the fact that they have been hitherto satisfactorily carrying out the contract. There is not a black mark in the department to-day against Leeson & Scott, and no doubt what moved the inspector to recommend them was that they had so well conducted their contract, through a long and difficult trail, with few inhabitants, in winter and summer, under trying circumstances. The hon. gentleman says that the price of living has so decreased between 1890 and 1894 that Mr. Dewar could do the work at a much less figure than what is paid Leeson & Scott. The hon. gentleman does not understand the condition of the country over which the contract runs, and he has never been there. It is from Saskatchewan to Battleford, a distance of 90 miles, over a trail along which there are only two settlers. There is no habitation from Battleford to Saskatoon with the exception of the habitations of

these two men. For the first 22 miles out of Battleford, you have to cross 22 creeks to the Eagle Hills—a very hard road to travel, particularly in winter. When it is remembered that these men have to carry this mail in sunshine or rain—whether the thermometer is 30 to 40 below or 90 in the shade,—and that they have to furnish relays of horses at different points and houses as well, one can see that the expense is much greater than if the mails were carried through a well settled country. As far as the price of building is concerned between Saskatoon and Battleford, there is no difference as compared with 1890. The price of wages is not lessened. On the contrary, the condition of things there is identical with what it was in Winnipeg twenty years ago. The records of the department show that there are no contractors who from year to year have done thir work as satisfactorily, under trying circumstances, as did Leeson & Scott. They carried the mail in the old days from Regina to Battleford, from Swift Current to Battleford during the rebellion, and from Calgary to Edmonton before the line was built; and in consideration of the services they rendered and the fact that they were well equipped in horses and riders and responsible men for the carrying of the mails, their contract was extended.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think that the Minister of the Interior has added anything to the case made by the Postmaster General. I was particular to say that no suggestion against Leeson & Scott was ever made or intended. It is not necessary to allege that Leeson & Scott are doing the work badly, because it is not a matter I bring before the House. I say nothing against that firm, but I charge the Postmaster General with deliberately wasting $4,000 of public money in the letting of this contract. The Minister of the Interior takes exception to my statement that prices have been reduced—he says that that does not apply to that country. That is absurd on the face of it. If it is true, as the Minister has stated, that there is a reduction in the expenses of the mounted police on account of the reduced prices——

Mr. DALY. That does not obtain there.

Mr. MARTIN. Suppose they get their supplies in Regina.

Mr. DALY. The mounted police do not get all their supplies from Regina, it is a question of feed for their horses.

Mr. MARTIN. I understood the hon. Minister to say that the goods had to be freighted from Regina.

Mr. DALY. So they have.

Mr. MARTIN. If the original cost at Regina is lower, the cost at Battleford must be lower, for the freighting does not cost more, but rather less. But I only mentioned this incidentally on the ground that one would expect the contract to be less in 1894 than it was in 1890. But the Minister of the Interior makes the peculiar answer that they have renewed the contract with this firm in face of the fact that in 1890 Mr. Dewar offered to do the work for $3,120 on the ground that they were afraid that Mr. Dewar would not do it.

Mr. DALY. What knowledge has the hon. gentleman of that?

Mr. MARTIN. I have been informed. There is nothing to show that they called upon Mr. Dewar to furnish security and that he failed to do so. When a contract is given to a man, the practice is to exact from him security for the performance of that contract. If he gives that security, there is no justification for giving the contract to another man at more than twice the price than has been offered. The Minister of the Interior suggests that Leeson & Scott had done a great deal of good work, and that the inspector thought that out of gratitude——

Mr. DALY. I did not put it in that way. I said they had done their work well.

Mr. MARTIN. I understood the hon. Minister to put it in this way, that the firm had done so much good work for the Government that they did not like to take the contract away from them. Now, I would go this far: Other things being equal, I think this is an eminently proper matter to discuss, and, thinking so, no sneers or jeers or uncivil conduct on the part of the leader of the House will prevent me from discussing it. I do not see why he should make himself so offensive. I would like to ask him to point out any occasion when I have been offensive to any member.

Mr. FOSTER. I could not do it.

Mr. MARTIN. I criticise the Government as severely as I can, but I do not think the hon. gentleman can say that I do it in an offensive manner.

Mr. FOSTER. No, no.

Mr. MARTIN. I was going to say that, other things being equal, or even if there had been a small difference between Leeson & Scott and the other tenderers, I think the Government would have been justified in giving them the preference. But surely that is no justification for giving them the contract at $4,000 more than the others asked, on a $7,000 job. Why, Mr. Chairman, it is an enormity. Every charge I have made is completely admitted by the Postmaster General.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not admit it.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand you to admit that in 1894 this contract was extended to these people for another period of four

years without tender, and the only justification is that the inspector recommended it.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the hon. gentleman any evidence that this Dewar tender was put in and what the amount of it was.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Where is it, pray ?

Mr. MARTIN. It is my information, and it has not been denied. I am not supposed to give evidence as to information in the hands of the Government.

Mr. HUGHES. The Deputy Postmaster General tells me that he has no record of it.

Mr. MARTIN. No tenders were asked for in 1894. But in 1890, Mr. Dewar did offer to do the work for $3,120. He has in his possession a letter from the department acknowledging his letter, and that is all. And in the face of that the contract is given to Leeson & Scott. Four years afterwards, the department thought it not necessary to go through the farce of calling for tenders, for it is surely folly to call for tenders if you intend to consider only one of them. Much has been made of the good work that Leeson & Scott have done. Whatever work they have done carrying mails during the rebellion, they have been paid for most liberally. They are wealthy men, having made large sums out of their contract. I am not finding fault with them on that account. I am not discussing them in this matter. They have done only what others would have done under similar circumstances. But what I am discussing is the action of the Postmaster General and his department.

Mr. HUGHES. When was this tender put in by Mr. Dewar ?

Mr. MARTIN. In 1890. That was the only time tenders were asked for, and Mr. Dewar sent in his tender at this price.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman charges that tenders were asked for by advertisement in 1890.

Mr. MARTIN. That is my information.

Mr. HAGGART. The Postmaster General could not furnish it at once four years ago. I was Postmaster General at that time, and if the hon. gentleman says so, it must be correct, but I will find out.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not state it on my own knowledge, but I have been told so by a person in whom I have every confidence, and I have every reason to believe it is correct. But I do know that in 1894, Mr. Dewar was prepared to make the tender, because I had communications from the party from whom I got the information, prior to the time when the contract expired in 1894, telling me that all the tenders had been sent in in 1890, and that Mr. Dewar was at that time prepared to do the work for $60 a week. Since then, I have received other letters in which it has been stated that the parties understood that the contract had been renewed. That is the information I received this afternoon, and the Postmaster General agrees that it has been renewed, and that no tenders were asked for, but it was done upon the inspector's report. The Minister of the Interior justifies the inspector's report because that is a lonely country up there, and it is expensive to carry the mails. But it is surely no justification for the Government to give $7,000 for a work if it is only worth $3,000. to say that it is an expensive work to perform. Seven thousand dollars is a large sum to be paid for this work. The contract expires, and no excuse whatever has been made to justify the department in not asking for tenders.

Mr. HAGGART. The gravamen of the hon. gentleman's charge is this, that tenders were asked for at first, that there was only one offer for $3,200, in 1890, and the contract was given to another person for $7,000.

Mr. MARTIN. That is exactly, as to 1890.

Mr. HAGGART. I was Postmaster General at the time. I think the hon. gentleman must be mistaken, I am sure his information must be incorrect.

Mr. HUGHES. Why did not the hon. gentleman put a question on the Order papers so that his information might be obtained in time ?

Mr. MARTIN. Early in the session I did give a notice of motion asking for papers, and I intended to make these remarks then. But that motion was passed while I was absent one day, when the House was going through unopposed motions, and a friend of mine moved it on my behalf, not knowing that I wished to make some remarks. That motion was passed three or four weeks ago, and no return has yet been laid before the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are you sure it was so long ago that you moved for the papers ?

Mr. MARTIN. I am sure it was three or four weeks ago. But there is a further charge, that in 1894 no tenders whatever were asked for. Now, if it is true that in 1890 a tender was received for $3,200, that makes the failure to ask for tenders in 1894 all the worse. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me in that.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, if your premises are correct.

Mr. MARTIN. If it is correct that in 1890 the department had an opportunity to get this work done for $3,200 that they deliberately refused to accept, and gave it to another man for $7,049, and then, four

years afterwards they deliberately renewed the contract with the same contractors without any tenders being asked for at all, the committee will see that it is a very serious matter. It is not a two penny ha' penny matter. It is probably the largest contract, with few exceptions, made in Canada for carrying the mails. So far as the Government are concerned, I think they have offered no justification for their course.

Department of Trade and Commerce—Outside service..... $19,100

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why cannot you do with $10.000 for expenses in connection with the negotiation of treaties, or in extension of commercial relations, instead of the $15,000 that you are asking for now ?

Mr. FOSTER. Because they have extended, notably in one instance, Australia, where we have sent an agent to do work with the different Australian colonies. The item is to extend the agencies a great deal, as may be found elsewhere.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suggested to the Minister last year the propriety of distributing amongst the members of the House, three or four copies of the chief reports of the English consuls abroad. They would cost very little. Every member knows who the traders and men of commercial enterprise are in his constituency. The information would be most valuable, and there is nothing we could publish on our own account that would not cost far more, and contain infinitely less information.

Mr. FOSTER. I will remember that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would support my hon. friend's representations. I have looked over some of those English consular reports. They are made with great care, and they are of great service, indeed, to English merchants. They ought to be distributed here, if they could be obtained from the English office for any reasonable sum.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know from the Minister what he expects to accomplish in sending an agent to Australia at a cost of $5,000 a year. Does he expect to increase the importation of frozen meat, and many other articles to come into competition with the producers of this country ? It is quite clear that the interest of the farmers is a matter of secondary consideration. The Government cannot accomplish anything to promote the farmers' interests by sending a commercial agent to Australia, although they might further manufacturing interests.

Dominion Lands..... $117,022

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. While I do not object to the reductions made in the salaries, I want to know the principle on which they are made. In regard to the commissioner, why has his salary been reduced, or has the hon. gentleman appointed a new commissioner ?

Mr. DALY. Mr. Smith remains commissioner, and the reduction was made with his consent. Other reductions amounting to $200 each were made in salaries of the superintendent of mines, Mr. Pearce, of Mr. Gordon, inspector, and of the secretary, Mr. Burpee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Winnipeg office should be abolished, for no staff is required there except an agent. It is duplicating the business in a most unnecessary way, and the actual amount of work coming into the office might be performed by a single individual.

Mr. DALY. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Government appointed a Civil Service Commission in 1891, and that commission recommended the abolition of the Winnipeg office. It was pointed out that at the time the office was established the Canadian Pacific Railway had not been built, and that office was necessary to save time.

Mr. DALY. The office is absolutely necessary and will have to be continued, possibly with not the same number of clerks, and the staff will be gradually reduced. The hon. member for Bothwell is mistaken in regard to duplication of work. The work done there is surprising. It is necessary to have some person as commissioner who is in touch with the people of Manitoba and the Northwest. Under the Dominion Lands Act all applications for patents come before him and he countersigns them, and immediately this is done a homesteader can deal with it the same as if a patent was issued. There are continually such applications before him for decision. He has also many other duties to perform, and I am satisfied that for years to come it will be absolutely necessary in order to conduct the business satisfactorily to have a commissioner there.

Mr. McMULLEN. It might be necessary to keep an agent there. I give the hon. Minister the opinion of the whole Civil Service Commission, which was appointed to investigate the civil service, both inside and out, and that commission dealt particularly with the Winnipeg office and declared that there was no possible excuse for continuing it in existence. I give the commission's decision in reply to the statement of the Minister of the Interior.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here we are charged $117,000 for Dominion lands chargeable to income, $75,000 for Dominion lands chargeable to capital, and then there is an expenditure of $100,000 at headquarters, making altogether about $300,000, while our

total receipts from the North-west were barely $158,000 according to the statement supplied here by the Finance Minister. So it takes $2 in our North-west to collect $1. There is no use in disguising that the people of Canada have very just cause of complaint. I cannot understand how, when the total receipts of the whole North-west from sales of land, timber limits and ranches, are only $158,000, it is necessary to spend $300,000 for staff.

Mr. DALY. Where is the revenue to come from ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We should not expend the money.

Mr. DALY. Where are we to derive the revenue ? Pre-emptions having been abolished our revenue from that source has ceased ; the only revenue we can expect is from the sale of Dominion lands, and the railway companies having lands for sale are strong competitors. The revenue is one which may decrease instead of increase, but the expenditure as regards the agencies will have to be continued. It is impossible to measure the expenditure by the receipts in this case. It is necessary to have the agents to conduct the business of the department and encourage settlers. If we were receiving $2.50 an acre for pre-emptions, the hon. gentleman might have reason to take exception, but we are deriving no revenue except from timber and the sources I have mentioned, and the revenue cannot be expected to meet the expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a very strong argument for cutting down the expenditure.

Mr. DALY. It has been cut down as far as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have the strongest possible objection to the way business is conducted in the North-west Territories. Any man of business habits could conduct the Interior Department for about one-third the present amount, and no doubt the same results would follow. The salaries of the outside service amount to $40.000, the expense of travelling is $30,000, then there are other expenditures for Dominion land agencies amounting to $41,000. I do not believe if the department was conducted on business principles that we need to spend half, or perhaps one-third of the sum we are now expending, and it is high time for the Canadian public at large to demand that the North-west expenses should be very materially reduced. We have a deficit of $4,500,000, according to the statement of the Finance Minister, and here we are only receiving $150,000 revenue and spending $300,000 in collecting it. No wonder we have a deficit of $4,500,000.

Customs—Collection of Revenue..... $874,285

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see there are very considerable reductions here and I would like to ask on what principle the hon. gentleman has made them ? Was he very extravagant before or is he extra economical now ?

Mr. WALLACE. We are getting more economical. I have gone through each port myself and we are superannuating a number of the old officers, some of them 70 or 80 years of age. We are proposing to make the men work harder than they did before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About what number of officials have been superannuated ?

Mr. WALLACE. About fifteen, and every one of the offices is abolished.

Mr. McMULLEN. What reduction is made in the matter of printing ?

Mr. WALLACE. In the old days when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power newspaper advertising amounted to many thousands of dollars. Last year we spent not a dollar, except for advertising unclaimed goods. The printing is now done at the Bureau, and consists of the necessary forms and books for officers which must be printed if the business is to be carried on.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad to find that the hon. gentleman is reducing the expenditure in connection with advertising.

Mr. WALLACE. We are not reducing the expenses because we have none at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will give the hon. gentleman what has been spent by his Government in advertising in the several newspapers for the eight years between 1887 and 1894. I have prepared the statement myself and it will be found to be correct.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that in the Customs Department ?

Mr. McMULLEN. It is in connection with the Government service.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the hon. gentleman ought be asked to confine it to the Customs Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman referred to what was spent by a previous Government, and I wanted to give him what this Government spent for advertising.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman can give no figures for the Customs Department, because there are none.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will give you the gross figures :

Toronto "World," $7,855.74 ; Toronto "Mail," up to 1889, and then the "Empire," $41,143.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think this is in order.

Mr. McMULLEN. The customs advertising are included in these sums.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend say that $1 of that has been spent by the Customs Department.

Mr. McMULLEN. It has been spent by the Government anyway :

The St. John "Sun" got $88,036.08 ; the Regina "Leader" got $39,279.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The whole amount in the Estimates is $15,000. and the hon. gentleman has already given about $150,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. There are only a few more items. and the remark of the Controller of Customs make it necessary that I should give them :

The Yarmouth "Times" got $22,608 ; the Charlottetown "Examiner," $12,377 ; the Halifax "Herald," $62,603 ; the Moncton "Times," $83,-908 ; the Montreal "Gazette," $44,408 ; the Quebec "Chronicle," $32,365.

That has all been drawn by each of these papers in eight years.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the Controller of Customs if he has done anything with regard to getting an examining warehouse close to the post office at Winnipeg ?

Mr. WALLACE. I have made application to the Minister of Public Works with regard to getting accommodation for the small parcels and packages in the post office. I have not been able to accomplish anything with regard to the examining warehouse.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me why he has not been able to accomplish anything ?

Mr. WALLACE. For the simple reason that it would cost many thousands of dollars. We have got a good examining warehouse now as the hon. gentleman knows, although it is true that it is not in the centre of the city. It is not in the centre of the city, it is true ; but for commercial purposes, there are no complaints of any extent about it. I met the merchants of Winnipeg when I was up there last December, and their only complaint was on account of postal parcels having to be taken to the custom-house, a considerable distance. I promised to try to have that remedied, and I expect to have it remedied in a short time. They also mentioned that it would be a convenience to have the examining warehouse nearer the centre of the city ; but there would be an inconvenience in that as well, because it would not do to have the examining warehouse there without the custom-house also.

Mr. MARTIN. It strikes me the hon. gentleman could make this arrangement without any increased cost. The Dominion lands office occupies a considerable portion of the Government building, and it is not very important, it might be removed to the present custom-house, and the custom-house given the flat now occupied by the land office. I am inclined to think that since the election has been removed a little further off, the hon. gentleman is not so active as he was at the time he met the merchants.

Mr. WALLACE. If the custom-house were removed to the post office building, we would have to have an examining warehouse adjacent to it. I made an examination as to that with our inspector, and we found that the lowest price for which we could get a suitable examining warehouse would be $2,700.

Mr. MARTIN. I am satisfied that is away beyond the mark.

Mr. DALY. I may say that the matter has been discussed between the collector of customs and myself. There is no objection on our part to going to the custom-house and giving up the flat we occupy in the post office. The only question is the question of expense.

Mr. MARTIN. I know a building at the rear of the post office, belonging to Mr. Mitchell, which could be got for $1,200.

Resolutions reported.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending on the 30th June, 1896, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,

Ottawa, July, 1895.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That the Message of His Excellency the Governor General be referred to the Committee of Supply.

He said : These Estimates are only such as are necessary because of changes which have been made in the main Estimates. For instance, the hon. Minister of Militia had to make savings in the main Estimates sufficient to drill the active corps of the cities. To do that he had to strike out certain items. The sum of $8,000 in these Estimates is to make up for that. Then, in the rearrangement of the Estimates for culling timber, which involves no more expense to the country, an item of $14,000 has to be provided for. A sum of $1,000 is asked for the family of the late Senator Burns, in which I think the whole House will concur.

There are two or three other items which are simply rearrangements of items in the main Estimates.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I shall not say very much about these Supplementary Estimates, but what arrangement of business will the hon. gentleman have for Monday ?

Mr. FOSTER. We will take Bills and Supply, or may be, instead of Supply, go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What particular Bills ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say generally there is the North-west Territories Representation Act, the Lead Smelting, the Bill to amend the Customs Act, and two or three Bills by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman intend to proceed with the amendment to the Superannuation Act ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think I shall. I will not say positively.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 15th July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WINDING UP ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 144) to amend the Winding Up Act, being chapter one hundred and twenty-nine of the Revised Statutes. He said : This is a short Bill, and is for the purpose of making applicable in the various provinces the practice and procedure in regard to the discovery of assets of judgment debtors.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXEMPTIONS UNDER THE INSURANCE ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 145) to authorize the Treasury Board to exempt sundry societies from the operation of the Insurance Act. He said : The object of this Bill is to give power to the Treasury Board to exempt certain classes of insurance societies from the operation of the Insurance Act. Take, for instance, the organizations of the Railroad Engineers, Conductors and Brakemen. These classes of employees have among themselves associations for insurance against death and against accidents, the benefits being confined to their own members. They are a class of men who are either formally prohibited from insuring in other societies, or they are practically prohibited by the high rates that are charged for men in such hazardous occupations. These societies have been carrying on their operations for some time on the supposition that they are exempted under section 43 of the Insurance Act. However, it is their practice to give the amount for which the member is insured upon total disability as well as upon death, so that in that way they carry on accident as well as life insurance. They have been prosecuted in several instances by certain informers, who are endeavouring to recover penalties in that way. It is proposed by this Bill, to give the Treasury Board power to exempt such a society, if the case appears to be one worthy of it. I submitted the matter, which is one of real hardship to railroad engineers and brakemen and conductors, to the Superintendent of Insurance, who, after looking into it very thoroughly, recommended that this course should be pursued. I may say, that in the province of Ontario, they are exempted by Act of the province itself. This would put them in the same position in relation to the Dominion Act that they now are in as regards the Ontario Insurance Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it confined to this one class of societies ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes ; to this class of societies that does not carry on a general insurance business, so that it is clear from possibilities of abuse in that way.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does it extend to benefit societies having insurance organizations of their own ?

Mr. FOSTER. You may say that the railroad men have an insurance scheme of their own, for their members pay these fees and the members or their successors get the benefits. This Bill does not refer to those having regular insurance features and doing a general business to any in whose case it is clearly established that hardship exists.

Mr. MULOCK. Of course, it is premature to discuss, the Bill at this stage, while judging from the remarks of the Finance Minister, the recommendation may be perfectly proper to exempt the societies named from the operation of the Insurance Act, yet the general character of the recommendation may be open to criticism. If we are to understand from the explanation of the hon. Minister, that, without rhyme or reason or without following any statutory lines, the Superintendent of Insurance, or the Government of the day, can, of its own volition, exempt from the provisions of the Insurance Act any associations that may be successful in applying, I think it is a very wide power to vest in any Government. The legislation, I think, should prescribe lines upon which the discretion of the Government can be exercised.

Mr. FOSTER. It does.

Mr. MULOCK. When the Bill is printed, we shall see whether it is open to what I consider as an objection. I do not wish these remarks to be considered as hostile to the particular society named. The only reason that makes it necessary for the society that has been cited to apply for relief is that its insurance branch is not confined to life insurance, and section 43 of the Insurance Act exempts only those associations that pay at death, and not those that pay because of disability. I hope that when the Bill is printed it will appear that distinct lines are laid down on which alone the Government's discretion can be exercised.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not rise to offer any objection to the Bill, but to point out that great difficulties have been found in deciding as to the proper interpretation of the law. It is certainly most unhappily worded. I would suggest to my hon. friend that this would be a good opportunity of making clear what the Government think it means, and what it has been held by one of the courts to mean, but as to which there is great difference of opinion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WHARF ON THE ISLAND OF ORLEANS.

Mr. CASEY (for Mr. Langelier) asked, How much has the Government expended on the works of the St. Laurent wharf on the Island of Orleans, and what was the cost of the storehouse built on the said wharf, and what has been done with the timber, iron and other materials remaining after the completion of the works on the said wharf ?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. The wharf at St. Laurent was originally constructed in 1866, and the cost of the original work was $23,594.42. In 1890-91 an extension was built, which cost $7,841.87 ; making a total of $31,436.29. 2. In 1893 an expenditure of $665 was authorized for the construction of an open freight shed on the wharf, and repairs to the planking, about $450 being the cost of the shed, and $215 being expended on repairs. 3. The department is informed by the resident engineer that he is not aware that any materials of any kind were left after the completion of the work.

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. CASEY (for Mr. Langelier) asked, What is the annual revenue of the Three Rivers Harbour Commission ? What are the annual expenses of the said commission, for salaries and all other expenditure ? Is the Three Rivers Harbour Commission in debt to the Government. If so, the details of such indebtedness ?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. The total revenue for the year 1894 was $7,164.02. 2. The expenses for the same year were $5,858.91, being as follows :—

Salaries and commissions.....	$1,634	18
Current expenses	369	63
Rent	200	00
Printing and stationery.....	90	27
Travelling, &c.....	61	40
Refunds	12	36
Engineer's office, and repairs....	300	47
Construction and property.....	211	95
Interest and debentures.....	1,978	65
Notes redeemed	1,000	00
Total.....	5,858	91

3. As per the reply of the Minister of Finance on the 8th instant (page 4099 of the unrevised edition) the Three Rivers Harbour Commission owed the Government on 30th June last, for loan, $81,760.97 ; arrears of interest, $30,479.24 ; arrears and interest thereon on account of sinking fund, $8,751.82. There is a sum of $800.52 at credit of the sinking fund.

CHARLES LEDUC.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, Is Charles Leduc in the employ of the Government ? If so, what position does he occupy and what salary does he receive ? Did he ever visit his office during the year ending 30th June, 1895, and if so, on how many days was he present ? What amounts have been paid to him in the way of salary and for other reasons during the years 1891-92-93 and 1894 ?

Mr. FOSTER. 1. Yes. 2. He is paymaster of the Ottawa River Works branch of the Department of Public Works, and receives a salary of $100 per month. 3. Yes, but no written record was kept of such attendance. Mr. Leduc's work is principally outside work as paymaster. 4. In 1891-92 the salary was $1,200 ; other expenses, $86.31 ; 1892-93, salary, $1,200 ; other expenses, $82.37 ; 1893-94, salary, $1,200.

COLLECTOR OF TOLLS AT GRENVILLE.

Mr. CHRISTIE asked, Has the Government made any inquiry into the position of Mr. Alexander Pridham, collector of tolls at Grenville, and has the Government given permission to said Mr. Pridham to carry on a general business as merchant in the name of his clerk ?

Mr. HAGGART. In 1893 the attention of the Government was drawn to the fact that Mr. Alexander Pridham, collector of tolls, Grenville Canal, was keeping a general store, when he was informed that he would either have to resign his position or give up his store. He elected to retain his official position and gave up his store. If his son keeps a store, so far as is known, he has a right to do so.

W. W. OGILVIE'S CLAIM FOR DRAWBACK.

Mr. MACDONALD (for Mr. Lister) asked. Has W. W. Ogilvie made a claim for drawback of duty paid on imported corn ? If so, when was such claim made and what was the amount claimed ? Was the claim supported by affidavit or statutory declaration ? If so, what was the name of the person who swore to the same ? What was the name of the official before who it was sworn ? Under what circumstances would he be entitled to the drawback ? Is the affidavit in the possession of the Government ? Has an investigation been ordered or made in respect of such claim ? If so, who is the official who made it ? What was his report ? How much money has been paid to the said Ogilvie by way of drawback of duty on imported corn prior to his said claim, and is it the intention to pay the claim ?

Mr. WALLACE. (1.) Yes. (2.) 17th March, 1894 ; $4,339.71. (3.) Yes, by affidavit. (4.) W. W. Ogilvie, Esq. (5.) Mr. W. J. O'Hara, acting Collector of Customs at Montreal. (6.) Upon the requirements of section 15 of the Tariff Act being carried out, and the regulations prescribed by Council. The section of the Tariff Act referred to reads as follows :—

> On imported Indian corn, to be kiln-dried and ground into meal for human food, or ground into meal and kiln-dried for such use, under such regulations as are made by the Governor in Council, there may be allowed a drawback of 90 per cent of the duty paid.

Copy of the Order in Council hereto attached, which may be read if desirable. (7.) No. (8.) An investigation was made previous to such claim. (9.) Mr. McLaughlin, Tide Surveyor of Customs at Montreal. (10.) That it was not clear that all corn upon which drawback had been claimed had been used solely for human food. (11.) $16,807.74 ; the claim which is now standing will only be paid provided claimant establishes that all meal the product of such corn was sold and used only for human food. I may say that the only claim was paid March 3rd, 1893, $751.88. One was paid on 16th January, 1893, of $675. No more was paid in my time.

Mr. CASEY. Has the $16,000 odd been paid ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Where is your affidavit ?

Mr. WALLACE. Perhaps the hon. member for Grey can tell.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BOYLE. I call the attention of the House to omissions in the Votes and Proceedings of Wednesday last, 10th July. A division was taken on the amendment moved by the hon. member for East York, that said Bill be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to add the following clause : Then follows the clause, setting out that the rate charged should not be more than two cents per mile. On that division I voted nay. I find my name is omitted from the division list. On Friday, 12th July, an amendment was moved by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), on going into Committee of Supply, relating to the appointment of Lieutenant-Governors. A division was taken on the amendment. I voted nay, but I find my name omitted.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to ask the Postmaster General when the papers relating to the letting of mail contract between Battleford and Saskatoon will be brought down ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The return has been ordered, and I expect it will be brought down at an early day. I take advantage of this opportunity to give the hon. gentleman some information in relation to that contract to which the hon. gentleman referred when the Estimates were under discussion. I learned from my department that no tender was received from Mr. Dewar in regard to the mail contract which was under discussion.

Mr. MARTIN. Was that 1890 ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. No tender was received ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, and there was no tender asked for and no advertisement published asking for tenders. That is the information I have received, and I thought it desirable to give it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. When may I expect the papers to be brought down regarding shipments of American cattle across the frontier?

Mr. MONTAGUE. All these returns are being hurried, and I wrote a note on Saturday to the department with reference to that particular return. I hope to have it here to-morrow.

WRECK OF STEAMSHIP "MEXICO."

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to inquire from the Government if they have had any official information of the wreck of the steamer "Mexico" in the Straits of Belle Isle, this vessel having on board the first cargo of dairy produce sent by the Government under the cold storage system as an experiment? Do the Government intend to make immediate provision for another experimental shipment? I hold that such a course should be followed, and those engaged in the trade would like to know the Government's intention.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can answer part of the question put by the hon. gentleman. The steamer "Mexico" has been wrecked. A telegram was received by my department this morning stating that the vessed was in a wreck and in danger of foundering, and calling for a Government steamer to go and aid the vessel. Finding there was no danger to life, I did not think it was a case where a Government steamer should be sent.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In answer to the other part of the question, I may say that the next ship will be the "Dominion" of the same line, which will leave Montreal on 18th July, with cold storage facilities.

PAYMENT OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BRYSON. I desire to inquire if the Government has decided to place Bill (No. 23) on the Government Orders? This is the Bill to which I drew attention about ten days ago. It is one of very great importance, and I should like to ask the Government if they have formed a decision as to what course they will adopt?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government have not decided to place the Bill in question on the Government Orders. It is a Bill of importance, and one which will require a great deal of care in its preparation. The statement made by the hon. gentleman showed that it is a Bill to provide a more speedy mode of collecting wages by railway employees when such are nine or ten months in arrear. A great deal of consideration and care will be required in drafting a suitable Bill in order to provide that some railway corporations shall not be, to a certain extent, blackmailed. Some such measure as that proposed is required, under which a simple form of collecting wages will be provided. It is the intention of the Government to prepare a Bill in the direction of the Bill proposed by my hon. friend.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES REPRESENTATION ACT.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Mr. Daly for third reading of Bill (No. 121) further to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there are some objectionable features in this Bill which I hope the hon. gentleman will not press. There is a provision in section 2, providing that section 13 of chapter 15 be repealed, and the following substituted:—"If any elector finds his name not on the voters' list in the polling subdivision to which he belongs, he may apply to the enumerator not later than two days before polling day, to have his name added to the said list." This will make a very serious alteration in the law. My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), when the subject was up for discussion the other day, said: that this was not really a voters' list as we understand the matter at all. That is so. There is no voters' list in the North-west Territories as at all corresponding to the voters' lists in the other parts of the Dominion. The preparation of this list seems to be merely for convenience, because the law as it now stands, and which the hon. gentleman proposes to amend and alter in this one important particular, provides that a person may come forward on the day of election and then apply to have his name put upon the voters' list, and he may vote immediately after having his name so placed. What the Minister now proposes is, that a person to vote at the election must apply at least two days before the day of election. Well, the polling divisions in the North-west Territories are in many places very large. They embrace a very considerable extent of territory. The population is sparse, the number of voters few, and in, I believe, the majority of cases heretofore, the voters did not apply to have their names put upon this list until they appeared at the polls for the purpose of recording their votes. Many of these persons will now be obliged to go a long way to the returning officer in order to have their names put upon the list, and the Minister proposes to restrict practically the right to vote—which is protected against spurious voting by the provision of the oath that the persons are required to take—by insisting that the person shall at least two days before the day of polling go to the returning officer and have his name put upon the list. That will be a matter of very great inconvenience. You compel a man who resides 20 miles away from the returning officer to go to that person to have his name entered upon the list, and he no sooner reaches

home than he is obliged to set out again for the purpose of recording his vote. I can see no reason whatever for requiring the party to subscribe to a voters' list of this kind before the day of polling. The law as it stood was much more convenient than it will be by the change introduced, and I propose, Mr. Speaker: "That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee to so amend it as to strike out this provision.'

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) has already spoken on this question, and some one else will have to move the amendment.

Mr. LAURIER. I beg to move the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) cannot do so either. He moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. EDGAR moved in amendment:

That the word "now" be struck out of the motion and the words "this day six months" added at the end thereof.

Mr. DALY. I again call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that there is nothing new in the Bill before the House. We are simply making a correction that should have been made last year. In the amendment to the North-west Territories Act last session, a change was made providing, as the law now stands, that a voter might have the privilege of putting his name on the voters' list two days before the election. Previous to that the law provided that he could put it on the night before the election. The hon. gentleman anticipates, that on account of the sparse settlement of the country a person may be prejudiced, but the hon. gentleman forgets that the polling divisions for which enumerators are appointed are numerous and that no man could be prejudiced, because the districts are of such extent that any one can come to the enumerator and get his name upon the list. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) stated that it made no difference whether a man's name was upon the list or not, because he could vote in any event. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. He evidently did not read the law, because section 32 of the North-west Territories Representation Act provides as follows:—

Every enumerator, having revised and corrected such returned copy of each voters' list compiled by him, if he deems such correction necessary, as provided in the next preceding section, shall write at the foot of such copy and close to the last name thereon two days immediately preceding the polling day, a certificate in the form of the second certificate contained in form "K" in the schedule to this Act.—49 Vic., cap. 24, sec. 32—57-58 Vic., cap. 15.

Section 33 provides:

The enumerator shall deliver the voters' list so certified forthwith, or before eight o'clock in the morning of the polling day, to the deputy returning officer for the polling division to which it relates; and such list, as received by such deputy returning officer, shall be the voters' list for such polling division.—49 Vic., cap. 24, sec. 33—57-58 Vic., cap. 15.

Sections 45 and 46 provide:

45. Every person whose name is on the voters' list, unless sworn as in the next preceding section provided shall, before being permitted to vote, if required by any candidate, agent or elector, take the said oath number one, and if he refuses to take the same, erasing lines shall be drawn through his name on the voters' list, and the words "refused to be sworn" written thereafter. —49 Vic., cap. 24, sec. 45.

46. Every voter shall be entitled to vote whose name is on the voters' list and has not been erased therefrom in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Act, or whose name is added to the said list as herein provided, but if any such voter, when required by the deputy returning officer, or by any candidate, agent or elector, refuses to take oath number two in the said form "P," he shall not be permitted to vote, and if his name has been entered in the poll-book, erasing lines shall be drawn through it, and the words "refused to take oath number two" written thereafter.—49 Vic., cap. 24, sec. 46.

Therefore, according to the law as it stands, the man's name must be upon the list before he can vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about section 44?

Mr. DALY. Section 44 was repealed, and by the amendment of last session, when we introduced the ballot into the North-west Territories, section 45 of the Revised Statutes, chapter 8, applies as to the poll, and reads as follows:—

Not more than one elector for each compartment shall, at any one time, enter the room where the poll is held, and each elector upon so entering shall declare his name, surname and addition, which shall be entered or recorded by the poll clerk in the poll-book provided for that purpose, which shall be kept in the form "R" in the first schedule to this Act; and if the same are found on the list of voters for the polling district of such polling station, he shall receive from the deputy returning officer a ballot paper, on the back of which such deputy returning officer has previously put his initials, so placed that when the ballot is folded, they can be seen without opening it, and on the counterfoil to which he has placed a number corresponding to that placed opposite the voter's name on the poll-book.

His name must be upon the list before he can get a ballot paper. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) was wrong in his statement. The voter's name must be upon the list before he can vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He could have got it on when he went to vote.

Mr. DALY. No, he cannot; and he never could.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, yes.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The law previously provided that the night before polling day he could get his name upon the list.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not the provision of section 44.

Mr. DALY. That was repealed last session, and section 50 of the Dominion Act was substituted. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Act of 1894 he will find that by section 10 of the Act, certain paragraphs and sections of chapter 8 were incorporated in the Act, and amongst them clauses 51 to 55, I think, inclusive. Section 44 was repealed last session. The consequence is that the law, as it now stands, independent of the amendment which is proposed, which is only to correct a mistake made last session, is that a man can get his name put on the list only two days before the polling.

Mr. McCARTHY. If my hon. friend were right in his law, this would not be a valid objection, because it would be only bringing the notice into conformity with the amendment which the hon. Minister says was made last session. But I think the hon. gentleman will find that that amendment was not made. Section 31 was amended to provide that the enumerator, two days before the polling day, shall add to the list the name of any qualified voter that has been omitted. Section 44 provides that the deputy returning officer shall, while the poll is open, if required by any elector whose name is not on the voters' list, administer to such elector the oath, and shall then add his name to the list. That is certainly not directly amended, and I do not think it is inferentially amended by anything in the Act of last session. At the same time, I think we should not refuse to read the Bill the third time, but I propose that we should go back into committee to amend section 2 by striking out the notice, and if necessary to repeal section 44. I do not see any object in the two days limit, and it seems to me inconsistent with the other provision. We have first a provision for an enumerator, to whom any person can apply to have his name put on the list; then we have the provision that at any time before polling day an elector can have his name put on the list; and thirdly, we have the provision that he can do that on polling day. I do not see why section 31 should not prevail. I therefore propose as an amendment to the amendment:

That all the words in the amendment be struck out, and the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House with power to amend the second clause thereof by striking out "the first subsection," and that it have power "to repeal section four of 57-58 Victoria, Chapter 15."

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think my hon. and learned friend is aware of the reason why that change was made last year, amending chapter 7 of the Revised Statutes. It was found that the provision allowing men to go on the day of polling and have their names put on the list, led to false swearing. There was no time for the enumerator to inquire into their allegations, whereas if they have to make application two days before the day of polling, an inquiry can take place.

Mr. McCARTHY. That section has not been repealed.

Mr. DAVIN. I grant that. I would suggest that it would be well perhaps to go into committee in order to repeal that, and to perfect what was aimed at last session.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Section 44 in the original Act was put in after very full consideration, for the purpose of meeting the convenience of a sparse population over a very large district. My hon. friend says that to require the parties to enter their names not later than two days before polling day is a protection against fraud; but surely the hon. Minister does not propose that the enumerator shall have the power of deciding whether a party has made a false declaration or not, and whether he is entitled to have his name kept on the list or not. That is a very extraordinary power to give to an officer who might undertake to disfranchise every one in the polling division whose political opinions were different from his own. Certainly the law never contemplated giving him any such power, and I do not think we ought to give him that power now.

Mr. MARTIN. I certainly understood last year, when we discussed this matter at considerable length, that the law would be such that the voters' list would be practically of no use at all, except, as explained then by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that it would save time. By section 44 any person could vote, whether his name was on the voters' list or not, by being sworn, for his name would then be added to the list by the deputy returning officer. I do not understand that the present Bill proposes to alter that. If it did, I should have serious objections. If there is any doubt about that, I think we should make it right, for the reasons mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell. The provisions as to the preparing of voters' lists in the North-west are most crude. The list is prepared eight days before the election. There are no proper checks upon the enumerators; there are no proper methods of appeal; there is no appeal to anybody; there is no provision for bringing the voter before the enumerator; everything can be done practically in the dark, and everything is done a very short time before the election. If that voters' list is to be final, unless the person applies two days before a polling day, it certainly will be a most gross outrage. There is, as I have said, very little difference, because if a man has not got his name upon the voters' list, he can get it

on, under section 41 of the Election Act. Unless that provision remains, it certainly would be a matter which would require a very thorough discussion, and which would not be submitted to by this House without a great deal of opposition.

Mr. DALY. I have been misled by the brief before me. There has been a mistake on the part of the Clerk. And under those circumstances, I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his amendment, and the amendment of the Bill will stand until to-morrow, in order that I may look into it. I have been entirely misled by the brief before me.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it the intention of the Government to alter the law so that this may be finally completed two days before the election ?

Mr. DALY. That was the intention last session.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it the intention now ?

Mr. DALY. I will tell you to-morrow.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That would disfranchise one-half the population.

Mr. DALY. No ; it will not.

Mr. MONTAGUE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MULOCK. Inasmuch as the hon. Minister has not quite made up his mind, I would call his attention to the clause he proposes. He proposes that two days before the voting day the electors who want to be put on the list, shall make a journey to wherever the enumerator may be, no matter how long the distance, and make their application. The enumerator may reserve judgment, and the elector will not know until the voting day whether he has a vote or not, but must take his chances.

Mr. DALY. Not at all. I would ask the hon. gentleman to read section 31. That section provides that if any enumerator, at any time before posting up any voters' lists, and two days before the polling day, is fully satisfied from representations made to him by any credible person—so that the man himself does not require to go in order to have his name put on. Any credible person can have it put on.

Mr. McCARTHY. Surely, it ought not to be the law in the North-west that a man should have to take the chance of some credible person—assuming there are credible persons in the North-west—applying on his behalf. The whole of the provisions are very unusual and extreme. There is a clause allowing the enumerator to strike off voters' names, behind their backs, without any cause being shown, or any opportunity being given to show cause to the contrary. I suggest to my hon. friend that he had better reconsider the measure and see whether it would not be better to dispense altogether with the enumerator.

Mr. DALY. It has been the law since 1886, and no objections were ever made until the other day.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

PENITENTIARIES.

Bill (No. 131) to amend the Acts respecting penitentiaries (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to amend the first section by adding the words, "hereafter appointed," so as to make it apply only to future appointments, and not affect the position of any officers now employed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the meaning of the change ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At present there is a special residence either built or purchased for these officers. These were originally heated and lighted by the Government. By the Act of 1887, the salaries of the wardens were increased, and these privileges abolished. The wardens were obliged to live in houses, in several cases, larger and more expensive to maintain than they would personally select. The extra expense of heating is not great. The introduction of electric light, which will soon be universal, will reduce the cost of lighting to a small item. As regards the quarters of the deputy wardens, they are now part of the prisons ; and as a matter of fact, are heated by a system common to the building. This provision is not intended to cover fuel for culinary purposes. The excessive salaries which are making trouble in the management of prisons were based upon some theory which is contemplated by the explanation I have given—that is to say, the officers were to pay for heat and light, and so on, and the result of that has been to handicap the department in the management of the prisons. For instance, you may have a warden and a deputy warden, thoroughly good officers, who may not be in accord ; they may not work harmoniously together, and yet, while the department may be cognizant of that, it is not possible at times to make a case for the removal or the disciplining of either. Whereas, if the salaries were on a uniform basis, there would be no difficulty whatever in removing one or the other to another penitentiary, and so producing harmony.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The only change is that heretofore you have not provided free fuel and light, and now propose to do so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And reduce the salaries from what they were before.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you propose to make a reduction in the salaries which will be about equivalent to the free light and fuel ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. About equivalent in the case of a warden.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And in the case of the other, is it not so ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Taking it generally, they would be, but they vary.

Mr. MULOCK. It would be better to divide that into two sections. The first applies to light and fuel, and the second to labour. Make the words "and the" in line 9 begin subsection C.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Very well.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there any limit to the area given to wardens and deputy wardens for gardens and grounds ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Speaking from memory, I should say there was not. The area depends upon the circumstances ; any waste land that we cannot make use of——

Mr. MULOCK. It is merely a garden for their own use, I suppose. If there was any considerable tract of land——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Oh, no ; we use that ourselves. It is obligatory upon us to use that for prison purposes. What is allowed these officers is practically a vegetable garden.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Referring again to the first part of the section, if I understand it correctly, the change suggested is not to apply to existing officers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Exactly ; no existing officer will be interfered with—that is, existing officers of the rank. But in case of promotion, to the persons who become "wardens or deputy wardens," this Act will apply.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, existing wardens will not be entitled to free light and fuel ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, they get the additional salary under the arrangement of 1887.

Mr. McCARTHY. This clause seems to recognize a proprietary interest in the garden in the warden himself. I do not see how it is limited.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The clause refers to lands "attached to the residence."

Mr. McCARTHY. There is nothing to prevent him using it for his own family.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is what it is intended for.

Mr. McCARTHY. I suppose so. But, if he cultivates more than he requires for his own purposes, there is nothing to prevent him from disposing of the produce of the garden, and so virtually entering into competition with market gardeners.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We limit that. This is the old law—lands "attached to the residence"—and the practice is that we attach or detach the land.

On section 2,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This incorporates as part of the law the construction of the existing law fixed by the late Minister of Justice. The point formed the subject of discussion between the Department of Justice and the Department of Public Works, and this is intended to remove doubt.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see that the 10th section of chapter 182 of the Revised Statutes says :

> The construction and repairs of building and other works in the penitentiaries shall be under the control of the Minister of Public Works.

The amendment permits the Minister of Justice, in cases where he holds that convict labour may be used, to take charge of such works. Suppose that the Minister of Justice takes charge of the construction of such works as can be constructed by convict labour, does it become part of his duty to accept plans for buildings, advertise for architects' plans, and so on ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The system is to work in harmony with the Public Works Department. The claim was that this work should be done under the Department of Public Works. But the late Minister of Justice, after a careful examination of the whole Act, insisted upon a construction of the law in accordance with these words, he contending, practically, that where he was of opinion that convict labour could do the work, it should be taken from the control of the Minister of Public Works to that extent. But as to the plans of the works, the Department of Justice invariably resorts to the Department of Public Works.

On section 3,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In this section, after the words "Section 32 of the said Act," I would like to insert the words, "Chapter 182 of the Revised Statutes of Canada." This clause is rather important, Mr. Chairman. An anomalous practice has grown up in Canada, which the officers of the department represent, in some cases, is followed by inconvenience, if not worse

consequences, in the administration of the penitentiaries. All the officers except the surgeon and chaplain, were bound to give their full time, and were not permitted to engage in other remunerative employment. The experience of my officers agrees with that in the penitentiaries in other countries, that if you have a prison chaplain and a prison surgeon, and wish to get the benefit of their administration, they should not have any other calling for money; because, if they have outside employment for remuneration, the experience has been—in the main, though there are exceptions even in Canada—that the prison work becomes secondary and their main work is the outside work. And, as the salaries are fixed at such a figure as to make it possible for us to secure the best men as chaplains or surgeons, it is deemed best to have these officers devote themselves exclusively to the prison work.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does that apply to existing officials?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, in these cases, seeing that some of these officers have served for many years and have come in on certain conditions, many of them having abandoned all outside work, we have felt that it was not right to cut them off suddenly in a material degree, as this would do. All these provisions apply to new appointments.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why not put in a short clause that this Act shall only apply to persons hereinafter appointed?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That would be well, and I will amend the section in that respect.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think, perhaps, the committee is entitled to some information from the Minister of Justice as to what rule governs his department in the selection of chaplains for penitentiaries, as to their denomination.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have in all our penitentiaries now, under the present Act, a Roman Catholic and a Protestant chaplain, and no others.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does it follow from that arrangement that the inmates of the penitentiaries are about equally divided between Catholics and Protestants?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, speaking from memory, I think the Catholic denomination is the largest. I may say that in respect to the payment of chaplains, I think Canada is more liberal than any other country in the world, Belgium alone excepted. I think in Belgium the state pays for the chaplains. I think they allow chaplains of every denomination to attend to the prisoners. I think Canada is almost alone among the nations of the world where the state pays for the services of chaplains of the two religions.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is to my knowledge that in many of the penitentiaries of the United States, chaplains are paid a salary.

Mr. FRASER. I think we should adopt the method prevailing in Belgium. I do not believe myself in paying chaplains for work of that kind. I think it is the duty, and should be the privilege, of clergymen of all denominations, to do that work gratuitously.

On section 4,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to insert a new clause as section 4, and I move in amendment that paragraph A of section 52 is amended by striking out all the words after "convict" in the 9th line, and substituting the following: "Shall be compelled to labour on any obligatory holidays of the religious denomination to which he adheres."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that possible? I do not think those parties adhere to any.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is an optional clause, and it enables us to respect the religious convictions of each denomination in the prison.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was suggesting to the hon. gentleman that none of them have any.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They are supposed to have those of the sect to which they belong.

Mr. CHARLTON. How would the hon. gentleman do in the case of the Seventh Day Baptists, who observe Saturday as the Sabbath?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We shall have to study their faith and respect their prejudice.

On section 5,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A memo. has been handed to me setting forth the unfairness of the operation of the present section. For instance, if an official was appointed on the 2nd day of last July, he would not get his annual increment until the 1st July, 1896; while an official appointed two days previously, would secure his increment on the 1st July, 1895.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is the statutory increment?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, each year.

On section 6,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentlemen have the Bill before them as to what is proposed. I will run over the salaries of some of the officials, beginning with the wardens:

Penitentiary.	Officer.	Minimum Salary.	Maximum Salary.	Present Salary.
Kingston	Warden	$2,600	$3,000	$3,000
St. Vincent de Paul	do	2,800	2,800	2,800
Dorchester	do	2,000	2,400	2,400
Manitoba	do	2,000	2,400	2,100
British Columbia	do	2,000	2,400	2,300 late warden.
Kingston	Deputy Warden	1,200	1,500	1,500
St. Vincent de Paul	do	1,200	1,500	1,500
Dorchester	do	1,100	1,400	1,400
Manitoba	do	900	1,200	1,000
British Columbia	do	900	1,200	1,400
Kingston	Accountant	800	1,200	1,000
St. Vincent de Paul	do	800	1,100	1,100
Dorchester	do	800	1,000	1,000
Manitoba	do	800	1,100	950
British Columbia	do	800	1,100	1,000 late salary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With reference to wardens and deputy wardens, the hon. gentleman adopts the minimum, and in fixing the salary for the future appointments of accountants, he adopts the maximum.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Looking over the field, I have taken the opinions of men who have had large experience, and the salaries given are sufficient to enable the Government to secure the services of thoroughly good men. The amount to be paid surgeons is $1,500. At the present time the rates are: Kingston, $1,400 to $1,800; St. Vincent de Paul, $1,000 to $1,400; Dorchester, $1,200 to $1,400; Manitoba, $1,000 to $1,200; British Columbia, $600. In two cases Parliament has been voting $200 over the maximum for many years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So the hon. gentleman is going to increase the salary paid to the surgeon in British Columbia.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, in some cases there is quite a levelling up, because the differences have been most extraordinary, and without reason. In a large penitentiary such as Kingston the warden has a very large staff, while in a small penitentiary the warden has a small staff. There is no system at present prevailing in regard to salaries. Under this Bill we propose to have the system of uniformity and the benefits flowing from it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. gentleman state what is the average number of inmates in the British Columbia penitentiary, as compared with the average number in St. Vincent de Paul?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Speaking off-hand, about half.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it considered fair to give them the same salary?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Kingston affords a good illustration. The salary of the surgeon is $1,500 and there are 490 convicts; Dorchester has half that number. Under this Bill there would be uniformity as regards salary. I say the proposed system is the right one, for this reason, that in the case of Dorchester the warden has only half the staff to assist him. In Kingston, where there is a large number of prisoners, there is a very large staff, and the duties of the warden at Kingston and at Dorchester are exactly the same.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How does that argument apply to the case of a surgeon who has not a staff under him? In some penitentiaries the duties of a surgeon would be two or three times as large as the duties of a similar officer in other institutions.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No doubt one officer may have heavier work than another, particularly in the case of a surgeon in one of the large penitentiaries. If we pay a sufficient sum to make it obligatory on the medical men to give their exclusive attention to a penitentiary, that is all we can do. No doubt in some prisons the surgeon will have less to do, though according to this system each surgeon will be drawing the same salary. This, however, will be a great improvement over the system that now obtains, where these physicians take outside practice and receive in some cases a sum far below that to which they are fairly entitled, and we take care to pay a sufficient salary to obtain the services of intelligent and able men.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the proposal of the hon. gentleman is not a reasonable one. Take the case of a physician who is employed at a penitentiary where there are very few convicts. If he is denied the right to practice outside, he will certainly in a few years not be well qualified to discharge his duties. He would be very much more efficient if he were to engage in outside practice, but of course it should only be to such an extent as not to interfere with his duties in the penitentiary. Where an officer has a large number of convicts to look after, whether he is warden or physician,

his responsibilities are greater and he is entitled to a larger salary than such an officer in a penitentiary with a smaller number of convicts. It will be a great mistake to undertake to pay a small salary to an officer, especially a physician or surgeon, and provide that he shall not engage in any practice whatever outside his official position. It was simply condemning a man to become rusty in his profession, and every year he would be less qualified to discharge his duties. The same observation may be made with respect to wardens, for a warden in a large penitentiary has greater danger to face and much greater responsibility is resting on him to see that none escape and that proper order is maintained in the institution than a similar officer in a small penitentiary. The Minister in undertaking to reduce the salaries in cases even where a large amount of work is to be performed, and to introduce a system of uniformity, is laying down a rule that will be far more objectionable than the one which now exists.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It will be found that the Government have provided an ample sum of money to pay the medical staff, judging by other institutions, such as public hospitals where a large number of patients require attendance and where the work is very hard. It is impossible to devise any system having this object in view that will prove actually satisfactory on all these points. In British Columbia penitentiary, for example, and in Manitoba penitentiary, there are 100 inmates in each case, but the physician of the former receives $1,200 and of the latter, $600; and so the whole list of salaries might be gone through and considered. Two points are to be gained by this Bill: first, we provide a sufficient sum to get good men; and second, having done that, we are able to move these men from point to point as occasion requires without doing injustice to any of them. The saving will be considerable, and we have only struck off abnormal increases that have been made in the past.

Mr. McCARTHY. Why does the hon. gentleman make a distinction between an accountant and storekeeper, and state in the Bill that an accountant shall only get a salary provided the inmates number 300. What provision is made in case the number of inmates does not reach 300, and what is the distinction between warden, accountant and other officers?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The provision referred to does not affect the question of salary. Each officer is to be paid $1,200, and in penitentiaries where there are 300 inmates the accountant is also to act as warden's clerk.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the Minister intend to apply the same principle to chaplains as he does to physicians?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I presume there would be not more than seven or eight Roman Catholic convicts in Stony Mountain penitentiary. At present I understand the chaplain gets about $600 a year, and I am sure he is scarcely ever there, while the Protestant chaplain remains at the penitentiary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In this case, he would have to be there. We ask both the chaplains and the physicians to give their exclusive time and attention to the penitentiaries, and we cannot, of course, count noses every day. I frankly admit that the work will fall on some chaplains and some surgeons less heavily than on others. By having the exclusive attention of those officers it will remove some of the complaints that have been made. One of the objections from prisoners' aid societies is based on the fact that these officers sometimes look upon the convicts as a secondary consideration, their main work being somewhere else. The officers do not take such pride in their work as they would, if the convicts happen to be their sole charge. The hon. gentleman is right in the case of Manitoba. One religious denomination would be comparatively small, but the amount involved is also small.

Mr. MARTIN. What would be the salary of the chaplain in Manitoba?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At present it is $1,000 in one case, and $800 in the other. If there is any new appointment made, both these chaplains will be paid $800 a year.

Mr. MARTIN. The Protestant chaplain lives there and devotes his whole time to the work, as most of the convicts are Protestants. The Roman Catholic chaplain could not possibly find anything to do the whole time if he were there. He is a priest and has considerable other duties. It does seem absurd to employ a man and keep him there all the time and pay him $800 a year, when he has got only seven or eight to attend to, and, at the same time, to pay the other man the same sum for looking after eighty or ninety. The present salary seems to be altogether too large for the work involved.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Justice, if I understood him correctly, said that as the medical officers were at present paid only a small salary, they generally devoted most of the time to outside practice, and made the penitentiary practice subsidiary to their private practice so that the convicts did not get their best attention. The hon. gentleman states that under the present Bill it is intended to give the medical men what would be considered a reasonable salary for their whole time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it provided by this Bill that the medical man, when so employed, cannot exercise his right as a medical man, either in consultation or practice, or in any way, outside of the penitentiary?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes; he is to be the prison surgeon, exclusively.

Mr. SPROULE. In the event of his doing any other practice, in consultation, or otherwise, does the Bill prevent him taking a fee for that?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Your arrangements, of course, might provide that, but I do not imagine that they would interfere with his right under his diploma.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We say that so long as he is our surgeon, he must be our surgeon exclusively, as is the case in large hospitals. It has been represented with great force, that, as we require medical officers, we ought to have good men, who should be our own officers exclusively, as is the case in every well-conducted prison. It is thought better that they should not be at the beck and call of a general practice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They cannot remain fit for the discharge of their duties if they are confined to a small institution, and not allowed to practice outside.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have got but few penitentiaries, and the most of them are removed quite a distance from the city, such as Kingston, Stony Mountain, and Dorchester. It would seem that the surgeon in these cases ought to be very near the prison.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that this provision is an injustice to the medical profession, and to the neighbourhood in which the penitentiary is situated. Many of these penitentiaries have only a limited number of prisoners, and the time of a medical man cannot be amply occupied in attending to 300 persons, even if half of them are sick, which is not the case. There would be only a small percentage sick, and the result would be that a medical man, knowing that his salary and living were assured, might become rusty in his profession. He would not have the same stimulus as if he were doing a much more extensive practice. On the other hand, it is to be supposed that these men are competent in their profession, and I respectfully submit, that being so, the community should not be denied the benefit of their skill, when it might occasionally be called into requisition, either in consultation or in cases of emergency. Suppose that an accident should happen, and that no other doctor than the medical officer of the penitentiary were available, should the fact that he was connected with the penitentiary prevent him from giving assistance or advice? That provision seems to be almost unreasonable.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is pressing it a little far. I do not suppose that Parliament expects the Department of Justice to close its eyes and ears to all human sympathy. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has now suggested that a terrible accident might happen near a penitentiary, and that one of those surgeons might feel that he was not at liberty to render assistance. I do not think there is anything in the spirit of the Act to prevent that, nor was it for a moment contemplated to prevent the surgeon rendering assistance in such cases. The whole point is that he is to be exclusively our officer. At present our difficulty is that he is only incidentally our officer, and chiefly interested in private practice. In the case of these serious accidents referred to by the hon. gentleman, it may be half a day sometimes before the services of the surgeon can be obtained under the present arrangement. Under this Bill his first duty would be to the prisoners.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not provide, then, that his first duty shall be to the prisoners. Do not prevent him discharging any other duties so long as they do not interfere with his attendance at the prison.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This will do no injustice to any man, as it does not apply to any surgeon at present in the service. Every future appointee will know the provisions of this Bill before he enters the service. But I feel that I am not speaking without the book, having some knowledge of the practice in other institutions. In our own country, some of the most brilliant men now in the medical profession have spent a large portion of their lives in this work for a very small sum of money; and the sum provided for here is, comparatively speaking, exceedingly generous.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to the sum, nor do I say it is not adequate compensation; but I do object to the contention that a medical man who attends a hundred prisoners for twenty years is just as efficient as the one who attends a thousand, because the one is able to be actively engaged in his profession and to keep up with the times, while the other is provided for, whether he does little or nothing, and he has no stimulus to keep up with the times. Then, some of these men are experts in a particular line, for instance, in typhoid fever or diphtheria, and I do not think it would be incompatible with the requirements of the situation that their services should be available for consultation, without encroach-

ing upon the rules of the prison to such an extent as to call for their dismissal.

Mr. CORBOULD. I notice that the number of convicts in the Manitoba penitentiary is about the same as the number in the British Columbia penitentiary, while the doctor in the former is paid about double the amount paid to the doctor in the latter. I would like to ask why there is this difference ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am removing the difference. I see no reason for it whatever. I take the ground that where the responsibilities and duties are the same, the poorest way to ascertain the compensation to be allowed is to count the number of heads requiring attention. I think all we should do is to provide adequate remuneration for proper and competent men, and appoint only such, and, when we find that they are incompetent, get rid of them.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would ask the Minister of Justice what saving he estimates will be effected when the schedule of salaries is in full operation in all the penitentiaries ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. $4,000 odd per year.

Mr. McCARTHY. It seems to me a rather scandalous affair to which the hon. member for Winnipeg has drawn attention, that a gentleman there gets $800 a year for attending to three or four convicts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. $800 for the Catholic chaplain and $1,000 for the Protestant.

Mr. McCARTHY. It does appear to me that we are going too far in laying down cast-iron rules for application in every case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is one of the points in which the present system is equally weak. At St. Vincent de Paul the convicts are nearly all Roman Catholics, and there the chaplains are paid in the same way. So that Manitoba and St. Vincent de Paul set off each other.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am afraid two wrongs do not make a right. The difficulty might be arranged by providing that these shall be the maximum salaries, leaving power to the Governor in Council to reduce them to a reasonable figure. But to keep a priest like a stalled ox for three or four convicts seems to me absurd.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUUPER. I think it would really be a small piece of work, in regard to salaries of this kind, to follow the suggestion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)—and I say that quite respectfully— and to endeavour to reconcile differences amounting to only a few hundred dollars. Under my system, in Manitoba, owing to the predominance of one religion, one chaplain will have comparatively little to do. So, in St. Vincent de Paul, the chaplain of another faith will have comparatively little to do. But the men who occupy these positions must be ready to change places—to go anywhere according to the exigencies of the public service ; and the department will not be handicapped by any question as to what they are paid at their different posts. I think that circumstance compensates for the discrepancy in the pay-list. The other suggestion of the hon. member would, I fear, put upon the Department of Justice more trouble than the whole thing is worth. A man comes in with his eyes open, and knows what men of certain rank are paid, no matter what their religion or where they are to be sent ; and there will be far less grumbling that at present. At present the files of the department are filled with representations, many of them most ingenious, in regard to the pay granted for services rendered ; but under this system, men knowing at the start what they are to have, will have little reason to complain. One or two cases such as those that have been mentioned, ought not to be allowed to break up the whole plan.

Mr. DALY. I understood the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) to say that the present Roman Catholic chaplain of the Manitoba penitentiary, Father Cloutier, had only five or six convicts under his charge.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not confine myself to any number.

Mr. DALY. If the hon. gentleman will look at the report of the Minister, he will find that Father Cloutier had twenty-two convicts under his charge, and the Protestant chaplain, the Rev. Mr. Goulding, had fifty-four under his charge on the 30th of June. If you take St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, you will find that on the same date there were sixty Protestant convicts and 299 Catholic convicts. So that if you take the total number of both penitentiaries, you find that relatively Father Cloutier has more to administer to than has the Protestant chaplain at St. Vincent de Paul.

Mr. CHARLTON. Just one more question with regard to the disparity of salaries. The surgeon receives $1,500 and the chaplain, $800. Now, the chaplain must have taken an arts course ; he must have spent three or four years in a theological seminary. His education is really of a higher order than that of the average surgeon. A surgeon may get his diploma after three or four years' study, and I would ask why that class of employee—if I may use that term—should have the best salary and the best equipments, while those who have spent the

most time and money in fitting themselves for their profession should receive a fraction over one-half what the surgeons receive ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have to take things and chaplains as we find them. Unfortunately, while chaplains and ministers of the Gospel in this country have, as a rule, an academic training, their pay is horribly small. It may be to our disgrace ; but at any rate our information is that $700 a year is a handsome stipend for most of the ministers of the different denominations.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not so bad as that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is my information, and my individual information is worse than that in my own province, and, I think, the hon. gentleman's province also.

Mr. FRASER. The salaries of Presbyterian ministers are $700 at the minimum, and go up to $3,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Presbyterian is one of the richest and best paid denominations in Canada, and I am very glad of it, and yet $700 is the salary.

Section, as amended, agreed to, and Bill reported.

SUPPLY—THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

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

Mr. LAURIER. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I deem it fit and appropriate that we should pause for a moment in order to consider what position we now stand in with reference to a question which is fast absorbing the public mind to the exclusion of all others—a question which is of a most perplexing character, involving, as it does, strong religious feelings, coupled as it is with a new and important interpretation of the constitution. I believe we have it yet. It has been patched up, it has been settled. Three of the colleagues of the hon. gentleman who now leads the House, three members of the Administration, tendered their resignations to the Prime Minister. Two of them, it is true, have since withdrawn it, but the third yet remains outside. Now, I would ask, at the outset, what is the cause of the crisis ? We know somehow that it is connected with the Manitoba school question, but what is the precise point of difference which led these hon. gentlemen to take the extraordinary step which they did ? What the point of difference is between them and their colleagues, is certainly not clear at all from anything that has been said on the floor of this House. The hon. Minister of Finance, speaking the other day, said that there had been simply a misunderstanding between him and his dissenting colleagues. But if we are to take the interview which was published in the Montreal "Star," and which was had by the correspondent of that paper with the Minister of Public Works, and above all if we are to take the explanations which were given on the floor of the Senate by the Hon. Mr. Angers, the ex-Minister of Agriculture, we must come to the conclusion that the point of difference between the Government and their dissenting colleagues was not a simple misunderstanding. If we are to take the explanations not given here, but given to the Montreal "Star" by the Minister of Public Works and those given by the Hon. Mr. Angers to the Senate, we must come to the conclusion that the point of difference between the Government and their dissenting colleagues, was, that though the Government professed to be willing and determined to restore to the minority in Manitoba their separate schools, of which they were deprived by the legislation of 1890, still those colleagues and a large section of their followers in this House did not believe in the sincerity of the Government, but that they believed, on the contrary, that the whole course of the Government, from the beginning to the present time, has been to make the restoration of those schools absolutely impossible. "Misunderstanding" is not the word, but if a proper word is to be applied to the present condition of things, "mistrust" is the word. Mistrust of the Government, mistrust of their intentions, mistrust of their ability, nay, of their desire to implement their promises—mistrust by their colleagues who have sat from day to day with them at the Council board, mistrust by their followers in this House who have been voting with them for a very great number of years. If we look at the condition of things, we must come to the conclusion that this mistrust is not without solid foundation. There is foundation for it, not only in the dubious course followed by the Government on this question, but also in the general character and conduct of this Government. I am not surprised that those gentlemen who have at heart the restoration of the schools to the minority in Manitoba should have no faith whatever in the policy of the Government or in the promise of the Government, because it is a fact that upon no question—not merely this one, but upon no question whatever—have the Government ever had any settled policy of their own. They have no mind of their own, they cannot come to any decision whatever ; or if ever they do take up a position, forthwith they proceed to undo what they have done before. Looking at their course, they would seem to be afflicted with some cerebral malformation which, as soon as they have taken

any course upon any question crowds upon their attention all the objections against that course, and impels them forthwith to undo what they have done. Looking at their course, it would seem that their nights and their days are haunted by the demon of doubt and vacillation. Look at their course during this very session, and what has that course been but a record of unfulfilled promises, a record of broken engagements, a record of decisions adopted and then abandoned, a record of conflicting determinations and of retrograde modifications. When Parliament met in the month of April, we were formally told in the Speech from the Throne that we were really to have at last what we had often been promised before, an insolvency law. The Bill was introduced in another branch of the legislature, but when it came up for second reading, the hon. gentleman who had charge of it there, saw that there was in the usually serene atmosphere of the upper house a storm gathering, and forthwith sought a harbour of refuge, throwing the whole cargo overboard and with it this ominous Bill. When Parliament opened in the month of April there was a difference between the ship-owners and the shippers of cattle, a difference upon what is to that trade a very important matter, the space which shall be allowed on board ship for each animal. The ship-owners wanted to give 2 feet 6 inches, the exporters wanted 2 feet 8 inches. The Government made a regulation in favour of the contention of the ship-owners, fixing the space at 2 feet 6 inches. Then we have a delegation of the shippers of cattle. That interest showed its teeth to the Government, and forthwith the Government proceeded to undo what they had done and to reverse their regulations. When we came here we were told that the Government, a few weeks before, had passed an Order in Council granting a loan of $2.500,000 to the Hudson Bay Railway Company. We were not officially informed of the fact, but somehow or other we knew it. When we put a question to the hon. gentleman who leads the House as to whether this was the fact or not, my hon. friend could not remember ; he had to look at the papers. A loan or present of $2,500,000 was a matter which did not impress itself upon his mind. And when, at last, we had extracted proof of the assertion that an Order in Council had been granted, we asked the Government whether they would lay that Order in Council upon the Table of the House. We had to have a fight with the Government in order to obtain the production of these papers. When the papers were brought down, we asked the Government whether or not they would implement their promise by legislation. But we could get no answer. At last, after question upon question from this side of the House, the hon. gentleman told us that there would be no more legislation this session upon any subject other than was mentioned upon the Order paper, and upon the Order paper was not found any Bill or resolution to implement the promise which had been made in the Order in Council. Since that time, however, though we were told that there would be no legislation upon that subject, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has given a notice applying to this very company. So there was another change in the policy of the Government. But, though the Bill has been called five times, my hon. friend has not yet moved to introduce it. Perhaps there is still another change in the policy of the Government. So it has been all along and all through the record. Doubt, vacillation, wavering, change ; firm in one thing only, firm in the purpose of keeping office by whatever sacrifice of honour or dignity or principle. When Parliament met here in April, we were told that an Order in Council had been passed by this Government, commanding the province of Manitoba to restore to the Catholic minority there the schools of which they had been deprived in 1890. Sir, if our hon. friends on the other side of the House could not be consistent with themselves in matters of moderate importance, it is not at all to be wondered at that in a matter of such magnitude as the Manitoba school question they should have been vacillation incarnate. We had an order passed by the Government commanding the province of Manitoba to restore the schools of the minority, commanding it to do so under threat that if it failed to obey, this Parliament would force those schools upon them. Sir, when that order was passed there was a great shout of triumph in some quarters. Two or three elections were fought over it, and, in one election to my certain knowledge, the promise was made that if the province of Manitoba failed to obey the order, this Government would put the order in the shape of legislation. What has taken place since ? The province of Manitoba failed to obey ; the province of Manitoba refused to obey. And then what ? Instead of implementing the promise which had been made to the electors of Antigonish, instead of implementing the promise which had been made to the electors of Verchères in particular, the Government proceeds to turn right-about face, and it says : Let us negotiate. Let us negotiate ! It will strike many, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentlemen are ending with the proposition with which they should have commenced. Let us negotiate ! This is a very wide departure indeed from the attitude which was ever maintained by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House upon this question. For, when this matter came up in the month of February, after the decision of the Privy Council had been received, they called Manitoba to their bar to answer the question before them The province of Manitoba begged for delay, but delay was refused. At that time the legislature of Manitoba was in session. The Prime Minister of Manitoba was ill and the duty of leading the House fell upon the Attorney General, whose duty it would have

been otherwise to argue the case for the province. The province, by its representative, Mr. McCarthy, asked to have a delay allowed in presenting its case. The Government here refused delay. And now, after they have refused that delay, after they have told Manitoba to come before them, now, after they have passed the Order in Council, they proceed to reverse their position and they say: Let us negotiate. I understand that the Prime Minister, speaking in another branch of the legislature says that he received a letter from a man saying that his policy of conciliation was a grand policy. Yes, indeed, that policy of conciliation would have been a grand policy at the outset. But it is not a grand policy when it comes after the rebuke administered to the Government by the province of Manitoba. It would have been a grand policy at the outset to be moderate in language and firm in action; but I see no grandeur in a policy that is bullying in language and weak and meek in execution. But we shall be told: After all it is better late than never; better attempt a policy of conciliation late than never, even if it comes at the fourteenth hour. I should say so—better late than never. I imagine every man would say so. I imagine the friends of the separate schools in Manitoba would say so. Yet they do not say so, and why? Is it because they object at all to the policy of conciliation? Is it because they object that the Government of Manitoba should be approached in a friendly spirit? No; the reason is that the dissenting Ministers, and the dissenting followers of the Government, have no faith in the promises of the Government. The case has been plainly stated by the Hon. Mr. Angers, in the speech which he delivered the other day in the Senate. Let me quote some portions of that speech; they are most pathetic in their expressions. After having referred to the speech delivered by the Premier, in the debate on the Address, at the opening of the session, he proceeds in this wise:

> Was it necessary to get another declaration of the same kind to induce all the lovers of justice to wait and accept a second promise? For me, the first is good; and, for me, the second one is not so good.

Then he proceeds to say that the voice of the Prime Minister has been since suppressed, upon which the Prime Minister interrupted him to say: "What has been suppressed?" To which Mr. Angers answered:

> Your promise has been suppressed by the influence which seems, although existing in a small fraction of the population of Canada, to have made itself so strong that it acted like a damper upon the voice and utterances of the Premier, and new utterances had to be made, it seems, in that declaration of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order when he refers to what took place in the Senate.

Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. McCARTHY. What took place in another place.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, then, in another place, the dissenting Minister proceeded to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is still out of order. Under cover of the words, "another place," he cannot refer to what took place in the Senate.

Mr. LAURIER. I am reading from a newspaper article.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you quoting from "Hansard?"

Mr. LAURIER. No; I am quoting from the "Globe" newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member is not in order in referring to speeches that were made in the Senate, even though he is reading them from a newspaper.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, at all events, one of the dissenting Ministers stated his objection, that he had no faith in the sincerity of the hon. gentleman, and he stated, moreover, that if the promises made by the Government were not implemented this session, he had reason to fear that they never would be implemented at all. Now, Sir, this is certainly most extraordinary language and conduct on the part of a member of the Administration, on the part of a gentleman who had been associated with them, and one of their prominent colleagues; and I must say that, according to my own judgment, the hon. gentleman had too good grounds to speak in the manner he did. Sir, I charge against the Government of the day, and I invite their answer, that they have dallied with this question, they never dealt with it frankly, fairly, sincerely; and if I am allowed, by the rules of debate, I will say they never dealt honestly with that question. There are two elements on the other side of the House. There is a fraction of hon. gentlemen who support the Government, who are against separate schools; there is another fraction who are in favour of separate schools; and the policy of the Government upon this question has been to give hopes to both of these elements, thereby placing themselves in the impossibility of satisfying either of them. This is the position which has been taken. When the Order in Council was passed in the month of March last, there was a shout of triumph all through the province of Quebec where the great majority of the population are in favour of separate schools. In the election that took place in the county of Verchères, the Minister of Public Works called God to witness that this present session of Parliament would not pass without the promise of the Government being implemented by legislation. The session is practically over, and where is the legislation? Why has not the promise been implemented? Why has not the pledge which

was given to the electors of Verchères been implemented by the action of the Government? The Government did not dare to implement their promises. If there is any other reason for their failure, let us know it. Now, we had a speech the other day by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), the whip of the party. He spoke his mind, and, speaking his own mind, he spoke the mind of a good many of his colleagues on the other side.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the point of order? I think this is the same question, we are discussing the same motion as we did the other day. The hon. gentleman proceeded to speak as follows:

I may just say for myself, that had the Government done as it had been rumoured two years ago they would do—had they introduced an Act to override the Act of the Manitoba legislature—I would then, as I notified them, have voted against them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member is not quite correct is saying that the debate to which he is now referring is the same that is now before the House. We are now upon a motion to go into Committee of Supply; the motion which was before the House the other day, was a motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I am speaking upon an amendment which I intend to move and which refers to the very same question. Of course, I am within your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. My opinion is that this is not the same debate. Of course, I am subject to the opinion of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt of the ruling of the Speaker; at the same time, for my own part, and I am sure I may speak for this side of the House, I have no objection to the hon. gentleman ranging over the whole session.

Mr. LAURIER. I will bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I do not want any favours from the other side of the House. I will simply say this, that I have always understood from the language and from the conduct of the hon. member for South Leeds, not only on the floor of this House, but even in interviews, that he would vote against remedial legislation at any stage, and under any circumstances. Of course, he was the whip of the party, he was the shepherd of the flock, and the whole flock would have followed him in his vote, whatever it was. When it was found, however, that there would be no legislation at all upon this subject, when it was found that the promises would not be implemented, the Ministers who represent the province of Quebec in this House, and who have taken the most prominent part in this question, threatened to resign; and, in order, I imagine, to prevent their resignation, the Government decided to make a declaration in this House, which was made just a week ago to-day, and a part of which I will read:

If by that time the Manitoba Government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievance of the minority, the Dominion Government will be prepared at the next session of Parliament, to be called as above stated, to introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895.

Now, Sir, this statement was not accepted by the hon. gentlemen, not accepted by my hon. friend the Postmaster General at first, not accepted by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works at first, and never accepted by Mr. Angers, the Minister of Agriculture. For what reason? For the reason that I have already stated, that they had no faith in the promises of the Government, that, having been deceived once, they did not want to be exposed to be deceived the second time. Sir, though this language may be clear enough, I must say, if we are going to judge the conduct of the Government and the policy of the Government by the interpretation put upon it by their organs, there is to-day much reason to believe that the mistrust of Mr. Angers is only too well justified. Let me here quote to the House the interpretation put upon that statement by the chief organ of the Government, the "Mail and Empire." In its issue of Friday, 12th July, that journal speaking of the statement of the Government, said:

To some minds the statement made by the Government is not wanting in definiteness. Mr. McCarthy interprets it as a declaration that the old school law, which Manitoba renounced, is to be re-established by federal legislation. This criticism is met by Sir Mackenzie Bowell in his statement to the Senate, wherein it is maintained, first, that Manitoba having declared 'that the strict letter of the remedial proposition, as understood there, cannot be observed, is to be invited to do what it reasonably can; and, secondly, that in the event of a distinct refusal being given, Parliament will be asked to legislate, not on the lines of the stricter reading of the remedial proposition, but with moderation, and, as is understood, without injury to the national system of education. This explanation points to no federal legislation, if possible, and to very restricted federal legislation, if there is to be legislation at all.

Here is the policy of the Government interpreted by their own organ. There is to be no legislation; but if, after all, they are compelled to introduce any legislation whatever, it will be of such a namby-pamby character as to amount to a farce; if there is to be any legislation introduced, if they are to be forced to their last entrenchment, then legislation will be of a namby-pamby character, so restricted, so diluted, that every one opposed to separate schools can swallow

it and grin over it as a huge joke. It is to be wondered that, under such circumstances, hon. gentlemen have lost faith in the promise of the Government and should be deeper in their conviction than they were before. Everything that has taken place tends to show that the policy of the Government as outlined in the chief organ is just as I have stated. In the province of Quebec the organs of the ministerial party have declared again and again that the Prime Minister was in favour of separate schools. We know this is a question which has long agitated the province of Ontario, and I believe the Prime Minister in his early days, even prior to confederation, had taken an active part on that question. Whatever was the side he took at that time I do not know at present, but at all events I have seen it stated more than once in the organs that support him in the province of Quebec that he was personally in favour of separate schools, nevertheless the hon. gentleman has made a declaration that, speaking for himself personally, he was adverse to separate schools. I take some of the comments also of the Conservative party newspapers upon this very order, and what are they? Here is, for instance, what the London "Free Press" says:

> In Ontario we will have the statement that the Ouimet-Caron end of the patent combination has capitulated, and that Sir Mackenzie Bowell, in shirking the question for another six months, and putting the kickers off with promises which he knows he cannot implement, has proved himself to be a great statesman.

That is the construction put upon the order. From first to last, in everything that has taken place hon. gentlemen will find that the construction which is placed upon the language of the Government is that there is a loop-hole somewhere, and that no more next session than this session are the promises made to the minority to be implemented. What have we to show to the contrary? What is there here to show that the Government are sincere in their utterances, and that there is no loop-hole open as to the fulfilment of their promises? They want us to believe them. Why do they not first convince their own colleagues, why do they not first convince their own followers as to what is their policy? The Government is simply reaping now the results of their double language used in order to conciliate at once the Orange vote and the Catholic vote. But so long as I see here an hon. gentleman, a member of the Administration in his seat, how is it possible for me to suppose we are going to have remedial legislation on this question—I refer to the Controller of Customs. The hon. gentleman is not of the Cabinet, but he is of the Administration; he is not of the Cabinet, but, I think, his shadow is over the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman belongs to a powerful order in this country, he occupies a prominent position in that order. There was a meeting of the order to which he belongs on 13th March last at St. Catharines. The hon. gentleman was present and took part in the proceedings. Part of the order of business was the adoption of a report, which reads as follows:—

> In dealing with reference to the grand master's address to the Manitoba school question, the committee say, that, "While as individual members of the order we might, and no doubt would, agree with him in the method proposed as a settlement of that question, yet, as a matter of organized action on the part of the grand lodge, we do not think it advisable to carry out his proposal to anticipate the policy of the Governor General in Council by means of a memorial. We would, however, place on record our opinion that, for the successful operation of a national school system, all religious teaching or instruction in schools, and everything in the regulations calculated to cause irritation among the creeds, should be eliminated. While reiterating our opposition to the existence of a separate school system anywhere in the Dominion, we believe that if grievances exist in Manitoba to the educational detriment of the minority in that province, it should be left to the legislature of Manitoba to adjust the same. We therefore recommend that this opinion be substituted as the action of the grand lodge, in place of the recommendations of the grand master on the subject.

That is to say, the recommendation was here made that the province of Manitoba should not be interfered with, but the grievances of the minority should be left to the operation of the legislature of that province. That report was adopted by the grand lodge, as I understand, and it was adopted unanimously, I believe, and no doubt by the vote of the hon. gentleman. How, I want to know, so long as a prominent member of the Administration who has taken a direct pledge, as is here stated, against remedial legislation remains in his seat as a member of the Administration, can we expect, whatever may be said by the Government, that these promises will be implemented? There is more. The hon. gentleman a few days ago spoke on this question on an occasion which I will not do more than indicate, and in concluding his speech, he said:

> So that, apart altogether from the cardinal principle of the question, there is a real and substantial difficulty in the way of details to be confronted which gives added weight to the objection to parliamentary interference with Manitoba. I propose, however, to await events, rather than to anticipate what may never occur, nor do I intend to be led or entrapped into precipitate action upon the subject by any device, no matter from what quarter it may come.

It may never occur, says a member of the Administration; it may never occur, says an hon. gentleman who has a right to speak on the question, and he says further that he will not be entrapped into giving any premature opinion or into taking precipitate action upon it. Sir, is that the language consistent with the solidarity of the Gov-

ernment one to the other ? Or is it not rather the action of a Government that seeks to stave off the difficulty of to-day by creating a greater difficulty for to-morrow ? All the members of the Government are responsible one for the other on this question as well as on all questions, and unless there is unanimous action they must explain their differences ; and the Government cannot be said to have unanimous action so long as they allow one of their colleagues upon a public occasion, and in order to capture voters, to make such a statement as this : " Oh, you need not fear, the question may never come before Parliament." It is not sufficient to have a policy such as has been expressed by the Government, looking to the Orange vote on the one side and looking to the Catholic vote on the other. We must have from the Government to-day a clear and defined policy as to what are their intentions, because they cannot please everybody, though they have been trying that for so long past. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the face of this, when the Government have had no settled policy up to the present time upon this question, I am entreated day after day by hon. gentlemen opposite or by their friends, to say what is my own policy upon that question——

Mr. FOSTER. Now we will have it.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, two years ago, speaking upon this question, when it came before the House for the first time, I stated then that in my estimation there was no doubt whatever as to the powers of interference by the Government. I stated then, that reading the history of the constitution, reading the history of clause 93, there could be no doubt whatever in the minds of any disinterested persons, that there were powers of interference in the constitution laid down by that section. I stated then : That the question which was to be solved was not a question of law but simply a question of facts ; facts to be ascertained in order to lay down the law. That was my policy then. I stated it at the time without fear. It was not heeded. It was not accepted, but as it was not heeded——

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend permit me to interrupt him a moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. Just for one moment. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that when he made the statement here that it was a question of fact and not of law, that that was his policy on the question ?

Mr. LAURIER. I stated then that it was my policy on the question.

Mr. FOSTER. It is difficult to see how that is policy.

Mr. LAURIER. I stated then that the power of interference existed. I stated that if the grievances laid down by the Catholic minority were true, that the schools were Protestant, there were grounds sufficient for interference. I said so at the time. My advice was not heeded. However, I did not expect that from hon. gentlemen. But as my advice was not heeded, I folded my arms, and waited for the hon. gentlemen to be wiser and to give us their policy, a thing which they have failed to do ever since. And, Sir, because they failed to do it ever since, and because I would not change my own policy, having given it once, until they showed a better policy themselves, they have been ever since doing me the honour of insulting me every day in their press as wanting in courage. Well, Sir, to be wanting in courage is a grave charge I admit. But if to make promises and not to implement them is courage, if to make threats and to quail before their consequences is courage, if to be boisterous in language and meek in action, is courage, if to pass an order and refuse to execute it is courage, if to act in such a manner as to force your best friends to the conviction that you are deceiving them is courage, there is a galaxy of courageous men on the treasury benches before us, such as we have not seen for a long time. Sir, courage is a noble thing in itself, but foresight is not to be despised either. Foresight is not to be despised in such a country as this, with all its conflicting elements. My courage is not of the kind of courage possessed by hon. gentlemen opposite, I admit. My courage is not to make hasty promises and then to ignominiously break them. My courage is to speak slowly, but once I have spoken, to stand or fall by my words. There is such a thing as courage and courage. When the six hundred men of the Light Brigade charged the Russian guns at Balaklava, they gave to the world such an example of courage as the world seldom saw ; but a French officer, high in command, Marshal Bousquet, if I remember aright, who happened to be on the battlefield, remarked : " C'est beau, mais ce n'est pas la guerre," It is splendid, but that is not war. Yes, those six hundred men when they rushed into the furnace of iron and fire, when they courted death with such sublime indifference, covered the British arms with a halo of fame which shall move the hearts of all men so long as daring courage and cool bravery continue to be admired by all men. I am not aware, however, that British generalship shone very brightly on that day. Those six hundred men, who rushed into the fight as they did, for the sake and for the honour of England, will live and live for ever, but the name of the commanding general is already lost in oblivion. Sir, I have no doubt whatever that it would be an easy thing for me to commit some glorious, some chivalrous blunder which would earn for me the plaudits, and the fame, and the praise, and the glorification of hon. gentlemen opposite, and their press as well. But I tell them, I care no more for their praise

than I am afraid of their taunts; for so long as I am here occupying a position which the confidence of my friends has placed me in, I will endeavour to commit no such mistakes as will send joy in the hearts of my opponents and dismay in the ranks of my friends. And when the day comes for me to walk into the battle, I hope that I shall perform my part without any bragging, and, God helping me, without any weakness either. But I am not in the battle today. No, the battle is there. There is the seat of contest; there is the raging conflict. Let those hon. gentlemen opposite unite their discordant elements. Let them unite their differences into a policy. Let them bring down that policy, and then, Sir, I pledge myself here that if it commends itself to my judgment, I shall give it all my support. I say again, what I said before more than once, that I have no desire that my party should walk into power over the Manitoba school question. Let hon. gentlemen opposite settle that question. I will be most happy to give them my support, but they must settle it in some other manner than they have tried heretofore. Something must be done, and done at once, because this policy of delay, this policy of vacillation, is not only paralyzing, but it is fast disintegrating national life; fast disintegrating national life, I say, because it is arraying creed against creed, and race against race. Something must be done, and done at once. What should be done? I have no hesitation, for my part, in here speaking my own personal sentiment, to say that I do desire and do wish that the minority in Manitoba may be allowed the privilege of teaching in their schools, to their children, their duties to God and man as they understand those duties, and as their duties are taught to them by their church. That is my wish. But I do say, that if that object is to be attained, it is not to be attained by imperious dictation nor by administrative coercion. If that object is to be attained, the hand must be firm and the touch must be soft. Hitherto the touch has been rude and the hand has been weak. Sir, this is my policy. We must build up a nation here——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, gentlemen on the other side may laugh. What else can they do? What matters it to them if the country is raked up by the fire of dissension and discord, so long as they keep the places they have at the present time. This is my policy. We must carry out the idea of confederation. We must have a nation here; we must build up a nation; but if this is to be done, we must teach every citizen, no matter what his creed or his race may be, in the prosecution of his rights, not to exact the last pound of flesh. We must teach every citizen in the prosecution of his rights to make some concessions to the feelings, nay, to the prejudices of his fellow-countrymen; so that they may not find themselves oppressed by the laws of the country; but, on the contrary, that all in the country may have in their hearts a pride in Canada, a pride in our institutions, a pride in our laws. Sir, I belong, I am proud to say, to a party which has always been signalized for its broad views of tolerance and justice to minorities; and when the time comes for the Liberal party to deal with this question, I think I can make the pledge for every member of the Liberal party, that we will endeavour to solve that problem on lines that will be found fair, equitable, and satisfactory to the minority, and on those broad lines, yet of equal rights and equal justice to all which underlie our constitution. It is because we are animated with these sentiments, and because I arraign the policy of the Government as a policy of uncertainty, with no ring of truth about it, that I beg to move:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"this House regrets the failure of the Government to deal with the Manitoba school question in a manner demanded by the best interests of the country, and is of opinion that the ministerial declarations in regard to the question are calculated to promote a dangerous agitation amongst the Canadian people."

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

After Recess.

SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 88) respecting the South Shore Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. White, Shelburne.)

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

Mr. MASSON. This Bill has already had a good deal of discussion in the House and in the committee. But for the fact that neither the hon. Minister of Railways, nor the hon. Minister of Justice were present during the time the Bill was discussed in the Railway Committee, I would not have any remarks to make this evening; and I do not now wish to occupy the time of the House, in view of the number of Bills now standing on the Order paper, many of which are unopposed, and I would gladly see some means arrived at whereby they could be dealt with this evening, without being delayed by a long discussion on this Bill. Without entering into a discussion of the matter, which there may be other opportunities of going into, I wish to state, in the presence of this committee, the objections I have to this Bill. In the first place, it seeks to revive a local Act, after the revival thereof has been refused by the local

legislature. This, I think, is quite sufficient ground for a refusal by this Parliament to entertain a proposition of this kind. Secondly, it seeks to revive a local Act, after a rival company, relying on the lapsing of the Act now sought to be revived, has commenced operations, has thirty miles under contract, and is actively pressing the work forward. This also is a ground that has always been taken by the Railway Committee, and I think by this Parliament —that where two companies have obtained charters over the same route, and one allows its charter to lapse, and the second goes on and commences the work, this House refuses to revive the charter of the other. I could cite many instances in which that principle has been followed. I remember the late Sir John Macdonald laying it down that such a proceeding would jeopardize many enterprises undertaken in reliance on the faith of Parliament. In the third place, the object of the Bill is to interfere with litigation now pending, brought in the name of the Attorney General of the province of Nova Scotia to declare the charter now sought to be revived null and void by lapse and forfeiture. Attempts have been made, and no doubt attempts will be made, to minimize the force of this litigation ; but of all kinds of litigation, that brought in the name of the Attorney General of a province should be protected and observed. It is of far greater importance than an ordinary case between individuals. The hon. Minister of Railways will recollect the position taken by himself, and the Conservative party throughout the country, when the legislature of Ontario attempted by legislation to interfere with a suit between private parties, the suit of Caldwell vs. Maclaren, then pending in the courts. It was then looked upon by the party to which I belong as being an outrageous thing for the legislature to interfere with litigation between private individuals. We have also heard a good deal about the iniquity of legislative interference on behalf of qui tam actions—actions brought by private individuals to enforce a penalty for some act done or omitted to be done. This legislative interference has always been condemned so far as I know, by the party of which I have the honour to be a humble member. The action relating to this company is a far more important action. Another kind of action is one where a private individual seeks to investigate a public matter, and, in doing so, has to make the Attorney General a party defendant. It is a still higher action in which the Attorney General is a party plaintiff. If this legislature should interfere with a suit of that nature, I think its action would be indefensible on any ground whatever. Now, on a further ground, I take it, this Act should not pass.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I rise to a point of order, as to whether this discussion, at this stage of the Bill, is in order. The hon. gentleman is discussing whether this Bill should be considered at all by the House, but the House has sent the Bill to the committee and has adopted the principle of legislation.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman intimated he was going to make some motion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My point is that the hon. gentleman's argument attacks the principle of the Bill altogether, and his only motion, in the line of his argument, would be to reject the Bill. The Bill has been read the second time and sent to this committee for the purpose, not of discussing whether the legislature should deal with this class of legislation, but whether the clauses should be adopted as they are put. The principle of the Bill cannot be discussed in this committee, but only on the motion for the second reading.

Mr. MULOCK. No doubt the argument of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) would be perfectly in order on the second reading ; but it seems to me it is also in order, in Committee of the Whole, for example, on the motion to adopt the preamble. If, for example, the preamble were rejected, the whole Bill would be rejected. If the committee decide against the preamble, what becomes of your Bill, so that, as the preamble of a Bill is in issue in the Committee on Private Bills or the standing Committee on Railways and Canals, it must also be in issue in Committee of the Whole. Shall the preamble be adopted ? Upon that motion, the whole principle of the Bill is in issue. This is not a public Bill but a private Bill ; and it appears to me that any argument relevant in the Committee on Private Bills is relevant in the Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

Mr. MASSON. I do not want to detain the House, and the only point I have left is this, that there is no reason for two roads in the district now, and that the promoters of this Bill have by their action, justified the objection raised that they are seeking the charter for the purpose of selling it. I have here a couple of affidavits in support of that statement. One is from Mr. Leonard Atwood, dated 11th July, in which he states that :

> In the city of Yarmouth, on or about 2nd February, 1893, one E. Franklyn Clement, who claimed to own and control the charter granted by the province of Nova Scotia for the line of railway in question, in virtue of having subscribed for all the stock except $1,000, approached me and agreed to sell all the rights and stock owned and controlled by him under the charter for $1,900.

This affidavit was made on 11th July, this year, and the event spoken of is stated to have occurred on 2nd February, 1893. That was at the time when work was started on the road now actively opposing this revival.

I also have another affidavit from William Nunn, made in Toronto, in which he says that he is thoroughly conversant with the affairs of the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, as well as the affairs of the South Shore Railway Company, Limited, and he firmly believes that the South Shore Company have no intention of building their road, but that their main object in applying to Parliament is to facilitate the sale of their enterprise to the coast railway of Nova Scotia. The reasons given for such belief are as follows :—

One of my reasons is the fact that E. F. Clement, of Yarmouth, N.S., who controls the local charter of the South Shore Railway Company, said to me that he was already interested in the present Bill before Parliament ; he has been, to my knowledge, a most active promoter of the said measure, and he approached me in the Russell House, at Ottawa, on 3rd June last, and stated that if I could bring together Mr. Drill, of Philadelphia, and Mr. Williamson, of New York, for the purpose of selling the South Shore charter, there would be a big pot of money to divide, and he would give me a share.

In addition, I would call attention to the fact that the name of Williamson, who has been spoken of so often as a New York millionaire, is, according to Bradstreet's report, an employee of H. B. Hillsford & Co., prominent brokers, and is said to receive the salary of $2,500. This New York millionaire, therefore, is an employee receiving this salary. These are the reasons on which I base my opposition to this Bill in all its stages. As the discussion would be naturally long, and as there is now a number of Bills standing unopposed, to which it would be a great advantage that we should give precedence, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Whether my point of order be good or bad, the question would be much better discussed with the Bills before the House. As far as I understand, the promoters are not at all adverse to having the Bill amended so as to protect existing rights in connection with the litigation the hon. gentleman refers to. Outside of that, the hon. gentleman has made no point whatever.

Mr. EDGAR. I would support the motion of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) on this ground. I would do so, not that I think it will affect in any way the fate of the Bill before the committee, but because it will give an opportunity to the House to spend a little over half an hour in considering the few Bills which are on the Order paper and which are not opposed by anybody. I do not understand that this motion will affect the consideration of this Bill or its progress for more than half an hour. It will stand on the Order paper in its place. If the committee rise and report progress today, the Bill will stand on the Order paper in its place. It would be only a proper thing to give the unopposed Bills a chance.

Mr. MASSON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think that would be most unfair. And the object is apparent. The effect of it is also apparent. This Bill would be choked by discussion such as was attempted last——

Mr. MULOCK. Well, kill the Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, and the Bill would be killed. Any fair-minded man, and any man who is not determined to hinder this Bill will, I think, endeavour to secure fair consideration for this measure in its proper turn, and its proper turn is now.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to say to the Minister that I have never yet been accused of trying to affect unfairly the discussion of a private Bill—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And I do not accuse the hon. gentleman of doing that now ; but I say that is what the effect of the hon. gentleman's action will be.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not think that will be the effect, or I would support it.

Mr. MASSON. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Justice referred to me as trying by unfair means to affect this Bill. At any rate I do not think that I have merited any such remarks from him. The statement I made set forth plainly what the object was. This Bill stands in the way of Bills that are unopposed ; there are two Bills that are opposed, but let us get through the unopposed ones to-night.

Committee divided : Yeas, 54 ; nays, 91.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. FORBES. Before the preamble of this Bill is carried——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FORBES. I regret that those who favour this Bill are not prepared to listen to a fair discussion of the principles involved. When this Bill was before the Committee on Railways it was with great difficulty that those who were opposing the Bill could get their views heard by the committee, and it seems that those who favour the Bill are in the same frame of mind as they were then.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. FORBES. I can understand the hon. gentlemen on the other side opposing anything that will tend to benefit the province of Nova Scotia. From the representatives of Nova Scotia in the Cabinet down to the lowest subordinate, they have set themselves against the efforts of those who endeavour by fair means to promote railway development in Nova Scotia. The hon. Minister of

Justice has been second only to the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) in endeavouring to stifle railway enterprise in that province. If a party advantage is to be gained, gentlemen opposite will oppose anything that is of advantage to the people. The object of the Minister of Justice evidently is to infringe upon and cramp provincial rights. Now, Sir, what is the principal feature of this Bill that we ask the House to take time and consider ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. Evidently the committee does not want to do any business.

Mr. FORBES. It is quite evident to those who are in favour of wise and judicious legislation, and who sit for the most part on this side of the House, and who are ably supported, I am proud to say, by some wise and able gentlemen on the other side of the House, but not by the majority of that side, that the majority of hon. gentlemen opposite are not willing that this proposed legislation should receive adequate consideration. Now, Sir, why do we ask the committee to pause before making such legislation as is proposed by this Bill ? Sir, I have solemn affidavits, that I will produce in a few minutes and ask you to consider, in support of the charge that I make against this Bill. The charge is that in the province of Nova Scotia, after solemn and careful deliberation, and several lengthy hearings, upon which able counsel on both sides were heard, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of that province, advised by his Council, saw fit to institute a suit in the courts of Nova Scotia contesting the legality of the charter, the very identical charter which this House is asked to confirm by legislation of this Parliament. Sir, this is a most peculiar Bill. It is said in the terms of this Bill :

> The company, as now organized and constituted under the said Act of the province of Nova Scotia, is hereby declared to be a body corporate and politic within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada ; and this Act and the Railway Act of Canada shall apply to the company and its undertaking, instead of the said Act of the province of Nova Scotia and the Railway Act of Nova Scotia.

Sir, I ask the Minister of Justice, with his judicial mind, calmly to consider that clause. Can that clause have any other meaning than this, that whereas an Act was passed by the province of Nova Scotia, saying that certain persons should be incorporated for certain purposes within the jurisdiction of the legislature of that province ; and whereas such persons have forfeited their right, under the terms of said charter, to carry out the enterprise, the powers which they were given by the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FORBES—and whereas doubts have arisen as to the validity of said charter and the right of said incorporators to use the powers vested in them by the said legislature of Nova Scotia, in the terms of said Act, and whereas there is now instituted in the province of Nova Scotia, one of a series of lawsuits for the purpose of testing the right of the corporators to use that Act, and whereas those proceedings are still pending, is it not patent to everybody who is cognizant of anything with respect to legislation in this country or any other, that an attempt is being made, under cloak of a servile majority in this House, to choke provincial rights, and to interfere with the courts of the province of Nova Scotia. Sir, the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) has put himself on record with regard to this matter, and it is rumoured that he has been induced by other parties in the province to lend his countenance to a measure like this. Sir, I say such a thing was never heard of in any British country, that by brute force of a majority, the authority of an inferior tribunal should be overborne by a superior tribunal and prevented from exercising its functions. Sir, I charge against the hon. member for Shelburne who promotes this Bill, that he is guilty of all—I was going to say, the crimes in the decalogue ; but he is guilty of a serious breach of the rules of this House. The hon. member is on record as a promoter of railway measures said to be for the benefit of a certain section of the province of Nova Scotia, and yet, during the years 1892, 1893 and 1894, when that hon. gentleman undertook to support that measure known as the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, we find him, between the 11th day of July, 1894, and the 22nd day of July, acting as the paid advocate and attorney for another company, and transferring his allegiance——

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I think the hon. gentleman ought not to make such a statement as that without some grounds. It is entirely untrue. I never received a cent from anybody for the purpose the hon. gentleman insinuates.

Mr. MULOCK. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Shelburne charged my hon. friend with having stated something that was entirely untrue. I submit that those are unparliamentary words, and should be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In the noise that has been prevailing for the last half hour, I did not understand what the hon. member for Shelburne was saying, and so I did not call him to order.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). What I said I will repeat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member has no right to interrupt the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes), un-

less he rises to a point of order. I may add that the proceedings of the committee are very disorderly. I would ask hon. members not to throw these bunches of paper across the Chamber, because if one of them struck an hon. member in the face, it would certainly cut his face. I think everybody is interested in keeping order.

Mr. FORBES. I have the handwriting of the hon. member for Shelburne in my possession, in which he advocates the construction of the road known as the Coast Road, and declaring over his own signature that the road was in the best interests of that section of Nova Scotia known as the South Shore. I have further to say that the hon. member for Shelburne was the paid secretary for the Nova Scotia Southern Railway, and in that capacity he advocated the interest of the road known as the Hervey road, running through the counties of Shelburne and Queen's, and on to the city of Halifax. I have further to say that as such paid secretary, advocate and attorney of the said road, he stood by that company as long as they paid his fees. Subsequently, when it became necessary for another body of capitalists supposed to possess money, coming from the United States, to approach this Parliament for the purpose of getting legislation, the hon. member for Shelburne, thinking the Southern Company had not all the money required to pay his taxed bills of costs, did exactly what he said on Friday, when he told us in the committee that he found Mr. Hervey and his son had left the country without paying their creditors, he also left the company in the lurch, and let them slide, and accepted a retainer on behalf of the South Shore Company, the company that is now endeavouring to obtain a Bill from this Parliament.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That statement is absolutely incorrect and unfair.

Mr. FORBES. I never said the Minister of Justice was senior counsel.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You might as well have said so.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. gentleman does not know the facts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was protesting against an unfair statement.

Mr. FORBES. This was the statement of the hon. member for Shelburne; he said that the promoters of the Southern Railway had disappeared and not paid their bills, and when he found this to be the case, he resigned his position as adviser, and, I do say, that under the eye of the Minister of Justice he signed a contract with this Government as secretary of the company, and that contract is on file with the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. Is not all this discussion out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No; I do not think it is out of order. It is on the preamble of the Bill, and so long as the discussion is kept without the scope of the Bill, I do not think it is out of order.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. member for Shelburne is here as a representative and trustee of the people's interests. I am not addressing him as a solicitor, but I say that a gentleman who occupies the doubtful position which he occupies, should be very cautious indeed. And what about the position of the Minister of Justice? What is the practice of the English Parliament? Members of the Cabinet have nothing whatever to do with private legislation. They are not permitted to have anything to do with it by the rules of the House, and by a grand social understanding it is recognized between all hon. gentlemen that when the public interest comes into conflict with their personal interest, the public interest must always prevail. This is the only way to induce an hon. gentleman who occupies the dubious position, or the duplex position, occupied by a member of this House, who is the paid advocate of this company, to act, and this is the only case we have had before the House. There is nothing for that hon. getleman to do except to retire as regards his private capacity, and withdraw from the advocacy of this Bill before the House. There are reasons why this Bill should not become law, that should appeal to the fair reason and understanding of any hon. gentleman, whoever he may be, who knows how to consider and deliberate on a question in a deliberative assembly like this House. We have had, time and again, brought to our attention in Parliament, conflicts of jurisdiction between legislatures. This is a special occasion when the broad, fair mind of the Cabinet itself, advised by the Minister of Justice, should come into play, and decide that inasmuch as it has been proved and establishel to the satisfaction of the majority that this measure which some hon. members are trying to pass this House, would inflict on Nova Scotia, severe injury, because it involves a gross and unfair attempt to gag and override the courts of the province, to subvert the jurisdiction of our courts, and crowd on the majority of the people of that province a measure which they do not want, it should be withdrawn. I say, further, that this Bill should not prevail for several other reasons. One reason in particular has been spoken to by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson), who proved by solemn affidavits that the statement made by the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) that the advocates or backers of this proposed legislation were fully capable, financially, of carrying out this enterprise, was incorrect, and that, as a matter of fact, these people were utterly unable to pay their bills. He proved, by affidavits, a fact long known to us, who have opposed this legislation, that Williamson and other gentlemen whose

names have been given to the House by the hon. member for Shelburne, were practically bankrupt, so far as regards their ability to carry out this road. Imagine a party of gentlemen of the character and means set forth in these affidavits read by the hon. member for Grey to ask this legislature to grant them powers to build a railway 230 miles in the province of Nova Scotia, at a probable cost of over $2,000,000, when it was clearly established in the minds of hon. members that they were not wealthy men, that they were nothing but employees, receiving salaries from $500 to $2,500, that they were without capital. Yet these were the men whom the hon. member for Shelburne proposes should be incorporated and constitute the backbone of this company. We had a statement made a few days ago by that hon. member, in answer to a challenge made to him as to what had become of Alexander, who had become bankrupt, and actually insolvent. Referring to that gentleman, the hon. member for Shelburne said that Alexander and certain creditors of the road were going to take stock in the new enterprise. For what purpose? Not for the purpose of keeping money in the enterprise; but they were going to take stock instead of payment of their debts, they having been creditors of the old road, the old company having only raised $12,500 in cash with which to carry out a two-million dollar enterprise. In violation of the terms, and against the spirit of all joint stock companies, and against the spirit of our laws, they had stuffed their stock-book; they had taken a block of stock, and put it in trust, for they had only one share of the stock of the company apiece and afterwards they borrowed money from widows on which to carry on the old enterprise. The hon. member for Shelburne has stated in the House that they had refused to lend any more money to that company, that the promoters were unable to pay their debts, and did not intend to finish the road. The hon. gentleman told us that those who took the assignment of the laborers' claims against the company and paid 33 cents on the dollar for their claims, were going to take stock in the new company to the extent of 66 cents on the dollar and construct the road. That means that Parliament is asked to place on the statute-book a law that will enable an absolute fraud to be perpetrated and the member for Shelburne, either in his guileness or ignorance, is willingly lending himself to that scheme. The hon. member for Shelburne, occupied that dubious position, still persists in saying that the allegations in the preamble of the Bill are correct. I hold in my hand the statement of the creditors of the road who advanced money but who were ashamed to take stock in the company. They advanced it on the personal credit of Messrs. Alexander & Farrar, alleged to be capitalists in the city of Boston, and the amount advanced was $106,400. These two gentlemen made affidavits of insolvency, and in the reorganization now, here is what the creditors propose to take in satisfaction of their respective claims from wherever they can raise the money. W. B. Strang, jr., 7th National Bank, New York, ·22 per cent; Mrs. M. B. Wheeler, Grovnor S. Hubberd, 35 Wall Street, New York, ·22 per cent; E. K. Spinney, Nova Scotia, ·17 per cent; Parker, Eaken & Co. Nova Scotia, ·156 per cent; Jacob Bingey, Nova Scotia, ·072 per cent; D. H. Andrews, Boston, ·06 per cent; Chas. S. Keene, Boston, ·02 per cent; Royal Whiton, Boston, ·02 per cent; Chas. H. Adair, Boston, ·02 per cent; and the committee, ·042 per cent; total. ·100 per cent. Representing $106,400. That is the way these gentlemen propose to get their money back, and how is it proposed to construct the road when these creditors take nothing but stock for their indebtedness? There would be no new money whatever coming into the road. We have the affidavit read by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson) showing that one Clements and others, including the hon. member for Shelburne, I firmly believe, were associating themselves together for the purpose of putting this Bill through Parliament and making this contract with this Government. There was a contract made in February last, but if the Government dared to submit it to Parliament it would be shown to be bogus. The bogus signatures of gentlemen who never were in "esse" are upon it. That company would make a contract with the Government for the subsidy of $112,000, which was voted last July to the South Shore Company, provided that this Government is not upset in the meantime by attempting to bring down remedial legislation. That contract will be made for the purpose of getting the subsidy and app y ing it so far as is possible to paying the debts, a list of which I have read. In the event of their not being able to handle the subsidy, they propose going upon the money markets of the United States and preventing the corporation of the Coast Line Company from floating their securities. The Coast Railway Company have up to date spent the following: Expenses of organization, surveys and construction work to 15th December, 1895, $143,672.21; officers' salaries, engineers on surveys and plans, 1st January to 1st April, 1895, $4,305; pay-roll and supply bills for April, 1895, $4,671.30; pay-roll and supply bills for May, 1895, $5.309.06; pay-rolls and supply bills for June, 1895, $8,-216.72; total, $166,174.29. Contracts ratified and closed, 20th June, 1895, for bridge and culvert masonry, with Harry Townsend & Co., New Glasgow, N.S., $14,630; 22nd June, 1895, for steel bridges with the Central Bridge and Engineering Company of Peterborough, Ont., $17.876; 25th June, 1895, for 70,000 ties with Warren Taylor of Salisbury, N.B., $18,900; 1st July, 1895, 25 miles of rails with the Cammeyer Company, England, 2,200 tons at $20.25 per ton delivered

at Yarmouth, $44,550; 1st July, 1895, for fencing with R. L. F. Strathy & Co., Montreal, $5,000; estimated expenditure for July pay-rolls and supplies, $9,000; total, $109,956. This statement is signed by Mr. George A. Fletcher, the treasurer of the company. This Coast Line Company has thirty miles already under construction, it has rights of way through the municipalities through which it passes, it has contracts with the government of Nova Scotia, and is bound under bonds signed by several capitalists to spend $396,000 to complete the work. There is evidence of genuineness and proof of their solvency. It is not like the bankrupt South Shore Company which asks Parliament for a confirmation of its bankrupt policy. I move in amendment, Mr. Speaker:

That the preamble of this Bill do not now pass, but that the following words be inserted in the preamble of the said Bill after the words "Nova Scotia," in line 19:—

"And whereas litigation is in progress in the province of Nova Scotia, in the name of the Attorney General of that province, which calls in question the validity of the said charter to the said company and its organization; that it is desirable that nothing in this Act contained shall be used as a defence in the said action or in any other suit now pending affecting the said company."

Committee divided: yeas, 53; nays, 89.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. FORBES. It may be that certain gentlemen on the other side of the House voted against the amendment because they were under the impression that the coast line road was a narrow-gauge road. I wish, for a few moments, to show that it is nothing of the kind, but that it is a standard gauge road. The company constructing that road was incorporated in 1893 by the legislature of Nova Scotia. It was then supposed to be a three-foot gauge road. The corporators applied to the several municipalities to assist them in securing financial aid from the Government of Nova Scotia, and they secured it on that basis. They then approached gentlemen from different sections of the province.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for private Bills has expired.

SUPPLY—THE MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who addressed the House before we rose at six o'clock, twitted this side of the House with having passed, or with, at the present time, passing through a ministerial crisis. Well, Sir, I acknowledge the advantage which this party possesses in that respect, and I take the allusion to it as a compliment. It is, I think, pretty well understood that only that party which forms Governments and carries them on is liable to such a thing as a ministerial crisis; and my hon. friend, who, for the last seventeen years, has neither formed a Government nor attempted to carry on a Government may have the slightest satisfaction which he obtains by speaking about, or watching with all the interest and zest imaginable, ministerial crises in the party which, during those seventeen years, has always had in this country a stable Government, and a stable policy behind that Government. My hon. friend may be congratulated on one thing, and condoled with on another. He may be congratulated on the fact that he has not had ministerial crises to trouble him during the last seventeen years. He may be condoled with upon the rather mournful fact that, although time after time during those seventeen years, he and his party have fixed their longing eyes on the treasury benches, and hoped to gain them through ministerial crises, they have been disappointed in their hopes. There are men called wreckers, who may never possess a good ship of their own, but who linger about the sand dunes and the rocks, waiting for the good, tight, staunch vessel, in stress of weather, to come in and go to pieces, when they may, perhaps, have plunder, if they do not get the solid hulk of the vessel itself. We have passed through ministerial crises. Not very long ago the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, having lost hope after elections that had passed, and having seen their best-cherished plans go aglee, determined within themselves, and more than once expressed that determination, that of course there was no hope for them until the hand of Providence should strike down the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party; and then they hoped, in the confusion, to leap into power. The hand of Providence was laid heavily upon this party, and the chief who had led a Government so long, and who had led a people so long, was taken away. Then the hopes of our hon. friends were very high, but their hopes were dashed. Not long afterwards they expected again to gain possession of the good ship of state, when the captain was again suddenly taken away—when Sir John Abbott died—they had high hopes again, and their hopes again vanished; for, from among the officers who manned the good ship of the Government, one stepped into the captaincy, and a strong and firm hand held the helm of the vessel, and guided it amidst all the troubled waters through which it passed for four or five years. Once again, a ministerial crisis came into view, and death having taken from us that leader, these hon. gentlemen, who could no longer trust to their policy, but who simply looked to disintegration to do a work inside of a party which they, with all their artillery, are not able to do from the outside, supposed that they would come into power.

Their vauntings upon the platforms, and the high hopes and cheerful predictions with which they came to this session, gave promise to all their friends of speedy victory —victory from disintegration and falling asunder of the Liberal-Conservative party. Again they were disappointed, and now, at this last juncture of circumstances, when they see what they think is a grave crisis over a grave question in the Liberal-Conservative party, they are hopeful of taking advantage of it; and once again they hope to slide into power upon two motions for the adjournment of the House, and the colourless, catch resolution now before us. So I present to my hon. friend his cogitations concerning Ministerial crises to which I have added my own, and I wish him joy, so far as this party is concerned. The hon. gentleman, in the next place, sought to establish that this crisis through which the Ministry has been passing, and on which this House has been very intent arose from a lack of confidence among the members of the Cabinet themselves, from mistrust, the one of the other. What are his proofs? He marshals, in the first place, the statement made in another Chamber by one of my late colleagues who, I regret to say, has felt it his duty to leave the Government and is no longer with us. But, Sir, he failed to marshal the full statement itself. Every one in this House, on both sides, who has read that statement and has thought over it, knows that the grounds which our late colleague took—the strong grounds that he took—were first, that it was useless and unnecessary and possibly harmful to any longer negotiate with the local government of Manitoba; and secondly, that in the course of added new negotiations, this Parliament might possibly lose its power—an opinion in which I am glad to know he does not find very much support outside of himself. But these were his principal grounds, and it is an inference, of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), which is not warranted by my late colleague's statement, that distrust and want of confidence was the reason which caused him to leave the Government. My hon. friend went on to cite quotations from newspapers and the like in order to amplify that proof; but he made one slip with reference to the statements which were read in this House by myself on two occasions, when he ventured incidentally to give his own opinion with reference to those statements. The opinion he ventured to give was this, that the statements, on the face of them, seemed fair enough. That was the only attempt my hon. friend made to attack the documents themselves and show to this House and the country that they implied distrust or grounds for distrust. And in the sole and only effort which he made to attack the documents themselves and draw an inference from them, he had to confess that the documents, on the face of them, seemed fair enough; and I wish the House to remember that admission which he made. As against his argument that it was mistrust and lack of confidence which caused the difference in the ministry, I wish simply to give him two facts, which I think will be strong enough with this House, and I think strong enough with himself. The first is the two statements themselves, read on two different days in this House by myself; the second is the statement which I myself made when speaking upon that motion, that the divergence which took place between my two hon. colleagues and the rest of the Government was due rather to a misunderstanding of the terms of the statement than from mistrust or lack of confidence. That was substantiated by the statements of my two hon. colleagues themselves in this House; but if there is one fact, more than another, which makes truth of my contention, it is that the Government's policy is now before this House in full, and the Ministers are here to back it up as a united ministry. So I think that assumption of the hon. gentleman falls to the ground. The hon. gentleman says that there are factions in the Government—some for and some against. That again is met by the fact that we stand here to-day, as I have said, as a united Government—united upon the policy which we have stated to this House, united upon the policy which we have given to the country; and that statement, as I have said before, is sufficient to disprove the attempt of my hon. friend to prove that non-confidence and mistrust are rife, and that there are factions in the ministry itself. Just here in passing, I wish to say that the Government have made no promise on this question in the past which they have not implemented. They have made no pledges to this House and the country which they do not intend to implement when the time comes. But my hon. friend quickly passed from that, because he merely mentioned it in passing, and he said that this mistrust, this want of confidence among the ministry was due to a generic fault in the character of the ministry and of the Government itself, that generic fault in the Government and the ministry being that they have not a mind of their own, that they have no settled policy, no opinion of their own. They are haunted, my hon. friend says, day and night, by the demon of doubt and vacillation, and he attempts to prove that this is true by citing cases of great vacillation and lack of a stable policy with reference to certain measures which this Government has introduced. What are the measures? This Government, for instance, introduced an Insolvency Bill. It had that Bill debated before one of the Houses of this Parliament, it had passed its second reading, and it was allowed to drop, and my hon. friend cited that as one of the proofs of the great instability and lack of settled

policy on the part of this Government. My hon. friend may read the history of governments, of his own government a long while back, of other governments in this country or in other countries, and he will find it no unusual thing that measures, even of importance, measures which the Government introduces and discusses are either laid over to a succeeding session or dropped entirely from the Order paper. If he thinks that this is an unerring proof of vacillation and lack of stability of and of settled policy in the Government, he will find few governments in this age which that same kind of proof would not convict of the same instability and lack of settled policy. But, coming from less to greater, he cites another instance to show the lack of stability and settled policy of this Government. And that, forsooth, is not a Bill at all, not a Government measure brought down in this House, but it is a small question of departmental regulation, the whole difference of which is summed up by a breadth of two inches. It was a question as to whether it were wiser in the department which had it in charge to make a regulation which should give the cattle shipped across the Atlantic a space of 2 feet 8 inches or a space of 2 feet 6 inches on the ship. And because, after the question had been discussed pro and con between the cattle shippers, the cattle dealers and the Minister who had it in charge, the Minister came to the conclusion that it would be well to give the cattle the benefit of the 2 inches, my hon. friend founds a charge of instability and lack of settled policy for which he asks this House to condemn the Government. These are the examples that my hon. friend gives to prove that there is such a lack of stability and of settled policy in this Government. My hon. friend should not allow his vision to become distorted in that way. A very small object kept close to the eye will make it impossible for him, if he shuts the other eye to see a very large object some distance away. My hon. friend has been so intently looking at that 2 inches of difference in cattle space in ocean vessels, that he has forgotten to look at the broad measures of the Government to find in them that very settled policy and stability which his soul longs for and which he affects to find so lacking in this Government. What are the broad lines of policy on which this Liberal-Conservative party has based itself from confederation and upon which it has sustained itself in successive appeals to Parliament and in successive elections in the country. It is not a question of 2 inches in space in cattle ships crossing the Atlantic; it is not as to whether a Bill introduced in either houses shall, after discussion be laid aside for a time or not. The people do not take stock, nor does the House take stock in such trumpery questions, when contrasted with the great lines of policy upon which a Government is conducted. And when you discuss broad lines of policy and upon these contrast the two parties, then it is that I might say to my hon. friend that, instead of being so solicitous to remove the mote from his brother's eye, he had better remove the beam from his own eye. Take the first question upon which the Liberal-Conservative party placed itself as upon a broad and stable platform—the union of the provinces of British North America into a strong confederation. From 1867 up to the present time the Liberal-Conservative party has pursued that policy with a tenacity, foresight, energy and success which have made this country what it is and have given this country the impetus which shall carry it forward to still greater success. Take another great line of policy of the Liberal-Conservative party—the establishment of means of communication between the provinces of this Dominion, so that confederation should not be upon paper merely, but become an actual union with the life blood of commercial and social communication running from province to province throughout the Dominion. And, Sir, against the most frenzied efforts of the Opposition, against their work in season and out of season, against heated appeals to the country at times when the House was in session and at times when the House was not in session, the Government conceived and carried out the policy of complete railway communication from the Atlantic to the Pacific, crossing our prairies, leaping over our mountains, and affording means of communication not only from sea to sea, but laterally through almost every part of this country. The Liberal-Conservative party and Government have had the energy to carry out that line of policy against all the force of the Opposition and against all the opposing influence that gentlemen on the other side could bring to bear. Sir, there was another broad line of policy—the development of industrial life and activity, the building up of industrial establishments of this country. And from 1875 when it was proposed, and from 1878 when it was formulated as a specific policy, up to the present, in what respect has the Liberal-Conservative party faltered or flinched with reference to that policy? Not once. Hon. gentlemen opposite who were protectionists became free traders and then became protectionists again. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in their opposition to this policy of developing the industrial life of this country on the lines of reasonable protection have boxed the compass of changes; they have look east, south, north and west; have been everything by starts and nothing long; have had nothing but changes and variableness in their policy—while the Liberal-Conservative party has adhered steadily and resolutely to a policy of reasonable and adequate protection to our industries. The hon. gentleman went on after that to say that this Government—approach-

ing nearer the question under discussion—had never dealt frankly, sincerely or honestly with what is known as the Manitoba school question. Sir, I meet that with a direct negative, as emphatic as words can make it, and I base it upon the statement which I shall prove before I get through, that from the time this question came to the front until the present day, the Government has done nothing else than act honestly, sincerely, frankly and wisely in this matter. Sir, when this question first came before this House, when the school law was passed in Manitoba in 1890, what was the first question which met this Government? The first question was as to whether it should veto the legislation of Manitoba or not. And if any clamour was raised for that veto power being exercised, it was to be found among the friends—and in his own province—of the leader of the Opposition. But the Government took a frank and honest and consistent course on that question and refused to veto the legislation of the local legislature and government of Manitoba. And that legislation went into effect. What was the next course? Sir, this Government encouraged the appeal to the courts to see whether that legislation was intra vires; it aided that appeal to the courts, and it did it above board. And the result was that in the highest court of the empire that legislation was pronounced to be intra vires. There was then a demand made upon the Government that it should come to the aid of the minority in the province of Manitoba, by remedial legislation at once, which would put the grievance right, and give back to the minority the privileges which they before that time had exercised. The course of the Government was again consistent in that regard. It said: Above all things, let us know exactly what our powers are, let us know exacty what your grievances are; and before we make a single step to remedy what you declare to be your grievance, let us know exactly what our constitutional powers are. So, Sir, taking advantage of the piece of legislation which was the joint product of both parties in this House, which Mr. Edward Blake, the leader of the Opposition, and Sir John A. Macdonald, the late chief of the Liberal-Conservative party, agreed upon, following the line of that legislation, they advised that the minority in the province of Manitoba should go before that tribunal, that the matter should be carried up to the highest court, and that all the constitutional powers should be made perfectly clear before any such important and far-reaching action as they asked for, should be taken by the Dominion Government. Was not that consistent? Was it not an honest policy? Was it not a straightforward policy? Was it not a wise policy? Well, Sir, this course was carried out, and after we had the decision of the highest court, when all the points were cleared by that decision, when the grievance of the minority was fully demonstrated, when the powers that the Government possessed were placed beyond doubt, then the minority came back to this Government and asked that its appeal be heard. The Government then heard its appeal, and the Government heard counsel for the local government, and as a result, they made the remedial order. Was that not a wise thing to do? Was it not an honest thing to do? Was it not a necessary thing to do? My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) shakes his head when I asked the question whether it were a wise thing to do, intimating that he thought it not wise that the Government, under the circumstances, should have issued a remedial order. What, Sir, was the state of the case? In what position did the Government stand? Yonder, in one of the provinces, a minority; here a law and constitution, which gave to that minority the only access to the only power which could ultimately right their grievance; and the only door through which that aggrieved minority could come into the presence of the only power that could remedy their grievance, was a remedial order issued by the Government which heard the appeal. Yet my hon. friend says that it was not a wise thing, not a right thing for the Government to do, to open that door to the minority, and to allow it, with its grievance, to come face to face with Parliament. Sir, I hold that any Government which had that position under the constitution, which, by its whim, caprice or will, interposed itself irrevocably between that minority and the Parliament which the minority wished to approach, would be taking upon itself a responsibility which I, as a member of the Government, would not take upon myself, and which I think any Government would be wrong in taking upon itself. For ever and wherever in this country there is a minority with a grievance, with that grievance backed up by a decision of the highest court of the land, when that minority prays, through the only medium, through the only door, by which it can reach Parliament, namely, the granting of a remedial order, that it may be brought face to face with Parliament, which alone can remedy what it declares to be its grievance—so long as that condition of things exists, it is the duty of the Government to open the door, whatever else it may do or may refuse. Fault has been found, and would be found, I suppose, by my hon. friend, and perhaps by many others, as to the extent to which the remedial order went. They say in so many words that it went too far. How far did the remedial order go? The remedial order went just so far, and only so far, as the alleged and certified grievances of the minority went. When I say the certified grievance of the minority, I mean the grievance which was considered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and upon which, and with reference to which, their decision was made.

I say that it would have been an assumption of power which I think would have been unwarrantable, if the Government had refused to open that door, by its remedial order, just as wide as the established grievance of the minority, in order that if Parliament wished, it should not be shorn of one jot or tittle of its jurisdiction and power fully and completely to right that grievance, if it chose in its wisdom to do so. So much then with reference to that. I believe that the verdict of this House, and the verdict of this country hereafter, will be that in these actions, and so far as we have gone, the Government has done its simple duty, and only its duty, in that regard. Well, Sir, much has been made of the fact that the language of the remedial order was too mandatory, that its language was too arrogant, and that it should have been rather a request; and the charge is brought against the Government that it irritated the province of Manitoba in the language and issue of the remedial order. Well, Sir, I do not think that governments in this country, provincial governments or Dominion governments, are simply children. I think they are made up of grown men who understand the relation between governments; and I doubt if there is one iota of foundation in the order, in the circumstances under which it was given, and the quality which it necessarily must have, to justify such a charge against this Government. It was like the order of a court, and it simply asked the Manitoba government and legislature, in so far as legislation was necessary, to remedy the grievance, a grievance which had gone through the courts, and the decision as to which had come back—to remedy that grievance so far as legislation was necessary to do it. I was going on to say that the remedial order having been issued it ought not to be considered as wanting in courtesy or in thoughtfulness towards the local government, because of the necessarily judicial tone in which it was couched, and that it partakes in no nature of a threat, but that it is simply, as it were, the order of a court, reciting the facts and declaring what, in the judgment of the court, following the judgment of the Privy Council, seems to be necessary in order to remedy the grievances by the local authority itself. Sir, from the issue of that remedial order and the time which elapsed after that remedial order was issued, until this session of Parliament was time given and granted to the province of Manitoba to take the matter into its consideration and to come to its conclusion as to what it ought to do, as to what it might do in the premises. And, Sir, after the answer of that legislature to the order was received, the Government had then two courses open to it, one of which was now that this Parliament if that were considered as a refusal to legislate, was clothed with jurisdiction in the matter, it could proceed at once to remedy the grievances by legislation; or the other course, that still another attempt should be made, other negotiations entered into and another space of time left, in which the Manitoba Government and legislature could think over the matter, and could make up its mind whether or not it still ought not to come to a reasonable and satisfactory arrangement by virtue of its own power, and in its own legislature. The Government, after thinking the matter over very carefully, came to the conclusion that in a matter of this moment, it was best that the local government should be given every possible opportunity to make the settlement within its own power and of itself before jurisdiction should be taken by this Parliament and remedial legislation should be introduced into this Parliament. Does my hon. friend object to that? If there was any point to my hon. friend's remarks this afternoon is was this, that conciliation should be tried, and his quarrel with us, was, as it seemsed to me, that conciliation had not been, as he said, tried from the first. That is to say, the hon. gentleman does not quarrel with the idea of a chance being given to Manitoba to make good the matter, and remedy the grievances within its own power, but his quarrel with the Government an impeachment of the Government seems to have been that this conciliatory course was not taken from the first, and his argument was that the remedial order was too harsh and conciliation should have been commenced at that time and carried on as well. So that on this line of policy which the Government has adopted, I cannot see that my hon. friend finds fault with the Government for the added time it has given for a settlement of this question by Manitoba itself. The statement of the policy of this Government has been made in this House. I leave it to the House and I leave it to the country if it is not a clear statement of a policy, if it is not definite. I call my hon. friend who sits on my right (Mr. McCarthy) to witness. He has declared in this House that the Government's position has been stated clearly, definitely, and is well known, and he bases his attack henceforth on that line of policy which he declares we have stated and which is definite and clear. Is it or is it not a clear and definite line of policy when the Government states as a Government, and unitedly, to the House and country that there is, we believe, a grievance of the minority, and for permanent settlement it is best that the grievance should be removed by the local legislature itself, and that intricate and important legislation ought not to be undertaken hastily by this House, and ought not in any event to be undertaken until the utmost limit has been granted to the local government and the legislature to settle it, if possible, satisfactorily themselves? Is there a child above ten years of age who does not draw

a fair and clear idea of what that means from the very statement of it? It is impossible to mistake. No great paper in this country doubts, no legislator in this country who is not prejudiced, or does not speak from simply party views, doubts as to what that means. The only possible doubt that a man can have who wants to see remedial legislation and who clamours for it now is that something may intervene between this and the next session, so that if the Manitoba Government and legislature do not settle the question satisfactorily, this Government will not be in a position to settle it and carry out its pledge. That is all. Is not every pledge of policy made by a Government, and every policy laid down by an Opposition governed by those very conditions? They state what their policy is to-day. No man living and no Government can state what, under circumstances untoward, fatal, may occur to prevent that policy being carried out.

Some hon. MEMBERS, Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen must not laugh until I have finished what I am saying. I am here to state, and to state it on behalf of the Government, that so far as a policy can be decided on unanimously and unitedly, this policy is: That so far as it can be enunciated clearly, this policy is enunciated clearly, and so far as this Government is concerned, it intends to adhere to that policy, word for word, line for line, and letter for letter. Well, Sir, now let me for a moment, contrast the policy and statement of the Government with the course of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and the party which holds him as its leader, and the exponent of its policy, a statesman who is continually vaunted by his party as being head and shoulders above the statesmen of the Liberal-Conservative party, a leader, Sir, who is looked upon by his followers as heaven-given and destined to lead them in the near future to the long-wished for treasury benches, and the delights of power. A man, Sir, who is continually taunting hon. gentlemen opposite to him with lack of high principle, and lack of high practice in statesmanship. What, Sir, has been the course of that hon. gentleman; what has been his position in the past, and what is his position to-day? Five years this question has been before the country, and for these five years my hon. friend has led that party and been its exponent. I defy the face of clay and the tongue of mortal—

Mr. CASEY. The face of brass.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, with regard to my hon. friend I defy even that, and he has it. I defy any one to find in the pages of "Hansard," the official record of this Parliament, or in the records of the press which chronicle the sayings and doings of our public men, or in the records of the Liberal party convention over which he has presided, and of which he has been the leading spirit. I defy any one to point to one single sentence which will definitely show where my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) ever has stood, or to-day stands upon that question. My hon. friend has made no announcement of his policy in all these years. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has not made even a valuable suggestion as to what he thinks should be done.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do you want to steal our clothes?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) wants to know if I propose to steal his clothes? No, I have too much regard for the hon. gentlemen who sit around me. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, for five years, has been always running for shelter on this question. The first underbrush he got into was the character and quality of the Manitoba school, and he kept under that for two years or more, and I am not sure but he is under that yet. He asks: What is the character of those schools; are they Protestant schools? It is a question of fact, he says, and for five years he has been asking that question, and for five years he has been taking precious good care not to answer that question. Why, Sir, does my hon. friend not know what his own people think (and by his own people I mean his supporters in the province of Quebec), who are in favour of remedial legislation and separate schools in Manitoba. Does he not know what his friend from Iberville (Mr. Béchard) thinks? Does he not know what his friend from Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) thinks? Does he not know what his friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) thinks? Does he not know what his friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) thinks? Go through all the different counties of his province, and what do his friends think? Do they not think that these schools are Protestant, and that the fact is well established that they are Protestant schools. And yet my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has been with these friends for five years, and up to this moment his mind is like a blank piece of paper, so far as information is concerned as to whether these schools are Protestant or not. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has a supporter, and a sole supporter, and a left-hand man from the great western country. He might have asked him for information as to the quality of these schools, because if I am not mistaken, the opinion of that gentleman is that these schools are Protestant schools. I think he (Mr. Martin), has been making a very strong plea lately that they should be secularized, for by secularizing them, he says, you take away any grievance the minority had that anything like Protestant doctrine was taught in these schools. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) ever sat down by the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) and asked him his opinion with reference to these schools? My hon.

friend (Mr. Laurier) even went to the scene of action itself. He was in Manitoba. He had a conference with the minority, not once but twice, and they told him all they knew about it, and they knew everything about it. He hob-nobbed with the local government, the members of his own party in that province, the authors and founders and continuers of this legislation. Did he try to inquire from them as to what was the character and quality of these schools? Is he to-day misinformed about them, or is he to-day still under the shelter of that cover and fighting from behind it? He either knows or does not know the question of fact. No man of average intelligence would take more than five hours to convince himself as to it. Mr. Joly de Lotbinière put just a little bit of energy and investigation into it, and straightway got upon the platform in Quebec and declared that he knew all about it, and that they were Protestant schools. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) does know or does not know. If he knows, why is he not using his knowledge? If he does not know, there are only three reasons why he does not. One reason, that of incapacity (and you should not mention incapacity and the leader of the Opposition in the same breath); the other reason, utter carelessness, and he is not going to take the imputation of carelessness in this great matter. And the third reason: cowardice. As a man who claims to be a statesman, I put this question to him: Can he as the leader of a great party, and a commanding light in this country, afford to go through five years of turmoil upon a question which he himself says is shaking confederation, or may shake confederation to its very foundation, and not make himself sufficiently informed as to facts, and not then inform his people and his party as to these facts. If his people in the province of Quebec believe these schools are Protestant, and that therefore they keep from the minority the justice and the right which they claim; if his people believe it and are wrong, and my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) knows they are wrong, his first and most responsible duty as a statesman is to teach them that they are wrong and to eradicate that idea from their minds. And as a consistent man, if he believes that these schools are in that position and believes that therefore there is a grievance, it was his duty during these five years to have been backing up his people in their demand. Neither of these things has he done. He has simply stood under cover and shot from behind the bush. Sir, he had another cover. When he was challenged again to give an opinion and to make a statement of his views, he declared that he could not do it because this question was before the courts, and that he must not open his mouth upon it while it was sub judice. I beg to inform my hon. friend that the matter has passed through the courts and has been out of them for the last year nearly; and yet my hon. friend has not opened his mouth. But, Sir, he had another cover still. He entrenched himself behind this idea, which he put forth again and again: Let the Government find its own policy; it is not my duty to find a policy for the Government. Granted that it is not; but I do contend that it is his duty to find a policy for his party; and it is his duty to the country, as the leader of a party and as a statesman, to let his voice of truth and information go forth to the people, in an agitation which he says is fraught with such danger, to lead them in the right way; but up to the present moment, Sir, not even a valuable suggestion, as I have said, has come from my hon. friend. But I will tell you what my hon. friend has done. Now, in this year of grace, and in this present month, after all these agitations, and after these five years of mental travail, he has risen to this height: he has plucked up courage, and taken a sufficiently definite position to actually move the adjournment of the House on two occasions. You may search in vain the annals of government and parliamentary practice through and through to find any similar instance of a great question being to the front, agitating men's minds and threatening the peace and quiet of the body politic and a leader of a party, who for five years has diligently found fault with every step the Government has taken, at the end of that period, when he thinks they have made their final irretrievable step, simply plucking up courage enough to do what? To define his policy? To propose a remedy? To put against the lack of policy of the Government, as he calls it, a definite proposal of his own? No, Sir. He plucks up courage enough to try to profit from what he thinks is a crisis amongst his opponents, and to sail into power by the poor, miserable, mean artifice of putting the Government out on a motion to adjourn the House. To that height my hon. friend has risen and that noble eminence he occupies to-day after five years of mental and moral travail on one of the greatest subjects that has ever been before the Canadian Parliament or the Canadian electorate. Well, Sir, to-day when he arose to his feet this House expected something. On your right, Mr. Speaker, expectancy sat on the faces of hon. members. On your left a milder form of expectancy was observable. The hon. gentleman's supporters had experience of similar occasions, and did not expect too much. And the representatives of that interested public outside who have thronged these galleries today, sat listening with bated breath as the hon. leader of the Opposition rose to arraign the Government upon their definite and declared policy—to prove that that policy was insufficient, and to propose something which should settle this question and approve itself to the House and to the electo-

rate as a fair and just settlement of the question. And, Sir, what did they hear? When the hon. gentleman came to the point of setting forth his policy, they listened with attention, and the three great planks of his policy were laid down. What was the first? "Two years ago I said that the Government under the constitution had certain powers; that was my policy." Will any man in the world make out the meaning of a statement like that? Why, Sir, I always supposed that a policy was a definite statement of what ought to be done and what the man or the party was going to do. But my hon. friend has another idea of a policy, and he brings up a two-year old, musty statement which means nothing, and reiterates it to-day when all the country is silent with expectancy and declares: "That is my policy." But he thinks that is not quite sufficient to stand upon; a little misgiving takes hold of him; and he resuscitates another two-year old statement. "Two years ago," he says, "I declared that this was a question of fact and not a question of law; that is my policy." Again, one is puzzled to know how such a statement can be tortured to mean a definite policy. Yet when the hon. gentleman gave it forth and said, "That is my policy," every man of his support cheered, and cheered most lustily. They had got what they wanted—a definite, clear cut policy; as clear, Sir, as the sunlight, with no shadow upon it at all. Again, I ask, what is the meaning of the word policy, and how can such a statement of mere fact be denominated a policy, and be cheered by half a hundred or more of intelligent statesmen at the back of their leader? But, Sir, my hon. friend wants to have a trinity of planks to stand upon. Feeling yet a little insecure, he went one step further, and resuscitated another old statement. He said: "Two years ago I declared, if the schools are Protestant, then there is a grievance and there ought to be a remedy; that is my policy." There you have it, gentlemen of this House; there the country has it—three isolated facts, uttered two or three years ago resuscitated to-day in the face of a great crisis when the hon. gentleman says confederation is shaking to its foundation, put together, echoed and re-echoed, applauded and re-applauded by his followers as the policy of the Liberal party upon this school question. Then, he went on to say: "I speak not hastily, but when I have spoken, I do not take it back." The hon. gentleman has been so much in love with the first part of that proposition of not speaking hastily that he has forgotten to speak at all, and consequently has nothing to take back. He talked about the charge at Balaclava and gave us some fine rhetoric with reference to that noted charge, and told how the French General who criticised it said that it was magnificent, but it was not war. And so I thought of all the pleasant badinage, the jibes and sneers, and the pyrotechnic display which gradually led up to the statement of this triune policy of his: as it was said of the charge at Balaclava, so it might be said of this—it is magnificent, but it is not war. If I were a Frenchman and had good command of the French language, I could say to my hon. friend: "Ce n'est pas magnifique, et ce n'est pas la guerre." But my hon. friend rose from those three dry sticks of fact which he denominated his policy, and declared in tragic tones that something must be done and done at once, that the country was being disintegrated, that confederation was threatened. Then, in the name of heaven, why does not my hon. friend do something? Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh. That is just what I expected. I expected my hon. friends opposite to laugh the very moment I mentioned the possibility of their leader doing something. The idea is so foreign to him, they know their leader so well, that the mere suggestion that he shall do something sends them off into inextinguishable laughter. But look at the situation now in a graver aspect. My hon. friend poses as the saviour of this country. He comes up, filled with the idea of a crisis, and declares that the country is being disintegrated and confederation is in danger. Against him stands the policy of the Government. But that is not sufficient for him. The situation, he cries, is pressing, the crisis is great, confederation is in danger, and something must at once be done. What is that something he proposes to do? It is another motion. Not a motion to adjourn the House. This time he is on higher ground; this time he has a motion which is going to bring light out of this darkness, hope out of this despair, and unity and stability out of this disintegration with which confederation is threatened. What is his motion? He asks the House solemnly, but firmly, to declare that they regret the failure of the Government to deal with the Manitoba school question. How? In a manner demanded by the best interests of the country. And furthermore, he is of the opinion that the ministerial declaration with regard to this question is calculated to promote a dangerous agitation among the Canadian people. Why, Mr. Speaker, what are the two lines of the Government's declaration? They are, first, give Manitoba six months to settle the question herself. My hon. friend thinks that is dangerous. Why, he argued for it this afternoon. He blamed us because we had not been practicing conciliation all the time. But there is another branch of the question. That other is that if nothing is done to settle this matter satisfactorily, legislation will be introduced into this Parliament. Does my hon. friend say that that is dangerous? I ask him that question now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. In this resolution my hon. friend declares that something is dangerous. I want to know what he declares to be dangerous—the delay of six months for Manitoba or the remedial legislation which, in the event of Manitoba doing nothing, is to be introduced when Parliament meets again. Which does the hon. gentleman say is dangerous? Or is it both? My hon. friend did not deign to explain it in his speech. My hon. friend, when he is asked the question now, remains silent in his seat. How delightfully definite is the hon. gentleman's policy. The Government's work for five years is all before him; and yet, when he comes to regret that the Government is dealing with the Manitoba question in a manner not demanded in the best interests of the country, he has no suggestion in his resolution or speech as to what is the manner demanded by the best interests of the country. Not the least. My hon. friend rose to the height of twice moving the adjournment of the House to defeat the Government. But to-day he reached a still higher plane, and he moved a colourless catch motion, which every man who is opposed, in the least particular, to any step the Government has taken, or who is opposed in the least to throwing a single ray of light on his own views, could vote for. I challenge my hon. friend to put a motion before the House, laying down a definite, plain policy, in substitution for the policy of this Government, and ask this House to support it. My hon. friend says that something must be done, and done at once. He is in a position to do it. Jurisdiction is now invested in this House. My hon. friend can introduce his Bill, his measure, and submit the same to the House for its adoption; and this House has jurisdiction to make it law. If he and his party have any plan, they can put it into the shape of legislation, and this Parliament is in a position to pass upon that legislation. Has he done that? Will he do it? Will he give even a suggestion of it? My hon. friend taunted us with being cowardly. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have put our position plainly and clearly before this House, and have taken our stand on it. Has the hon. gentleman done the same?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Where is your Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend taunted us with trying to keep together in union in this party and the country the two great branches of different belief and different race. Does he find fault with that? Has he no solicitude for the same? Would the leader be worthy of the name who did not, in the spirit of toleration, in the spirit of love of unity in diversity, which my hon. friend made a part of his peroration, try to join all sections and creeds together in this country, within the ranks of his party, instead of making a cleavage line dividing them? My hon. friend taunts us with being disunited in our councils. How is it with himself? I challenge him and his lieutenants to rise to-day and say what they are in favour of on this question. They dare not do it. They put motions which are colourless; they dodge every motion which is definite; the thing they do not want to do is to put themselves on record. They have been skulking through this House and through this country without giving the least information to the people of where they stand, looking only, and hoping only, for profit to themselves and power to themselves through the disintegration which may come to their opponents. I like the men who will attack from without, who will batter down the walls, who will attack the beleaguered political fortress from without and capture it manfully; but I despise the men who will send their minions inside and try to capture it by exciting dissensions within. I ask my hon. friend to leave this pusillanimous statesmanship, this miserable small-minded manoeuvre of attempting to put Governments out on motions of adjournments and colourless catch motions, and to rise to the spirit of the occasion and the importance of the question by giving this House and the country the benefit of a statesmanlike opinion, the benefit of his declaration of what his policy would be, what he thinks would heal the sore, what he thinks would make peace and lasting and durable amity and unity throughout the country. To none of these does he respond. All his hopes, all the hopes of his party are based upon dissension in the ranks of gentlemen opposite to him and are as far as possible removed from any policy that he proposes to substitute for the policy of his opponents. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to my hon. friend to-night; I appeal to him and to his lieutenant. I challenge them again, to rise in this House and give their opinions with reference to this question. I challenge them to do it, but they will not do it. I said to my hon. friend who sat by my side when the leader of the Opposition rose to-day: "He will talk around everything and commit himself to nothing." And it fell out exactly that way. The hon. gentleman talked around everything; he committed himself to nothing; he ended up by declaring: I am not going to commit any chivalrous blunder. No; the blunders my hon. friend commits will never be chivalrous. He has made many blunders, he will make many more; but he does not run many risks of making that chivalrous blunder which consists in simply rising and stating plainly and frankly and honestly his position upon the great questions of the day.

Mr. TARTE. Mr. Speaker, you will never see me voting for the establishment in any part of Canada of a school system under which the languages of the two great nationalities represented here are not taught. Each time I rise in this House I am tempted to express my sincere regrets that such a system as I favour was not in existence

during my school years. If I spoke in my native language to-day I might hope, at least, to do justice to some extent to the great question that is now before you. But, Sir, if there ever was an occasion when a French-Canadian public man should try to be understood that occasion is the present. And, speaking in another than my native language, I must ask the indulgence of the House. We have listened to a very eloquent speech indeed. But looking at that speech squarely, what do you find in it? You find that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, calls upon us to give him a policy; he challenges us to formulate a policy for the other side of the House. Sir, the hon. gentleman, with all his experience, has evidently forgotten that we are not called upon to assume the duties of the Government. Governments have duties to perform; opponents also have duties to perform. We on this side perform our duties in calling upon the hon. gentlemen who administer our affairs to keep the pledges they have given for years and years. So much abuse has been heaped upon my head that to-day I feel justified in giving, as briefly as possible, the view I have entertained upon this question. From the day when the legislature of Manitoba adopted these school laws in 1890, and the law abolishing the French language, I did not hesitate to advocate a policy of disallowance. I am always surprised when I hear even the foremost men in the House apparently scandalized at such a proposal and declaring that the autonomy of the provinces must be maintained at all hazards. Those who have read carefully the debates upon confederation cannot forget that Mr. Brown, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Galt—nearly all the important English-speaking members of the House held the view that the right of veto was the very keystone of our system. They may have been right or they may have been wrong. But, the right of veto has been established. And no one has defended it with more eloquence or more strength than my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I listened with care to that hon. gentleman's speech, in 1888, if I remember well, on the Jesuit Bill question. He advocated strongly the disallowance of that measure, which was assuredly a provincial measure. But, Sir, let bygones be bygones. I claim that the disallowance of the Manitoba laws would have been a safer and more just mode of dealing with them than the one that has been pursued by this Government. With what are we face to face to-day? By the tacit consent of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, a system of national schools has been established in the province of Manitoba. They have the power to veto the laws by which those schools are established to-day. They did not disallow those laws. But the same government, if we are to believe the statements of the gentlemen from the province of Quebec, would ask us to undo what they have allowed to be done. I say it would have been more manly, it would have been more just to disallow those laws immediately. Archbishop Taché began by asking for the exercise of that right of veto. In the petition of 7th April, 1890, he asked that these Bills should be disallowed. But, Sir, he was soon led in another direction. Archbishop Taché was, no doubt, a good man, a good missionary, and it is far from my intention to throw suspicion upon his memory. Surely not. But he was living thousands of miles away from the centre of population and of politics. He was born a Conservative; he belonged to the good old school of which Bishop Lefleche is to-day the most eminent representative in Quebec; the very word "liberal" frightened him. And he was led by hon. gentlemen on the other side to have confidence in them and in them alone. Yet, Sir, Archbishop Taché had learned to know hon. gentlemen opposite before that day. In the inquiry of 1874, he stated that he had been deceived over and over again by the late Government of Sir John A. Macdonald. But in spite of all that, as I said a moment ago, he stood by the Conservative Government in their policy of non-interference. The bishops and the French Conservative party in the province of Quebec took their lead from him, and agreed not to press for a policy of disallowance, but on the condition that certain legal proceedings should be taken and followed up to the end. We are to-day face to face with the result of that policy. To any man of common sagacity, it should be evident that all these proceedings were instituted and have been carried on to gain time. What did we see? In the province of Quebec assurances of one kind were given, in the province of Ontario other assurances were given. I have under my hand here an article published in the Orange "Sentinel," in 1893, in which the present policy of this Government was foreshadowed. That article stated: The Government will go on with these proceedings; if the judicial committee of the Privy Council decide that the minority has rights, the Government will not do anything at all upon that judgment. Sir, that which the Orange "Sentinel" foretold in 1893, is taking place to-day. Well, such was the policy of the Government until the judgment of the Privy Council. In Quebec they were saying one thing, in Ontario they were saying another thing. Their position became much more embarrassing after the judgment of the Privy Council. They were now confronted with the judgment of that high court, and what were they going to do? Sir, we had four elections, two in the province of Quebec, one in Ontario, and one in the province of Nova Scotia. The Government were bound to do something, and what did they do? They passed the remedial

order that we have heard so much about. But of that remedial order, it seemed at the time, and it seems to-day, that there are many interpretations. In Verchères we had the full interpretation of that order. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and myself took a certain part in that election. I was in Verchères on nomination day, and half a dozen of my hon. friends on both sides of the House were there with us. The Minister of Public Works, after having made eloquent appeals for the support of his candidate, called God to witness the truth of the statement he was going to make. I well remember that the crowd had a good laugh at him that day. We asked the hon. gentleman what kind of a law it would be that would remedy all the grievances of the Manitoba minority, and the hon. gentleman stated that he had in his pocket the very remedial order about which the leader of the House speaks so evasively to-day. The hon. Minister of Public Works was then very positive, and, holding the paper over the heads of the vast crowd that was listening to him, he said: This is the law that we are going to present to the House. I call on my hon. friend from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), on my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet), and on my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) to say if I am not correct when I state that the Minister of Public Works, holding the order in his hands over the crowd, told us: This is the law we are going to introduce. I then asked him, "When will you introduce that law?" The hon. Minister of Public Works, again calling upon God as his witness, answered: The law will be introduced during the next session of Parliament. These were his words, I quote them from "La Minerve," of 13th April:

Mr. Geoffrion asked by what Statute we will settle the school question. That Statute will embrace precisely the same terms that are contained in the remedial Order in Council, and, if Mr. Geoffrion had read that Order in Council, he would have seen that the Government meant to be serious, and will be serious. Nothing will stop us in our determination.

But the hon. Minister was supported by another great authority in making all these pledges. He had with him a very important telegram from a gentlemen occupying a very high position in this House, I mean my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, who was in those days fighting in the battles of justice and equity, so he said, in Antigonish.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They got justice there.

Mr. TARTE. Yes, and more than justice. The Minister of Justice desired to say a good word in behalf of the Conservative candidate in Verchères, and so he sent the Minister of Public Works this telegram, which I translate from "La Minerve":

Antigonish, 11th April, 1895.

Prospects here are everything that could be desired for those who wish to give justice to the minority in Manitoba. Antigonish will declare itself for the rights of justice and for the cause of the good government of the country. Our friends ardently desire your success in defence of the cause, which is the same everywhere in the Conservative ranks.

CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

After these statements, the electors were not yet sure that the truth had been told them. What did the Minister of Public Works do? Now, I am going to call the attention of the House to the real cause of the whole trouble with which we are face to face to-day. The Minister of Public Works, I have reason to believe, with the consent of the Government, instead of acting as a statesman, instead of doing what the leader of the House has asked us to do, namely, to take the full responsibility of his act, the Minister of Public Works, I say, seeing that he was not believed and not trusted by the electors, went to the Archbishop of Montreal and asked him, not only did he ask him, but I will go so far as to say that he even forced him, to interfere in Verchères.

Mr. OUIMET. The statement of the hon. gentleman is not founded on fact.

Mr. TARTE. I expected that very denial from the hon. gentleman, I was prepared for it. I must accept it. The hon. gentleman forgets many statements, I am afraid. In past days he has forgotten many, and he has done so to-night. I have here an interview with the Archbishop on 19th April, 1895, and the last part of it only will I read.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. From what paper?

Mr. TARTE. From the "Herald." After reciting the facts, here is what the Archbishop said—here is what the reporter makes the Archbishop say:

From the statement made by Archbishop Fabre it appears that the using of the second letter was brought about in this way. The fact that the cures had been instructed to remain neutral became known, and was interpreted by certain Liberal journals as meaning dissatisfaction of the bishops with the remedial order and the action of the Government. His Grace was, therefore, called upon by the Catholic members of the Cabinet and asked to remove an impression which was not only a handicap to them in Verchères, but prejudiced the cause of remedial legislation with their colleagues in the Government. His Grace, therefore, issued a second letter, wherein he made it clear that he approved the action of the Government in passing the remedial order, but he was careful in no way to reflect upon the Liberal party.

Do I understand the hon. gentleman to state that neither he nor any of his colleagues to his knowledge called upon the Archbishop? Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that neither he nor any of his colleagues wrote, not only to the Archbishop, but to those around

him? Does the hon. gentleman state that neither he nor any of his French colleagues asked and pressed upon the Archbishop of Montreal to interfere, giving as a reason that the action of the bishops was prejudicing them with their colleagues? I will accept the hon. gentleman's denial.

Mr. OUIMET. Why should I speak for my colleagues when they can all speak for themselves?

Mr. TARTE. It is quite true that the hon. gentleman has enough to do to speak for himself, but it is no less proof that what the Archbishop said was perfectly correct. The hon. gentleman knows that his colleagues called upon the Archbishop of Montreal. The Postmaster General called upon His Grace on two different occasions; the Minister of Agriculture called and wrote. The result of all these visits was that the Archbishop issued a circular, which I have here. I will not read the whole of it, but I will give its most important parts. The prelate at first sent a letter to all the priests not to interfere, but after the French members of the Cabinet had complained that the inaction of the clergy was injuring them, the bishops interfered believing if they did not interfere it would be all up with the remedial order. Here is what the Archbishop wrote. I translate it from the French:

In asking you to keep silence on the Manitoba school question, my intention is that you should not speak about it from the pulpit. You are, however, free, outside of it, to express the entire satisfaction of the episcopacy with the firm and courageous position lately taken by the Federal Government. It is only justice to the good will of our legislators to encourage them to pursue to the end the work so happily begun.

The Minister of Public Works stated that he did not call on Archbishop Fabre. Will he deny that he made public and gave to the press a private letter written to him by Bishop Moreau? I charge the Minister of Public Works with having made public a private letter addressed to him a few days before by Bishop Moreau, that he did not only make it public but broadly circulated it in every house in Verchères? It read as follows:—

24th March, 1895.

Hon. A. Ouimet.

Allow me to express to you the earnest pleasure felt in making communication with you and your colleagues as regards the position you have taken in favour of the Catholics of Manitoba. It is precisely what all Catholics and true friends of the country expected of our hon. Ministers. They have accomplished the very difficult task which was imposed on them, with a spirit of justice, with a fairness and devotion which call alike for the gratitude of all French Catholics and admirers of good government. May Heaven bless them with all His benedictions and come to their help until perfect victory over all their enemies shall be accomplished. Very great also has been my pleasure in learning that there will be a session of Parliament in April next. The great question of Manitoba schools will certainly be discussed, and it will be then that our Ministers will pronounce the sentence of life or death. It is my opinion that, after an act so courageous and so noble, they cannot fall from their high position, because they have the support of all those who have a sense of justice and right and who desire to advance their country. These are in greater numbers than those who have allowed themselves to be dominated by injustice and fanaticism.

That interference which the Ministers forced on the bishops is at the bottom of all the trouble with which we are face to face today. But at the same time those promises were made in the province of Quebec, pledges of quite another kind were made in the county of Haldimand. If I am well informed, the Secretary of State and his friends told their important followers that the remedial order was simply an act of administration and that nothing would come out of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is quite true.

Mr. TARTE. Yes, and the best evidence is, that when Parliament met, the Speech from the Throne referred to the question in that vague way of which the leader of the House is an expert. Even when he speaks through the mouth of the representative of our sovereign, we can recognize the vagueness of his language. Well, Parliament met, and speeches were made. My hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Belley) made a speech to which I may not allude. But I will read the newspaper comments upon it. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) also made a speech. My hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Belley) was evidently authorized by the French Ministers to state that there would be remedial legislation this session, and my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was just as evidently authorized to state that there would be no remedial legislation. The Manitoba legislature met, and something had to be done; but the Government were afraid to be obliged to come out of the bush. What did they do? As I have shown, they had promised the church and they had begged the church to interfere on their behalf? What did they do, Sir? We all know that His Excellency, Lord Aberdeen, is a man of great good sense and of high honour. He knows his duty too well to do anything improper. I most certainly will not allude in any disrespectful way to him, but I am to a certain extent allowed to refer to him in this Chamber. His Excellency entered into the arena. It is not possible to conceive, it is not possible to admit, that, when he called Mr. Greenway and Mr. Sifton to come to Ottawa, that he did so without being authorized by his advisers. He was authorized by them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has told us that we have no policy. Did the hon. gentleman have a policy, when, after sending to the Manitoba Government that remedial order, he called on His Excellency to negotiate on his be-

half? Is this policy? Let the country answer that question, for I can allude no further to it. But, Sir, Manitoba declined to enter into these negotiations, and what did the hon. gentleman do? Did he proceed immediately to keep the pledges which the hon. Minister of Public Works had given in Verchères? Did his Government introduce a remedial law? No, but they discussed carefully the matter between themselves, as the leader of the House has told us. The result of that discussion was that, on a given day, we heard that the three French Ministers had resigned. We have been told a great many stories about their resignation; but "La Minerve" has given the genuine story of the whole thing. "La Minerve" is the property of the Postmaster General, and it is edited by Mr. Royal, an ex-lieutenant-governor, who, during the crisis, has been in constant communication with the French Ministers. On the 11th of July, "La Minerve" gave us a full report of the incidents of the crisis. I will not read the whole of it, as it is too long, but I will translate a few brief extracts. The article is headed, in French of course, "The Secret of the Crisis," and it says:

To properly understand the position, it is necessary to know what has taken place between the French Ministers and their English and French colleagues, in so far as it is possible to control the one thousand contradictory rumours which are circulated.

I call the attention of the House to what follows:

Last Friday, after several days of deliberation, the Cabinet adopted unanimously a statement which was to be put before the House. When the Ministers separated, they were in perfect accord, and the Catholics were in a position to declare that they were satisfied, because they had obtained an acknowledgment of the rights of their countrymen. Saturday, when the Council met again, the harmony had disappeared. Thanks to a secret work, a certain number of Ministers had changed their views, and four paragraphs had been stricken from the statement, in spite of the energetic opposition of the French-Canadian Ministers, who then refused to accept that statement.

Is that true or not? I have more than one reason to know that it is perfectly true.

Mr. OUIMET. Let me interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) to say that nothing in that report has been warranted by anything I have said.

Mr. TARTE. The statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Ouimet) is just as vague as the speeches of my hon. friend the leader of the House.

Mr. OUIMET. I am no more at liberty to say what has not taken place in Council than I am to state what has taken place.

Mr. TARTE. I do not say that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has given this information to Mr. Royal. The hon. gentleman knows that "La Minerve" is not under his control, but it is under the control of his colleague, the Postmaster General. The writer goes on to say:

The work of several days was lost, and everything had to be begun anew. At last, on Monday, the English Ministers arrived in the Council Chamber with the statement which has been read to the House.

The statement is too long to be read by me to-night, but I will give it to the reporter. Briefly, it says, that the French Minister had asked that the words "separate schools" be introduced into the statement that was read to the House, and that instead of these, the words "adequate means of relief" had been introduced. Will the hon. Minister deny what I am stating? I will accept his denial, if he denies that the French Ministers have pressed upon their colleagues to put these words in the statement. At any rate, he knows that I am perfectly right in the statement I make.

Mr. FOSTER. You are perfectly safe in making a statement about what was done in Council. Nobody can deny it or affirm it.

Mr. TARTE. I am not responsible for the statements of my hon. friend's colleagues. If they have spoken it is not my fault; and if my hon. friend takes time to read the statement I have in my hand, he will see that the secrets of the Council Chamber have come out. It is not our fault, I say again. The Ministers were out at the time, and they did not intend to return to the fold as soon as they did. And they evidently spoke. Well, Sir, the House does not know yet why the French Ministers went out. We have the statement that was made in the House, but the country is still asking why the French Minister went out. It is also asking why they went back. Why they went out is not quite known; but why they went back is, I think, pretty fully understood. The hon. Postmaster General has been a Minister for a long time; in fact, his calling is to be a Minister. If he were not a Minister, God knows what he would do. I am told that he was very anxious indeed during the three days that passed between his so-called resignation and his return to the Government. Sir, I am inclined to believe that he went out to leave out the hon. Minister of Agriculture. On a former occasion the hon. Minister of Agriculture was pretty near going out of the Government; I allude to the occasion when the disallowance of the North-west ordinance was pressed. At that time the hon. Postmaster General kept him in and did not go out himself. This time he went out, and the Minister of Agriculture has been kept out. The hon. Minister of Public Works was quite sure to stay out. His interviews with all the newspaper men he could see were read to the House. He was starting for war and for blood. Sir, the reception that he got when he took his

seat is a warning of the reception that awaits him in the province of Quebec.

Mr. OUIMET. Hear, hear.

Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I say again to him, he should not have gone out, or he should have stayed out. The position he occupies to-day is a very important one. He has taken upon himself the succession of Sir George Cartier. In the district of Montreal he has been looked upon for a certain time at least as the leader of the great Conservative party; and when a man occupies such a position, he has a duty to perform, and the hon. gentleman has shown want of dignity, or incapacity or want of courage. He has gone into this Government, I take it, in about the same way that he went into the Privy Council Chamber for the first time. I happen to know what took place in 1891. The hon. gentleman did not go into this Government by the grand door of honour and truthfulness and fidelity to his friends; and on the present occasion he has played the same role that he played in 1891. And it is a very curious coincidence that this time he went into the Government through the same negotiator, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), as he did in 1891.

Mr. FOSTER. It is wonderful how much you know.

Mr. TARTE. I happen to know some little things about the hon. gentleman's colleagues in the province of Quebec. Will the hon. gentleman deny, for instance, that in 1891 the hon. member for Cardwell was a party to a pledge that was given to the Hon. Mr. Chapleau in his house by the ex-Prime Minister and by Senator Drummond? I was not the only witness, either. I think my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) knows as much as I know about that, because, if I remember rightly, on that very occasion he was offered a position in this Government, and he declined to take it; and my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, took it. As far as the ex-Minister of Agriculture is concerned, he went out and he stayed out. Well, Sir, I am not here to defend him. He has friends who can defend him better than I can; but even his bitterest opponents will not deny that on this occasion he has given evidence of fidelity to his duty and of strength of character. Now we know a good deal of what has been the policy of this Government in the past. What is it going to be in the future? The hon. Minister of Finance has made a long speech, and he has begged us to give him a policy. Sir, what is his policy? His policy is not to do anything during this session, and to say that if the Manitoba Government does not settle the Manitoba school question in a satisfactory way, then this Government may do something. He has asked us many questions. I will ask him, what does this something mean? Is it going to be a remedial law covering the remedial order? The hon. gentleman will not say it is.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it necessary to give my hon. friend any answer to any question he may ask me. He knows everything.

Mr. TARTE. The hon. leader of the House is, of course, very much above every one of us. Still, he might condescend to give us a few short answers. We have listened to him patiently, even when he was saying nothing. Let him not imagine that he is above public opinion. On the floor of this House I am on just as good a footing as he is. He may have a better opinion of himself than I have of myself. I quite admit that I am only a humble member of the House. I have the misfortune of not speaking the English language as well as I speak my own language. Let him learn the French language as I have learned the English language, and let us fight a good political battle together. Well, Sir, he does not want to answer that question, because he is not able to answer it.

An hon. MEMBER. He is afraid.

Mr. TARTE. Yes, he is afraid. He will not answer me, but his organs speak for him, and they speak more definitely than he does. What does the "Mail" say, the organ paid—I will not say bought—by the money of his colleagues? What does that organ say? It says that there will be no remedial legislation, or that if there is any, it will be of the mildest possible kind. That organ goes on to charge the hon. gentleman's former colleague with being at the head of the church party of Quebec. It accuses Mr. Angers of trying to excite racial hatred and passion. The hon. gentleman will not answer, but his organ will speak for him, one of his Ministers will answer for him. He will not even tell us that we are going to have a session; we are not sure of having a session; but we are sure of one thing, that the Minister will not speak, some of his colleagues and friends will. On the 12th July one of his colleagues, the Controller of Customs made an important speech in the city of Ottawa. He reproached the Bishop of Nicolet with having written a factum to the sacred congregation of the Propaganda; he said that the publication of that document was an indictable offence, a felony; and he went on to say that if the Government dared to introduce remedial legislation, he would step out of the Government. My hon. friend used the same language that we have heard from the mouths of three hon. gentlemen on the floor of Parliament; and that we would have heard from forty members on the other side if the Government had attempted to introduce remedial legislation this session. But, Sir, we have further language of the same

kind from friends of the hon. leader of the House. In Hamilton a gentleman, who calls himself a Conservative in good standing, alderman Cook, spoke. He said :

There never was a time when Orangemen and Protestants should stand more firmly and allow of no surrender by legislation. Manitoba had done what she had a right to do. He was sorry to hear the Government say that in six months they would pass remedial legislation, if Manitoba did not remedy the grievance to the minority. If the Government should pass remedial legislation, he would oppose the Government.

I call the attention of the House to the next sentence :

We have got to crush out this French race in Canada, and we will never have peace until we do so. These Frenchmen will not be coerced, but we have to grind them down and make them understand that we mean business.

In the county of York, where my hon. friend is a prospective candidate, a gentleman spoke also—the leader of the Conservative Opposition in the legislature. This gentleman, Mr. Pitts said that if the Government ever dared to introduce a remedial law, he and all the Conservatives he could control would go against the Government. I have made those quotations to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the serious state of things with which we are face to face. The Government, by their vacillating policy, have brought about a state of things that we cannot characterize as aught but very dangerous. In Manitoba, on the 12th July, speeches were made ; and in these speeches we are told that the people of Manitoba—some of them at any rate—are prepared even to rise in arms if this Government should introduce a remedial law. Similar language has been used in many meetings in the Orange lodges. Sir, are we going to have civil war again ? If the unwise, the vacillating policy of this Government is going to bring this new disaster on this country, the least imprudence in Manitoba could to-day excite a very dangerous conflict. We cannot ignore that. Well, it seems to me that when a Government, by their vacillation, have brought about such a state of things, they are no longer worthy of public confidence. Even if they introduced such a law here, I say that it would be a most dangerous thing to trust them with the enforcement of such a law. What would they do with it ? I ask my hon. friends from Quebec to weigh that question. We are in a small minority in Manitoba, and the least imprudence will lead to a most dangerous conflict. The hon. gentleman laughs. The hon. gentleman may laugh at the voice of a member of the House who is after all just as good as he. I am not proclaiming myself a puritan ; I am not going upon the public stand and teaching puritanism as my hon. friend did in the past for many years ; but if when I am speaking from my seat in this House, I am speaking as representing electors who are just as good and honest and loyal as the electors who will not elect my hon. friend in his own county.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend never wrote for money.

Mr. TARTE. When I was the editor of a paper, I got, I will not say, a decent salary, because there are very few newspaper men who get that, but when I wrote on a public question I supported it as well as I could. But my hon. friend, after preaching prohibition for many years for money,—which he cannot deny—came to the House and went back on all his preaching.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is courteous in one thing and wrong in another.

Mr. TARTE. I accept the statement of my hon. friend, but I want to ask him if on that very question of prohibition he has not played the same vacillating game he is playing now.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is wandering away from the statement before the House.

Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend stated that we had no policy on this side. I want to ask him, as one knowing something about constitutional law and parliamentary government, if it is the duty of the Opposition to form a policy ?

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem to be.

Mr. TARTE. Great men—not quite so great, perhaps, as the hon. Finance Minister, but still of some ability—have not taken the hon. gentleman's view. Lord Palmerston, for instance—of course, he was not as big a man as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) but he was something of a man. Sir Robert Peel would not have answered as the hon. gentleman has answered, and yet he has been considered a man of some ability. What did Sir Robert Peel say ?

It is an old maxim that the duty of an opposition is very simple ; it is to oppose everything and propose nothing.

And in the same spirit, Sir Robert Peel said that he would refuse to prescribe until he was called in. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, is perfectly prepared to prescribe, but not to undertake to cure the incurable disease inflicted upon the country by hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir Robert Peel goes on :

The peculiar office of the opposition is doubtless to watch with keen eye the conduct of the government they oppose, to see if anything be blamable or liable to criticism to trip them up even before they fall——

That is just what we are going to do——

——at all events if they stumble to mark their stumbling and call upon them to set things right again.

Right again.

The originators of measures and inventors of a policy, the individuals who come forward with their schemes and suggestions for public approbation, are not the opposition but the Ministers of the Crown.

The leader of the House would be happy if my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition were to place upon the Table of the House a remedial Bill. He would immediately adopt it. The Ministers have not been able to indicate any policy or to propose any Bill. If we were ridiculous enough to make a Bill for them, to assume their duties, they would be very much relieved, indeed. The country understand that we are not called upon to do that. The policy of the leader of the Opposition is, in my estimation, a very clear one. What has he said? He says: I am ready to grapple with the question. Is not this a policy? The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) who is opposed to the policy of this Government, as he stated the other day, but who is, nevertheless, going to vote for it, laughs. Well, I ask again, as against the policy of postponement that we have had for years and years, is it not a perfectly good policy when my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says: I am ready to grapple with the question, and to settle it. If my hon. friend was called to power tomorrow, and did not keep his pledge, if he did not grapple with the question and settle it, it would be the duty of those who have supported him to vote against him. Sir, we are to meet again in six months, it appears. All the organs in Ontario of gentlemen opposite declare that we must not have remedial legislation.

Mr. DAVIN. What does your organ say?

Mr. TARTE. Our organs say very rightly that we have an incapable Government, a Government who have deceived the people. But what do the organs of the French Ministers say. Look, for instance, at "L'Evenment." It is obliged to say: We have no confidence in our friends; we have been deceived. "What does "Le Canada" say in the person of Emmanuel Tassé, an able editor? Mr. Tassé has retired from the editorship of "Le Canada"? Why? He states why: I have been deceived; I no longer have cofidence in my friends. But the organs in Ontario, the "World," the "Mail and Empire," the Hamilton "Spectator," state that there will be no remedial legislation. In six months, things will be worse than they are to-day, and God knows they are bad. As I said at the beginning of the remarks, I am about to conclude, I am sorry that the languages of the two great nationalities that are here to stay are not taught in every school in Canada. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I hope I shall never give in this or any other House a vote to establish or to re-establish a school system under which the two languages are not upon the same footing. I go further and say that if my hon. friends on the other side of the House, instead of resorting to the hateful mode of coercion, had managed in such a way as to grant to my fellow-countrymen in Manitoba and the North-west, the benefit and blessing of the teaching of the French language, the Manitoba school question might have been settled long ago. Sir, I speak for myself alone; I have no right to speak for anybody else. But I say again that so far as I am concerned, let my hon. friends try to restore to my countrymen the official use of their own language, the teaching in the schools of their own language, and they will have done a great deal. A great many suggestions have been made, and gentlemen opposite ask of this side of the House what suggestions we have to offer. I am making one. Why, my hon. friend is not ready to-day to go on with the measure his colleagues have promised the public. Six months hence, I say again, we shall be in a worse position. Passions will have been inflamed, speeches will have been made on one side in Ontario, and, it may be, in Quebec on the other. In Quebec we will preach the same doctrine we have preached in the past. The public press has, on many occasions, circulated false reports of meetings that we have attended. For my part, nearly every day I see my own words distorted. I suppose I can stand it—I must. The duty we have to perform, if you will allow me to say so, is to go calmly to work. These speeches made on the 12th July will not improve matters; and will you allow me to add, Sir, that the position taken by my hon. friends the French Ministers will not improve matters, either. If we could make up our minds to act like politic men; if, on both sides of the House, we decided to take the responsibility of our actions, a great many things would have been done that have not been done. Sir, what has done the greatest harm in the Manitoba question? Is it not the unfortunate publication of Bishop Gravel's letter? Who caused Bishop Gravel to write that letter? Sir, I am not going to traduce the bishops of my own church in this House, but in the name of the church to which I am proud to belong, I wish to protest against the abuse that has been made of the authority of that church. Our bishops are good men, indeed. They are not politicians. When approached by designing men, they are apt to be deceived. If the Bishop of Nicolet had not been deceived, if Archbishop Fabré had not been deceived, they would not have interfered in the way they did. I was sorry to read somewhere a statement that the province of Quebec was endeavouring to dictate to the Dominion. I beg to assure my hon. friends in this House, and the English population outside the House, that the French Ministers who represent the pro-

vince of Quebec in the Government, have made blunders, they have compromised themselves. Let them alone be compromised. Sir, the province of Quebec is a proud province. It may have made mistakes, it may have its failings. The French race that Mr. Coo wants to trample upon, is a proud race. It may have its failings. I do not know any race which does not need improvement. But, Sir, the province of Quebec is a loyal province, the church of Quebec is a loyal church. It may make mistakes, some of its members may make mistakes. I am sorry for the interference that has taken place. My friends on both sides of the House, Conservative as well as Liberal, are sorry as I am myself. When we meet together, we express the same views and the same ideas. If the Roman Catholic bishops had not interfered at all—and allow me to add if a great many Protestant ministers had not interfered at all—we might be just as well off. I take my seat, thanking you for the indulgence you have shown me. I take my seat in the full conviction that this Government cannot and does not intend to settle the question, with the full conviction that they will go on pursuing the same deceiving policy, that they will deceive Ontario, that they will deceive Quebec as long as they can. Fortunately, they cannot go on much longer, the country will not much longer be exposed to the mismanagement and unwise policy that the Government have been pursuing. I know that there are in the Conservative party, in the grand old party that I have known in better days, thousands and thousands of men who have made up their minds to oppose this Government. As I say, we shall not have long to wait. If Parliament is not dissolved by treachery before another session, it will be dissolved by course of law in the month of April next. And, Sir, when this Government has to give an account of its deeds, I believe that it will be condemned by the people of this country.

Mr. OUIMET. The speech the hon. gentleman has just made can be thoroughly answered by his own statements, statements that he made a week ago over his own signature in the paper called the "Cultivateur," of which he is the editor, and over which he has sole control. When the hon. gentleman was led to believe that remedial legislation was going to be introduced he felt very sorry, he felt that his position before the province of Quebec would be so compromised, and that the success of his party at the next election would be so jeopardized, that he endeavoured to soften the blow that was about to fall upon himself and upon his party, and he wrote as follows in his paper :—

This remedial legislation was only resorted to as a means to bring the active and violent intervention of the clergy into the electoral struggle, as in the days which preceded the mission of Archbishop Conroy in Canada. It is to obtain this intervention that the Government will introduce the so-called remedial legislation. We are, therefore, in the presence of a bold, audacious and cynical electoral manoeuvre, freighted with consequences and perils for the Catholics, for the French Catholics especially, and for the entire Dominion. There is not in the whole Canadian Parliament a man of any intellectual ability who does not know that it is impossible, in the present state of things, to force Manitoba to submit to any educational law adopted by the Federal power. Such a law can be passed, but it cannot be put into effect. It cannot be put into effect if Manitoba chooses to resist ; and, unfortunately, no one can doubt that such resistance will take place. Such resistance has been, so to speak, organized by the Tory party itself.

Mr. TARTE. Please go on.

Mr. OUIMET. I do not want to detain the House ; I will do like the hon. gentleman, and give the whole paper to the "Hansard" reporter.

Mr. TARTE. I want the hon. gentleman to go on reading.

Mr. OUIMET. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the same gentleman who, eight days ago, charged the Government with the most audacious attempt to commit the clergy, as he says, to a violent intervention in politics in order to compel remedial legislation. The hon. gentleman realized that the effect of that remedial legislation would be so disastrous to himself and to his party, that he endeavoured to weaken the result of that legislation in advance, and to take upon himself, I suppose, as he tries to do on every occasion, the merit of the whole thing. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to speak of myself, but as a member of this honourable House, I think I owe it to my colleagues to state, in answer to what has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman, the facts as they exist. I have been charged with having entered this Government by the back-door, I have been charged with having been false to a friend of mine, a man occupying a high position in the province of Quebec, a gentleman who is yet an intimate friend of mine. Mr. Speaker, I beg to state that when I was twice offered the portfolio of the Hon. Mr. Chapleau in the Government of Sir John Abbot, I refused it. I refused it because I would not take a portfolio belonging to a friend of mine. Every political consideration apart, I must say that I never ran after a portfolio, I had no necessity for doing so and I did not wish it, and from my own choice I would not have it to-day. When I was offered and solicited, in the presence of Mr. Desjardins, the Senator, by Sir John Abbott to accept a portfolio as the colleague of Mr. Chapleau, I accepted it ; and I accepted it because it was then pointed out to me that I could be of great use, under the very difficult circumstances in which the party was placed at the time, on the eve of the by-elections upon which depended the fate of the party. I

accepted and went into the fight, and the result of the bye-elections in the province of Quebec was of a nature to satisfy my hon. friends who had shown confidence in me that I could really do good service for my party. We won the elections, nearly all the by-elections, with the exception of the first, the election at Richelieu, and I am proud to say that as a colleague of Mr. Chapleau I did honour to him. I am sorry to take the time of the House to give these explanations, but as a member of this House I thought that I owed it to my colleagues in the Government and in the House to make that statement. Again I am sorry to speak of myself, but I hope that after having been 22 years in the House, I am in a position to say that I have never done an act which was not worthy of a member of this House, that I have not on every occasion maintained the dignity and honour of this House as an independent member, as the President of this honourable House, as well as a member of this Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured on more than one occasion to obtain the favour of your recognition, but unfortunately without success, and my desire was to bring to the notice of the House and to challenge the policy of the Government from beginning to end with respect to the Manitoba school question. My hon. friend, who was more lucky this afternoon than I was, has put a motion in your hands, Sir, in which reference is made to the question that I am most anxious to discuss here; but I am unable after listening to the debate which has taken place, to say that the merits of this question have yet received attention at the hands of hon. members of this House. My hon. friend who leads the Opposition in this House has with great effect and upon facts which certainly justify many of the observations that he made, has been able to point out the inconsistencies of hon. gentlemen occupying the treasury benches, and the hon. gentleman who leads the House has with much effect pointed out what in his view was the want of policy on the part of the Opposition. Well, Sir, I am not particularly concerned with either one view of the case or the other. What I am concerned in is the question of whether we in this House are prepared either now or at any other time to adopt a remedial Bill. I cannot agree that the statement of the Government in that respect, whatever it has been in the past, is not now definite and clear. For my part, judging by all the rules of constitutional Government, it appeared to me that the adoption by the Government of the remedial order was a clear adoption of the policy which is embodied in that order; but I rather gather from what has fallen from the lips of the Finance Minister to-night that that was not the view which the Government took. He rather seemed to say that the order was passed simply and solely for the purpose of enabling the question to be brought before this House; but whether that may be so or not, it is quite certain that now at he end of the session, the order having been granted, the order having been sent to Manitoba, and Manitoba having declined to obey that order, the Government have come down with a clear and definite policy, if words mean anything, that they propose at a very early day to invite this House to pass a remedial Bill. For my part I have no hope, not the slightest expectation of any arrangement being made with the province of Manitoba. I do not think if we read the answer made to the remedial order, made by that legislature, not in haste, not in anger, but after due deliberation, that any sane man can hope that the same Government which brought down the answer to the remedial order or the same legislature which by a very large majority adopted it will within the next six months or less than six months, and that is the limit of grace permitted to it and them to change their course, make any alteration in the conclusion at which they arrived. So that it appears to me we are now face to face with this view of the question. We have now arrived at that stage, because in one respect I think the Government were quite warranted in postponing legislation to another session; I do not think it would have been reasonable at this period so near the end of the session to ask hon. members to stay one month or two months to consider the question of a remedial Bill, and therefore in that respect I am free to say that I think the excuse of the Government for procrastination was well founded and well justified. But that there is any hope or any reason to expect that anything can come out of renewed negotiations with Manitoba is to my mind perfectly illusory. If that view be correct, we are here face to face to-night with the Government's policy, so far as the policy of the Government can be announced. Let me draw attention to the answer given by Manitoba to the remedial order, and let me draw attention further to the pretense made that this Government or the legislature of Manitoba has in any sense or way by this answer pretended that under any circumstances they were prepared to change the course which they deliberately adopted when they made that answer. Having set forth the facts in the recital, they answer in this way:

> We are, therefore, compelled to respectfully state to Your Excellency in Council that we cannot accept the responsibility of carrying into effect the terms of the remedial order.

Nothing can be more definite and clear than that. They go further:

> Objections on principle may be taken to any modification of our educational status which would result in the establishment of one or more sets of separate schools.

They bring up the abstract question, which we know prevails as an objection in Manitoba against separate schools for and on that reason alone. But I pass them by. They go further and say :

Apart, however, from the objections on principle, there is serious objection to it from a practical educational standpoint. Some of these may be briefly indicated.

I need not trouble the House with what those objections are. Briefly they are, that in Manitoba the country is very large, the school tax weighs very heavily on the people, large portions of the lands do not yield any assistance towards that tax, and on the whole if there is any place in the Dominion where a separate system of schools is unwise and unworkable it is in the province of Manitoba. They go on gently to say, with perfect truth I venture to assert, that :

When this remedial order was made, there was not then available to Your Excellency in Council full and accurate information as to the working of our former system of schools. And we also believe that there was lacking the means of forming a correct judgment as to the effect upon the province of the changes indicated in the order.

Sir, I had the honour to appear for the province before the Council that advised His Excellency to make this order, and while I did the very best in my power in the limited time that was granted, for there was much hurry, and no time was to be allowed to the province then. The order had to be made, and made for the purpose of bringing in a remedial Bill this session—and while I begged that the Attorney General, the head of the educational department, who alone had full information, might be granted an opportunity of appearing, that simple prayer, which ought to have been admitted, one would have thought, in justice to a great province, was denied to Manitoba, and I was compelled to go on and do the best I could. Until I heard the Attorney General when he came down to the county of Haldimand to state to the people of this province why it was the legislature of 1890 had abolished separate schools, and why the province was not prepared to restore separate schools, I did not realize (and I fancy few gentlemen in this House who have not followed the speeches of Mr. Sifton have been able to realize) how enormously strong the case was for a change in the school system, and how impossible it is to revert to the old system. And so, Sir, they gently say to His Excellency that his advisers acted without a full knowledge of the subject which they professed to deal with when they passed the remedial order. But, Sir, in truth that was not the way the case was presented, because my friend Mr. Ewart who represented the Catholic minority, did not pretend to ask the Council, upon the merits of the case, for a remedial order. Having gone through some historical references, all of which really had gone by the board, and having made certain charges supported by affidavits which he was compelled to withdraw ; he rested his case in the end simply and solely upon the fact, that in 1871, 12,000 people, ten thousand of whom were half breeds, established separate schools in Manitoba, and that in 1890, when there were 150,000 settlers, they in their wisdom had thought fit to introduce a system of public and national schools. And the remedial order follows that line. Reading it all through, there is nothing more or less to be found in it than that separate schools existed, that separate schools were abolished, that the Privy Council in England said, that under the peculiar wording of the statute, that constituted a technical grievance in reference to which the Governor General in Council had power, if he thought fit, to pass a remedial order. And the Governor in Council, without knowledge as to the working of the law or the possible effect of the change, directed the Manitoba legislature to make that change. We are now told to-night that that was done simply for the purpose of opening the legislative doors here, so that they could get from this Parliament whatever this Parliament was willing to give : the widest possible margin being left, because in the same way they were not in any sense to be denied the right to have everything restored of which they had been deprived. I am reading it through, Sir, for the purpose of pointing out that from beginning to end of the answer to this remedial order, there is not a suggestion of a compromise. I challenge any gentleman to say that there is a word in it which holds out the hope that the province or the legislature propose to make any change, or to make any compromise in any sense or in any way. It goes on :

It is urged most strongly, that, upon so important a matter, involving as it does the religious feelings and convictions of different classes of the people of Canada, and the educational interest of a province which is expected to become one of the most important in the Dominion, no hasty action should be taken, but, on the contrary, the greatest care and deliberation should be exercised, and a full and thorough investigation made.

So they challenge investigation, and they argue, and argue it seems to me with irresistible force, that before a change of this kind, (involving as it does the religious feelings in all parts of this Dominion and the interest of this great province) further investigation should be made. There is no suggestion from this Government that any further investigation is to be made. On the contrary, Sir, I find it stated by the Prime Minister that he will have no commission, that he would vote against any commission, because any commission or any further inquiry would be utterly and entirely useless. So we are to have no further investigation, and we are to have no further examination. We are

not to be enlightened any more by January next than we are now in July. I will not trouble the House with any legal argument for I am now dealing with a question of fact, and I will come to the concluding part of the remedial order, and then I fancy I will have read to the House, all that appears in this document. My point is (and I am troubling the House simply with that view), that there is no possible hope to expect a settlement from the Manitoba legislature, which, as Mr. Angers very well said, has just adjourned and wont meet again until after next January, unless specially called for the purpose of dealing with this question. There is no possible hope of any settlement by the legislature of that province—and it is from the legislature alone it could have come,—prior to the time we are to be assembled here again, to pass a remedial Bill. This Government have made their announcement. My hon. friend who leads the Opposition says they are insincere. that to the people of Quebec they are holding out the hope of a remedial Bill and to the people of this province they are allowing it to be understood that there will be no remedial law. There were some significant words which fell from the hon. gentleman in his speech, about the possibilities that may happen between this and the 1st of January, and, of course, the Government cannot be held responsible if any of those unforeseen events occur. There may be something of that kind. There is the insinuation that the Prime Minister is to be got rid of in the meantime and that the arrangement may possibly not be binding upon his successor. Has there been given a bond in point of fact, since the word of the Ministers was not acceptable to their colleagues? If that bond were not given we might not be troubled (and I should be rejoiced to hear it) with a remedial Bill next January. For my part, I think we are bound to accept the statement made by the Government, and I certainly so accept it as being an honest, a frank, and a sincere announcement of their policy. As an announcement of their policy I think we are bound to consider it now, as if the Government had been newly formed, and had come down to this House to announce their policy and we were asked to accept it. I am not at liberty in this motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) to express any opinion. Voting for this motion or voting against this motion, will not express in the slightest degree the view I hold upon this question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Nor the view of anybody else.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman says "nor the view of anybody else." That may be so, Sir, but I am not responsible for the motion. I do trust, Mr. Speaker, that before this House is prorogued I may be happy enough to catch your eye, if you only look this way. I have tried for it twice, Sir. I gave notice formally on Thursday last that I proposed to bring up the question, and I do hope yet that I may have the opportunity of making it, and that then this question may be discussed on its merits. I rise at this moment for the purpose of saying that I do not feel inclined to vote for this motion, and I feel equally disinclined to vote against it. If I vote for it what would I say? I would say "that I regret the failure of the Government to deal with the Manitoba school question." Well, Sir, nothing would please me better than that they had failed altogether to deal with it. I would have been delighted, Sir,—knowing now as I do what they meant by the remedial order—if having got this answer, argumentative, calm, deliberate, from this province, they had seen their way to let the matter rest. I cannot therefore say, so far as this is concerned, that I have any quarrel with the Government; and yet I cannot say, affirmatively that I think they have dealt with this matter as they ought to have done. They have announced a policy. That is one way of dealing with the question; but I shall take an opportunity, if I can, of challenging the policy of the Government in a way in which I think it ought to be met before we separate, so that the country may have the benefit of hearing expressed, pro and con, from all sides of the House, the views on which this question must ultimately be settled. Therefore, following great examples in England, I will withdraw from the House during the voting on this resolution; for I do not feel that I can vote for it with any satisfaction, and I should feel much more dissatisfaction if I voted against it.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) A great French statesman, Mr. Thiers, when addressing his colleagues in the French Chamber of Deputies, after he had several times risen in his place to speak on the same subject, craved their indulgence because he said they ought to extend their indulgence to a man who harboured in his breast deeply-rooted conscientious convictions. On the question now before the House, Mr. Speaker, I may say I entertain also deeply-rooted convictions, and I trust the House will allow me to offer a few remarks about what has been said to-night by hon. members in connection with the Manitoba school question. When Mr. Thiers rose in the French Chamber, under the circumstances alluded to, it was to ward off from his country the scourge of a foreign war, and the danger of an invasion. But the policy he advocated was one which thwarted the schemes of the time-servers and of those men who speculated on the military supplies, for it is on record that, during the Franco-German war, speculators sold to the Government shoes with pasteboard soles for the French soldiers; and it was those time-servers and speculators, who, in order to lull the fears of the people, were

seen to inveigh against M. Thiers's patriotic harangues, and who proclaimed aloud that France was ready for war, and that there was not even a single button missing of the soldiers gaiters. To-night, we have listened to the utterances fallen from the lips of the hon. gentlemen who lead the two great political parties, in this House and in the country ; but they have been very guarded in the expression of their views, and have avoided committing themselves on the question at issue. The hon. leader of the Opposition has brought forward a motion, which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) stated he could not support. But then, the leader of the Opposition has arraigned the policy of the Cabinet ; he has conjured up a few jeers and gibes on the return to the Cabinet of the stray colleagues of the hon. leader of the House. These gibes, at least, find their justification in the vacillating course pursued by the Government on this question. The hon. leader of the House has thought it fit to oppose a vigorous reply to the gibes and taunts of the hon. leader of the Opposition. He has pointed out the splendid record of the great Liberal-Conservative party for these last seventeen years, and outlined the great deeds accomplished by that party under the leadership of the distinguished chieftains whose loss the country bewails still more bitterly under the baleful circumstances that confront us to-day. The hon. leader of the House has reviewed the splended achievements of Sir John A. Macdonald and his illustrious colleague, Sir George-Etienne Cartier, as also those of the Tuppers, the Tilleys and so many other members of the different Conservative Governments, from 1878. He has claimed credit for the carrying out of those broad lines of policy, for the union of the provinces of British North America into a strong confederation. But, I think, Mr. Speaker, when these great lines of policy were being carried out, the hon. gentleman's voice was not then heard within the walls of this Parliament. Then the hon. leader of the House spoke of another great line of policy of the Liberal-Conservative party, the development of industrial life and activity and the building up of industrial establishments ; but, Sir, neither can the hon. gentleman's Government claim any credit for the building up of the National Policy. It was Sir Leonard Tilley and Sir John A. Macdonald, and the other eminent leaders of the Conservative party that laid down the broad lines of that policy. The hon. leader of the House has also claimed credit for a great many other political achievements, which will not go down to posterity with the name of the Government attached to them as the promoters of those measures, and still less, will history give them credit for the proceedings instituted to bring about the settlement of the question now before the House. The legislation enacted with a view to the solving of this political question was the joint work of the two leaders at the time, Sir John A. Macdonald and the Hon. Edward Blake. Subsequently, Sir John Thompson and some of his colleagues submitted for the opinion of the Supreme Court certain questions affecting the Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba, in connection with the main question at issue. Everybody is aware of the fact that Sir John Thompson—whose loss the Conservative party feels the more keenly as it sees his seat occupied by the present leader of the House—submitted for the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada and to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England the questions which have been decided by those tribunals, allowing the Catholic minority to come back and ask that its appeal be heard of the Governor General in Council ; so that my hon. friend cannot claim any credit for the settlement of that question so far, nor lay any claim to those deeds as being the achievements of the Government of the day. In the distant future, Sir, the hand of our historians might knock off the head of the hon. leader of the House, the plume of feathers which he has made for himself and his Cabinet out of the achievements and great deeds performed by his predecessors, the leaders of the Conservative party. The balance sheet of his political achievements and political feats are likely to prove a pretty meagre one. I have risen in my place, to-night, Sir, to repel the imputations cast on the hon. Minister who has remained outside the Cabinet, as well as on the hon. members in this House, who adhere to his views on the Manitoba school question. All the hon. members understand that I wish to refer to the Hon. A. R. Angers, who, in order to remain true to his conscientious convictions, has felt it to be his duty to send in his resignation and to remain outside. The papers, the leading organs of the Conservative party in the province of Ontario, when the departed leaders were at the head of the Conservative party, used to raise their voices and compose the differences of opinion in the ranks of the party ; and they used to preach the gospel of toleration, peace and harmony ; but where are they now ? Those very same papers, the mouthpiece of the hon. Ministers, who occupy on the treasury benches the seats filled by our great statesmen, are now fanning the embers of the fire of discord within the very ranks of the Conservative party. Not satisfied with encouraging the province of Manitoba to rebel against the judgment of the highest court in the realm, they go still further and cast imputations on those who do not approve of the course pursued by the hon. gentlemen who now represent the province of Quebec in the Cabinet. They contend that the Hon. Mr. Angers and those who approve of his line of action, hold extreme ultramontane views and put forth

unreasonable claims, which do not commend themselves to the better judgment of the people. It is not the case, Sir, that the Hon. Mr. Angers, nor any one of the hon. gentlemen who adhere to his views on this question, set up unreasonable claims, and when the time comes for the Government to carry out its pledges and the promises reiterated solemnly in their capacity as a Government —unless they choose to slip out of their former pledges by new promises—the House will be satisfied that we are not as unreasonable as some people are pleased to represent us. The House will be satisfied that we are not—as contended by the "Mail and Empire," the chief mouth-piece of the Conservative party, and also the chief slanderer of all those who do not endorse its views—so unreasonable as to encroach on the rights of the majority of the province of Manitoba. What are our claims, Sir, with regard to the rights of the minority? Do we mean to lord it over the majority and put the latter under the control of the minority? No, the editors of the "Mail and Empire" are well aware that such is not our pretension. We simply claim the schools guaranteed to us by the constitution. We have been slandered long enough. Long enough we have been taunted by people in Ontario who did not know the nature of our claims, or who knowing them, misrepresented them, in order to arouse religious and racial animosities and bring back hatreds and conflicts. Long enough we have been taunted and slandered by both political parties and their organs in Ontario. We ask for separate schools which the Catholic children of the minority may attend, so that Catholic parents may not be coerced to send their children to public schools which according to the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) are merely Protestant schools, such is the respect these people profess for freedom of conscience. Now, the courageous Government that we have come and tell us that, in six months from now, a more satisfactory settlement of the question will be arrived at. Suppose that next session we pass a law, restoring to the Catholics their educational rights. The law may be appealed to before the courts; and the Catholics of Manitoba might have to wait many years before the law is supplemented by further provisions. As I just said, Mr. Speaker, we do not mean to do violence to the conscientious convictions of the majority in Manitoba; but we merely claim in favour of the minority certain rights guaranteed to them by the laws of the country, and by the constitution such as interpreted by the last judgment of the Privy Council of England. Can it enter any one's mind that Manitoba alone, out of all the other provinces, shall not bow in obedience to the law of the Empire? I appeal to your judgment, Mr. Speaker. This Parliament, years ago, passed a law regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors. We believed such a legislation to be within the competency of this Parliament, on the ground that we had a right to the regulation of trade and commerce in general, under the constitution. The local governments appealed from the law enacted here and the Privy Council of Her Majesty decided that it was not within jurisdiction to regulate the traffic of intoxicating liquors. Another case in point is the disallowance of the Streams Bill. The Ontario Government had enacted an Act for protecting the public interests in rivers and streams (1881), which was disallowed by the Government of the Dominion. To this decision strong objection was taken by the Government of Ontario; the matter went in appeal before the Privy Council of England and was decided in favour of the Province of Ontario. Did the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald wait six months before bowing to the decision of the Privy Council? Did it ever enter the mind of any hon. member in this House or outside of it, that the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada, two legislative bodies, to my mind, far above the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, could interfere with the decisions of the Privy Council and wait five or six months before repealing those laws? In disallowing the Streams Bill, the Government had exceeded their powers; and by both sides of the House, the decision of the Privy Council was accepted as a finality. This is the second time the legislature of Manitoba rebels against the laws of the Dominion and the decisions of the Privy Council; and yet, this strong and energetic Government that, who if we are to believe their supporters, display such an incredible amount of energy, decline to mete out the most elementary justice to the aggrieved minority. The legislature of Manitoba and its supporters are on the road that leads to rebellion, just as the Southern States were, at the time when they resisted the decisions of Congress and of the Supreme Court of the United States. The Manitoba Government decline to carry out the decisions of the highest tribunal in the realm; and now the Government say, give Manitoba six months to settle the question herself. That means that the minority is going to wait six months more for the redress of the grievances it has been complaining of for over five years. The Government are going to enter into further negotiations with the Government of Manitoba. From the statement of the hon. leader of the House, it would seem that this time the Government of Manitoba are to be approached in a friendly and conciliatory spirit. But I ask the hon. leader of the House, and as the leader of the Opposition very pointedly put it—why was not that conciliatory course taken from the first? At all events, to my mind, the language of the declaration or remedial order is neither too mandatory nor too high, and I

do not think it ought to be considered as wanting in courtesy or thoughtfulness towards the local Government, at any rate. I may say that diplomacy is not my forte, but it strikes me that the answer of the Government of Manitoba sounds to my ears as a challenge to the federal Government to carry out the remedial order. It is an outrageous defiance. And the Government falter again and flinch in their policy; and they have nothing better to propose than to postpone action until another session. I am afraid less, during their pilgrimage to Manitoba, the Government should meet with some accident. This puts me in mind of a story. One day, two gentlemen, very neatly attired, were travelling in the cars. One of the gentlemen had his feet and hands manacled; for he was being kept under restraint. They were brothers. The former was a lunatic, but his folly was intermittent, and when he fell into a fit, he would become raving mad, and that is the reason why they had manacled him, so as to prevent any accident taking place during the journey. Still, for intervals of several hours, he would enjoy the full use of his intellectual faculties. And then, when in his right mind, he talked quite sensibly and was pleasant in his own way. During one of his lucid intervals, he said to his brother: Please rid me of those handcuffs; you don't know what a nuisance they become in the long run. His brother removed them from his limbs. The lunatic then said: You can't fancy what a nuisance those hand-cuffs are; and I bet you could not keep them on for five minutes. His brother said: That's just where you are mistaken. The lunatic said: Well, I am going to handcuff you, and you tell me after five minutes, how you like them. Now, it happened that this man was being led to a lunatic asylum. The conductor, having accosted the passengers, the passenger who was compos mentis asked him to rid him of his manacles. He told his brother that he had quite enough of the experience. But the lunatic, who was then in one of his lucid intervals, said he would not have it so. And turning to the railway employee, he said to him: My brother is a lunatic, and, at times, becomes raving mad, and then he could smash up everything, if you set him free; for he is a very dangerous man, when in his fits. And so it happenel that the one who was in the full enjoyment of his intellectual faculties, was handcuffed and sent to the asylum, while the lunatic was set free. Now, it is the Greenway Government that is being handcuffed. They have put themselves in that position, owing to their answer to the remedial order. But the Federal Government, through their policy of conciliation, are going to be handcuffed in their turn, by the fact they enter into further negotiations. The Government's hands will be tied and handcuffed as it were; so that, when the moment comes when it will be necessary for them to bring in a remedial legislation, they will no longer be able to do so, while, now, they are free to pursue that course, so long as they do not enter into negotiations. The hon. members in this House who support the Government and who want to have a remedial legislation put upon the statute-book, ought to realize the situation and oppose the course pursued by the Government. They should ask them to give up the idea of negotiating any further. Where will the Government stand if the negotiations contemplated prove to be an abortion? At all events, the Government can expect no practical result to come out of these negotiations. But, Sir, the Government in preparing the plan of their campaign, have not forgotten to keep a back door open. It is quite true that so long as they remain in power, they are pledged to their policy, but who knows but some unforeseen events might not take place. Were, for instance, the hon. Prime Minister to resign, either on the plea of ill-health, or on any other ground, and were a new administration to step in before next session, then, is the hon. leader of the House prepared to tell us whether the new Administration would be bound to carry out the pledges of the former Cabinet, and whether the Manitoba minority would not run any risks, owing to his policy of postponement? I am satisfied that the Manitoba minority have lawful rights, that they have rights guaranteed by the constitution, and by such interpretation of the constitution as has been put upon it by the tribunals. I am satisfied that, were the Government to take a firm stand on the question, they could have a remedial legislation put upon the statute-book this session; and if some of their supporters broke with them on that account, their loss would be made up by the votes from this side of the House. The Government are well aware of all this; but they thought they could bargain for the rights guaranteed by the constitution to the minority; the Ministers believed that, for the sake of their popularity—and it is an ephemeral popularity, that rests on no other grounds than race and creed prejudices—they could postpone for years and from one session to the other, a legislation that would afford an adequate measure of relief to the minority; and why, Sir? Because they were afraid of the electorate, or a portion of the electorate, aroused by heated appeals to their racial and religious prejudices. As I just said a little while ago, Mr. Speaker—and I think the statement cannot be too strongly emphasized—I anticipate disasters for confederation. Let not the hon. gentleman lend a deaf ear to the warnings of reason and truth; let them understand that there are rocks ahead for confederation, if we allow religion and national wrangles to be stirred up, for they constitute the greatest danger that can beset the path of a young nation in process

of formation. The Government are blind to the danger the country is threatened with. To their mind, everything is running smoothly, so long as they are safe in power, and it will be all right, if they can get rid of Parliament, and postpone action and delay the matter until another session is called. They ask for delay at a time when the country is upon a volcano; they want to postpone action at a time when monster meetings are being held in Winnipeg, and when twelve thousand men are seen parading the streets of that city, as was the case just a few days ago, clamouring for the political decapitation of one of the colleagues of the hon. leader of the House. They beg for delay, and they do not realize that, by those means, they are fanning into new life the embers of the fire of religious and racial hatreds. They beg for delay, fancying that it is never too late to resort to the necessary means to quench the flames. As a great statesman said to his countrymen: Beware, gentlemen, of begging for delay from ill-fortune; for ill-fortune never grants any respite. Another thing I would take exception at, would be to see the hon. Ministers compare themselves, in their life time, to Sir John Macdonald and Sir Geeorge Etienne Cartier. I noticed that the inspired organs of the Ministers are just beginning to institute such comparisons. I am sure they are not in earnest, but it teases and dumbfounders one who knows the utter fallacy of the statement, to see our Ministers placed in comparison with those great statesmen, to whom a grateful country has just raised statues. Not to mention the unusual modesty that such a course evinces, on the part of our hon. Ministers, I would give here expression to the wish that they may leave to the future judgment of posterity the care of erecting their statues on Parliament Hill. I may be told that Cartier, on the New Brunswick school question, was also abandoned by several of his supporters from the province of Quebec; that, after having been unmercifully slandered in his life time, he was, after death, proclaimed a great man. It may be so, and I have not lived these many years without being aware that great injustice was done the memory of Cartier. But, Sir, I say the course pursued by Cartier was in no way similar to the position occupied by our Ministers. Cartier had no judgment of the Privy Council enabling him to restore to the minority in New Brunswick their just educational rights. On the contrary, the decision of the Privy Council was against the minority. And wherefore did Cartier exhort his colleagues to bow in obedience to the law and to the decisions of the tribunals? He himself states the ground of his position on the matter, in one of his speeches which I now have before me, in which he propounds the true constitutional doctrine. He says: Bow down to the tribunals and the constitution, and should you ever appeal to them, and they favour your claims, then you will be very glad to avail yourself of the tribunals and constitution. To-day, the grievances of the minority are backed up by the decisions of the tribunals and by the constitution, and Parliament, or rather the Government, asks for further delay. The grievances exist and are well founded; still, they arouse differences between the Ministers on that matter. Three Ministers have sent in their resignations; one of them is no longer a member of the Government, and the two others have returned to their posts in the Cabinet. And now the Government are trying to create the impressions that the agitation, far from gathering any new strength throughout the country, is calming down, dying out. Let us wait, and time will tell who is right and who is wrong; time will vindicate the truth of my statement. I sincerely hope, in the interest of the Catholic minority in Manitoba, that my forebodings may prove false. But it is not only the interest of the minority that actuates us in advocating so vigorously this cause. To my mind, there is a question of national honour involved in it. The hon. leader of the House does not appear to be aware that, outside of the answer of the Manitoba Government, there rests upon his Government—if it can be dignified by that name—a question of honour. After having received the peremptory answer given by the Manitoba Governnrent, a government that is in the least concerned with their dignity, would not enter into any further negotiations. If the hon. leader of the House tries to escape from the obligation of honour that rests upon him in his capacity as leader of the Government, he will lose all prestige, and when once a Government has lost its prestige, it can no longer be a Conservative Government. As I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, this conflict has been raging for over five years. But, as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has remarked, it was not the Catholics who insisted upon this education clause being embodied in the Confederation Act; but it had been embodied in the constitution as a statutory guarantee of the rights of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec, who insisted upon its being included in the constitution. I wish further to state here that the majority of the people of this country are in favour of separate schools. There are nearly two million Catholics in the Dominion, who are in favour of that system. Moreover, all the members of the Church of England, which aggregates about 600,000 souls, are of the same opinion. This gives us one-half of the people of this country as in favour of separate schools; and among the other religious denominations in Canada, there is a large number of reasonable men, loyal subjects of Her Majesty, who are also in favour of that system. I believe that if the sense of the House had been taken as to the passage of a measure in that direction, this session, it would have been disposed to grant to the

Manitoba minority—not a retrograde and absurd school system, as would have it the "Mail and Empire"—but a school system in keeping with the intellectual progress of the age, a system under which the children of the poor would be given that moral instruction and that shaping of life which go to make of the child a good citizen. I hold in abhorrence, Sir, that policy of compromises which our Government repeatedly told us they intended to carry out with regard to Manitoba, a province which is now in rebellion against their authority. Compromises, as shown by the history of the United States, always result in compromising affairs. Through compromises, the very life of the American republic was imperilled. It was owing to the doctrine of nullification advocated by Calhoun that a spirit of rebellion pervaded the public mind to such a degree that a civil war endangered the very existence of the republic. I do not believe the hopes cherished by the Government will ever be realized ; and as I am of opinion that the peace of the country is going to be disturbed, during six months, by a dangerous agitation over this question, I intend to record my vote in favour of the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I declare that so long as the wrongs of the minority are unredressed at the hands of the Government, I cannot restore to them the confidence I have hitherto reposed in them.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques-Cartier). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) has spoken of secrets or supposed secrets of the Conservative party to which he belonged for so many years. It is true, for a long time he was a prominent member of that party. He was the proprietor of a leading newspaper, published in the city of Quebec, in the interests of that party, and very often in that paper appeared articles from his powerful pen in defence of the principles of the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman has the right to change his political allegiance he has the choice to throw mud and dirt upon everything that he formerly worshipped ; but I deny the right of the hon. gentleman or any other gentleman, either in public or private life to reveal private conversations. In regard to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, I have only one thing to say—that when he entered the Cabinet of the late Sir John Abbott, I was far away from Canada—in fact, in Great Britain. In regard to the quotation made by the hon. member for L'Islet from Todd, I think it is important that we should look a little more carefully into the book from which he quoted. He quoted only one authority, Sir Robert Peel ; but there are a great many precedents to show that on national questions it is not only the privilege, but it is the duty of the Opposition to give every possible assistance to the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques-Cartier). Just wait a moment, and hon. gentlemen may laugh as much as they like. Here is what I find in Todd at page 417, the very page quoted by the hon. gentleman :

> But it is quite compatible with these functions for an opposition, under certain circumstances, to coincide with the policy of ministers, and to ground their attack upon the weakness of the administration in carrying out principles which the sense of the country has approved.

Again, at page 419 :

> Occasionally, such communications (between Government and Opposition) assume a more important aspect, and refer to different political questions, in the settlement of which the co-operation of both sides of the House is desirable.

And if there is a question as to which it is desirable, that there should be the concurrence of both sides of the House, it is this question, which is not a political question, but a politico-judicial one, which has been imposed on this House by the judgment of the Privy Council. Let us see what is the practice in Great Britain. At page 420, it is said :

> Two or three interviews of this description occurred between Pitt and Fox. Mr. Addington consulted Pitt, his predecessor in office, on various occasions. Mr. Brougham, when in opposition in the House of Commons, had communications often and again of the most delicate nature with Lord Castlereagh, with Mr. Canning, and with Mr. Percival, to the last of whom he was more vehemently opposed than is usual between those in opposition and the head of a government. During Lord Melbourne's Administration, the Duke of Wellington, who then led the opposition in the House of Lords, was in constant comunication with the government, not only upon "all military matters, but likewise upon many others."
>
> After the defeat of the Wellington Administration on the question of reform, and before the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832, under Lord Grey's Ministry, frequent communications took place between ministers and the opposition, for the purpose of arriving at an understanding in regard to this difficult and momentous question.

I think we have enough authorities to show that the hon. leader of the Opposition does not follow British precedents. But I heard an interruption this evening, when the hon. leader of the House was speaking, Where is the policy of the Government ? Where is your Bill ? The Bill, it is true, has not been laid on the Table ; but we know what it is going to be. The promise of the Government, made public before the House, is that remedial legislation is going to be introduced on the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order. Where is that remedial order ? It is on the Table of the House. This House then is fully aware of the character of the remedial legislation which this Government intends to pass. My hon. friend who has just sat down has spoken of the supposed compromise between Manitoba and Canada. He is afraid that the Government is going to compromise this important question, and that no proper relief will be obtained for the

minority in Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Government has declared, in answer to the question which I put the other day, that they will not be satisfied with any answer from Manitoba except on the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order. Is not that sufficient guarantee? As far as I am concerned, I believe it is. But so far as this House is concerned, I may tell the hon. member for Bagot that no compromise which the Government may make can remove the jurisdiction of this Parliament over the question. If next session we are not satisfied with the compromise between Manitoba and the Canadian Government, it will be for this Parliament to express its dissatisfaction and proceed to give such relief as, in its opinion, should be given to the minority. I am very glad that new negotiations are going to be opened. The answer of Manitoba, although containing a positive refusal at the beginning, still contains some remarks which give us hope that a settlement will be made. It is very important that this local question should be settled by the legislature of Manitoba instead of by the Federal Parliament. That would remove all causes for irritation between the different elements and races of this country, and would be the best mode of securing the rights of the minority, because those rights would be in the hands of the local authorities instead of in the hands of this Government, which may find it difficult to enforce a law relating to education. The name of Cartier, who will always be a model to politicians in this country, has, I believe, been wrongly used in this discussion. Not on one single occasion, from the early years of the union of Upper and Lower Canada, did Sir George Cartier ever use any expression or take any course in Parliament which could possibly have been interpreted as hostile to either one or the other province or race inhabiting this country, or to any religion in this country. On the contrary, the policy of Sir George Cartier was one of peace and harmony with all the elements of this Dominion. I think, therefore, the name of Cartier was falsely invoked in this discussion. Our policy should be to keep peace and harmony in this country and not provoke a war of races. I compliment the hon. Ministers who had the courage to withdraw their resignations upon receiving further assurances, and that all misunderstandings have been removed. I compliment the Ministers who had the courage to come back and resume their seats. If they had not done so, what would have been the consequences? They would have been simply frightful. The defeat of the Government is a very insignificant and unimportant question compared with what would then have been the result. The result would have been to shake confederation to its very foundation. The Government would have been obliged, as they were entitled to, to demand a dissolution, and they would have gone to the country without having the province of Quebec properly represented; and according to the precedents, what would have been the consequence? Not a war of religion? No, but it would have been a war of race, a war of the whole confederation against the French of the province of Quebec. I think the Ministers who came back were right when they refused to face such consequences. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) has talked of the South. Well, I visited the South a few years after the great rebellion of 1865. If the hon. member for Bagot had seen the devastation and ruin in that country, he would employ every means before resorting to arms in the settlement of the constitutional difficulties existing in one of our provinces. My hon. friend, I must say, did not speak of any resort to arms, but that would have been the consequence of the policy he advocated. It would have been the inevitable consequence of the withdrawal of the three Ministers; and if the Government went to the country without the province of Quebec properly represented, we would have had a war of race. I am very glad that means have been adopted to preserve this country from such a danger. My hon. friend from Bagot mentioned that on previous occasions this Parliament has passed laws which were afterwards declared unconstitutional. He cited the Streams Bill and the License Act. This is true; these statutes were passed after mature deliberation, not only during one or two weeks in the last hours of the session, but after they had been the subject of months' discussion, and notwithstanding this care and attention were subsequently declared unconstitutional. I ask my hon. friend if what took place with regard to these two statutes is to be taken as a guide, whether instead of coming to the conclusion that we must not wait for six months, but must proceed at once, he should not be led to the opposite conclusion, that we should not legislate in haste, but on the contrary, take due time and deliberation in the framing of an Act establishing separate schools in Manitoba, the more especially as such an Act presents still greater difficulties than any statute which this Parliament has yet been called upon to pass. Every clause of such statute must be carefully weighed, as otherwise no rights will be secured to the minority. The hon. member for Bagot must not forget that the Manitoba government will fight the Bill which we will pass inch by inch, before the courts of justice; and it is only after the law officers and advisers of the Government and the members of this House who are lawyers, are perfectly satisfied that we are within the jurisdiction of this Parliament with the subject matter of every clause, that we should pass the Act. For that reason, which is mentioned in the statement made by the leader of the Government, if

there was no other reason, the delay asked should be granted. For those reasons, I shall vote against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. First, because he has no policy, when he is bound to have one on a national question like this; and, in the second place, because I entirely approve of the course pursued by the Government.

Mr. BELLEY. (Translation.) I feel, Mr. Speaker, that at this late hour of the night, I must ask the indulgence of this House for the few brief remarks which I am about to make. I have listened attentively from the outset, to all the utterances that have fallen from the lips of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, during this debate. I was anxious to hear what the hon. the leader of the Opposition had to say on the subject; and I was no less anxious to hear what the hon. leader of the House had to state. Although admittedly the Opposition leader has not laid down a definite, plain policy on the question at issue, still, I may say the Government are, in duty bound, to declare their policy; and it is incumbent on the hon. gentlemen who occupy seats on the treasury benches, it is incumbent, I say, on the leader of the Cabinet, to tell us where they stand to-day upon the Manitoba school question. What is the issue now before the House? The question is whether the pledges that have been given to the Manitoba minority are satisfactory and beyond cavil; and whether the federal compact is carried out. The issue before the House, Sir, is whether the constitution is to be transgressed with impunity, and whether the majority will approve of such a transgression. Such is the main issue before the House. I think, Sir, when the federal compact is violated, the duty of having it respected, does not devolve upon the Opposition leader, but upon the Government; and it is their duty to do right to the minority, to uphold the constitution, which is committed to their trust. It were idle, Sir, to refer to Bourinot, Todd or any other exponents of the constitution in the matter; plain common sense is all that is required. The duty of carrying out the constitution devolves upon the administration of this country. If the hon. leader of the Opposition does not do his duty by the country, are the Government thereby justified in shirking their duty? Most certainly not. We arraign the Government in this Manitoba school question, because they are wanting in courage in not introducing, this session, such remedial legislation as would afford an adequate measure of relief to the Manitoba minority. And, Sir, what will be, in the future, the outcome of this unsettled policy of the Government? The consequence will be to make it impossible for this House to enact such legislation as would afford a full measure of relief to the minority, in case such a legislation should be introduced at the next session of Parliament. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, would be incomplete and could afford inadequate relief and redress; and that is the reason why I say the Government should have introduced this very session, their legislation, so as to press it to a conclusion and perfect it at the next session of Parliament, to be called in January next. The Government themselves must agree that the legislation which is to be introduced at the next session cannot be but incomplete and inadequate; because the Bill then introduced will contain no special enactment as to the proportionate shares of provincial moneys to be granted by the Manitoba legislature for the support of separate schools. I hold that the Manitoba Government will give no share of the provincial grants to the Catholic minority. The Bill in contemplation ought therefore to contain an enactment providing the means of reaching that end, in case the Manitoba legislature should decline granting any share of the provincial moneys to the minority. I give utterance to that view now, and I have no hesitation in saying that there lurks a very serious danger in that direction. I hold that the legislation to be introduced at the next session should contain an enactment governing those legislative grants; and hence follows the necessity of another session being held, in order to perfect that legislation by adding to it the provision I have just referred to, an enactment which I look upon as necessary in order to secure for the minority the rights guaranteed to it by the constitution. As this legislation will be enacted only next session, I ask the hon. gentlemen —and I call to it the attention of the hon. gentlemen who represent here the province of Quebec—what would occur if the Opposition were to come into power, pledged to carry out a policy, one of the main planks of which would be the non-interference, by the Federal Government, with the Manitoba legislature? From the utterances of the Government supporters, the majority of the Liberal party are opposed to the principle of Federal interference. Now, if the Liberal party rode into power on that question, at the next elections, this would preclude Parliament from perfecting the remedial legislation to be introduced at the next session, a legislation, I say, such as would afford an adequate measure of relief to the minority. Under such circumstances, I hold that the remedial legislation contemplated would never be supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievances complained of by the minority and afford them a full and adequate measure of relief; and, therefore, I ask the hon. members from the province of Quebec whether they are willing to run the risks of waiting six months more before they get such a measure passed by the House, and also, whether they are willing to incur the risks attending the accession to power of the Liberal party, who, they contend,

would never perfect the remedial legislation clamored for by the minority. Such a policy is unacceptable, in view of the fact that there is nothing to justify this delay of six months. There are many other points which might be properly argued in this connection. Our position in the province of Quebec is this : we wish to avert a war of races and a war of creeds ; we do not want to excite evil passions of race and creed, by heated appeals to religious or national prejudices, calculated to revive the conflicts of the past. But are our fellow-countrymen disposed, I ask, to allow the rights of a minority, guaranteed by the constitution, to be trampled upon ? Should we give out now on this present issue. Presumably before four or five years have elapsed, the Prime Minister of Ontario, being no longer at the head of affairs, they will say : Let us do away with the separate schools. I may be told that they certainly have no such right under the constitution. True, but neither has the majority in Manitoba the right to deprive the minority of its schools, except it be the right of the strongest. So, later on, with Ontario ; might will overcome right, just as now, might knows no right in Manitoba. And the Ontario separate schools, having been swept away, they will go still further and ask : What is the use of the French language here ? Why go to the expense of having all those statutes published in the French language ? And here again, the right of the strongest will prevail, and might will know no right. It devolves upon us now, French-speaking members of this House, to enter our protest and to ascertain whether the rights guaranteed to us under the Federal compact are to be infringed upon with impunity. In 1867, we entered the Canadian confederation, under certain conditions. Any party to a compact, which is broken, may be released from it. I say that all men of good will, irrespective of creed or race, whether they belong to the majority or the minority, let them be Protestant or Catholic, English, French or Irish, I say they are bound to join hands and exert themselves to secure the respect of all rights, established and recognized by the convention of 1867.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Laurier) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allan,
Bain (Wentworth),
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Belley,
Bernier,
Borden,
Boston,
Bowers,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Burnham,
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davies (P.E.I.),
Dawson,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Edgar,
Fauvel,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Fraser,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Grieve,
Guay,
Harwood,
Innes,
Jeannotte,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Lépine,
Lister,
Livingston,
Lowell,
Macdonald (Huron),
McIsaac,
McMillan,
McMullen,
Martin,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mulock,
Perry,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Scriver,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Turcotte,
Vaillancourt, and
Yeo.—70.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adams,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Baker,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Blanchard,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Bryson,
Burnham,
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chesley,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis (Alberta),
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grandbois,
Grant (Sir James),
Guillet,
Haggart,
Haslam,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Leclair,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Macdowall,
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreevy,
McInerney,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLean (King's),
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Patterson (Huron),
Pelletier,
Pridham,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Simard,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),

Hazen,	Tyrwhitt,
Henderson,	Wallace,
Hodgins,	Weldon,
Hughes,	White (Shelburne),
Hutchins,	Wilmot,
Ingram,	Wilson,
Kaulbach,	Wood (Brockville), and
Lachapelle,	Wood (Westm'd).—114.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
White (Cardwell),	Charlton,
Rosamond,	McGregor,
Barnard,	Welsh,
Prior,	Edwards,
Smith (Sir Donald),	Préfontaine,
Ives.	Geoffrion,
Corby,	Paterson (Brant),
Carscallen,	Gibson,
Carignan,	Bourassa,
Kenny,	Frémont,
Pope,	Legris,
Madill,	Bowman,
Calvin.	Sanborn.

Amendment negatived.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. gentleman means only to take one item pro forma to-night ?

Mr. FOSTER. I supposed that the hon. gentleman would be ready to go on ; there are very few items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But every one is disputable and will require discussion. There are the items relating to the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. Then the Minister of Railways has to make his explanation as to railway affairs—and it is impossible that at two o'clock in the morning we can go on with these.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The first item is the dairy commission.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest that we take up the supplementary Estimates that have been brought down. It is impossible to go on with the others.

Mr. FOSTER. We shall never get through with the Estimates as we are going on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is no fault of mine. The hon. gentleman had four days in which he might have gone on, but for reasons of his own, we made no progress. The hon. gentleman might have gone on ; we were ready. To go on with these general items is simply to keep us here to very little purpose for an hour or two.

Mr. FOSTER. Take up the supplementaries.

Civil Government—Department of Trade and Commerce—To provide for the salary of a third-class clerk..... $650

Mr. BELLEY.

Mr. McMULLEN. The question with regard to the Department of Trade and Commerce have not been discussed, but will naturally come up on this item. I think we should be allowed a fair opportunity of discussing it, and I would suggest that you take up item 2 and leave this to stand.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then we may as well go on and discuss the question. I hold in my hand the report that has been furnished the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, there has been no discussion on the Department of Trade and Commerce yet.

Legislation—Senate—To pay Minnie Burns, daughter of the late Senator Burns, the sessional indemnity for 1895..... $1,000

Mr. McMULLEN. If the principle involved in this is to be carried out, every member of Parliament affected should participate in the advantage. The hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Livingston) had the misfortune to get his leg broken and was absent from Parliament nearly the whole session, but no provision was made for his case.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Waterloo did not die and leave his family unprovided for, as Senator Burns did. This is a compassionate allowance to his family. I am not going to submit the item for the hon. gentleman referred to, or for the half dozen others whose case is just as strong as his. I am not admitting the principle that when a member does not do his services here, but is away sick at home he necessarily must have his allowance. This case is submitted to the House to ask whether they will grant this sum as a compassionate allowance.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not challenging this case. But I think the case I call attention to, also deserves the attention of the House. Allowances have been made in similar cases before.

Mr. HUGHES. Has any sum been paid to any member of this House or the Senate this session or last session when that member or senator was not in attendance ? If so, then, I think the case of the hon. member for Waterloo should be considered.

Militia—Drill of city corps and field batteries $80,000

Mr. CASEY. Is any ammunition to be provided for artillery practice ?

Mr. DICKEY. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman that information.

Mr. CASEY. I spoke about it on a previous occasion and the hon. gentleman did not know then.

Mr. DICKEY. I am trying to provide for that.

Mr. HUGHES. Will that sum pay the city corps in full ?

Mr. DICKEY. No ; but it is proposed to drill the city corps for twelve days.

Mr. MULOCK. I have received a communication from a North-west pensioner asking why it is that the pension payable on the first day of the month, is never paid to him till late in the month. His right arm was shot in the North-west, and is now withered.

Mr. DICKEY. One gentleman in a similar case spoke to me, and I understood him to say that it only applied to this year. I think the vote was not ready for payment. But if there is an exceptional case of that sort, I can scarcely understand it. I shall certainly see that he be paid at once.

Mr. MULOCK. He says this is due on the first of the month, and a voucher and receipt are sent to him, which he has to sign and return to some local authority, all of which consumes a good deal of the month.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the Minister to say just now that this amount would not pay the city corps in full, but that they were to be drilled twelve days, and the balance was to be provided for in some other way. What does he mean by that ?

Mr. DICKEY. It can be voted by the House at the next session, or it may be provided for out of contingencies. This will more than do eight days, but I do not know how much more.

Drill Shed at New Westminster..... $5,00)

Mr. MARTIN. I would like some explanation of that item.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an item for the drill shed in last year's vote. The contract was let, but the work could not be finished before the 1st July, therefore, there would be no money to pay, because, after first July, the vote lapses. The contract having been made, the amount was voted on the supposition that it would be spent before the 1st July. But the contract not having been fulfilled by that time, the money had to be carried on so as to be available.

Mr. MARTIN. That item, I suppose, is included in the sum of $116,000 which is paid in the main Estimates to have been voted for 1894-95, but which will not be required until 1895-96. Were not the Government in possession of the information which the hon. gentleman gives us now ?

Mr. FOSTER. If they had been, the money would not have been re-voted, or the work would have been hurried. At that time we supposed it would be done before the 1st July, but it transpired afterwards that it was impossible to carry out the contract before the 1st July. The original appropriation was $5,000. The work is being done now, having commenced in the beginning of July.

Mr. MARTIN. So it is a new determination arrived at since the original estimates were prepared.

Mr. FOSTER. No ; it is not. The sum was voted a year ago to build the drill shed, but, for some reason, the contract was not let, and, after the contract was let, it was impossible to finish it. There was plenty of time until the first July to finish the drill shed, but the work did not go on, and no money was paid. The contract was let about a month ago. The Estimates were prepared in February.

Mr. MARTIN. The Government surely knew whether they were or were not intending to build when they prepared these Estimates in February. Evidently, at that time, they were not intending to build ?

Mr. FOSTER. They were intending to build.

Mr. MARTIN. Why was not the contract let ?

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman will understand that we had this money in the previous year's Estimates, and in the change of the Department of Militia, a delay occurred in completing the contract, and as soon as I could get to it, in the work of the session, I handed the matter over to the Public Works, with instructions to carry it out. The contract was made as speedily as it could be, in view of the long distance between here and New Westminster. Delays occurred, and so we did not get the contract completed until some time in June.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not see what the Department of Militia has to do with the matter.

Mr. DICKEY. This vote was originally taken in the Estimates of the Department of Militia, and not in the Estimates of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. CORBOULD. One of the reasons for the delay was on account of the site. The city of New Westminster furnished the site for the drill shed. The first site they selected was abandoned, and a new one was selected. It was only late in the spring that the new site was determined upon, about May.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the value of the site ?

Mr. CORBOULD. It was given by the city. It was worth, I should think, about $5,000.

Culling Timber..... $14,750

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that we are asked to vote here $14,000 for the purpose of

paying cullers. Last year the entire revenue from that source was only $12,006. We have for a number of years been paying more for wages than we get in fees. Some $65,000 have been sacrificed in the last ten years in keeping a staff of cullers that were not wanted, and here we are asked to vote $2,000 in excess of the revenue last year. Again we are asked to vote $7,200 annuities to superannuated cullers. I would like to know what is the wages of these cullers that are now placed upon the superannuation list, how long they have served, and what retiring allowances have been granted to those cullers that have been superannuated ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I cannot tell the hon. gentleman the length of time the cullers who are to be superannuated, have served. But he is wrong in saying that there is a deficiency of $2,000 between the sum asked for in the supplementary Estimates, and the revenue last year. In the sum of $14,000 is included the sum of $7,000 of the amount paid to the annuitants, not only those who would be superannuated on the 1st August, but those who were superannuated some years ago. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that the revenue which will be received by that branch during the coming year, will somewhat more than meet the expenditure.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why is this amount for superannuation not included in the ordinary superannuation vote ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I understand the present system has always been followed. It is a special superannuation under a special Act. It is a good provision, because we expect a surplus this year in that branch, and that will apply towards payment of the superannuation fund.

Mr. McMULLEN. I maintain that it is an improper way of applying public money. The entire sum required should be put in one vote, so the people can understand what they are asked to contribute to the superannuation fund. By dividing the payments and putting them under Inland Revenue and other departments it will be impossible to obtain an exact account of the total amount paid. This is the first case in which I have noticed a vote taken in this way for superannuated officers.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville.) You have voted the same vote for years.

Mr. BRYSON. I think the hon. member for Wellington is unnecessarily alarmed. The quantity of lumber going to Quebec this year will be about three and a half million feet, the dues collected on which will amount to about $12,000, so as the Controller has correctly stated, there will be a surplus over the expenditure. It is understood between the Controller and trade that in future the cullers' office at Quebec will be made self-sustaining by dues collected and will involve no charge to the country. It is easy to understand why $7,200 should be asked for superannuations, because there will be a few more cullers superannuated. The staff is now reduced to five, and it is contemplated to reduce it to four, who will be able to do the measuring of all lumber both from the St. Lawrence and Ottawa going to Quebec for the next few years at all events. So the hon. member is unnecessarily alarmed, for the Quebec office will be self-sustaining, and there will be a small surplus so long as the timber remains at two and half millions to three millions of feet.

Mr. McMULLEN. I hold that these cullers who have been employed by the Dominion have received fair remuneration for their services, and instead of making them pensioners for the balance of their lives they should have been removed without superannuation. I do not think it right to superannuate them, for this country is now paying $263,000 in superannuations and this vote will bring it to $270,000. What I object to at this moment is that the superannuation vote should not be voted in one amount, and this committee should not be asked to vote separate amounts and thus have the expenditure diffused over different branches of the service, whereby members may be deceived and it become impossible to find how much is really paid for superannuation allowances.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand the Finance Minister to say that if the committee passed the Supplementary Estimates, he would not proceed further.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to get them all passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was on the express understanding that only the Supplementary Estimates were passed that I prevailed on my friend from Wellington not to proceed with the discussion on trade and commerce.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought the hon. gentleman was anxious to get through the Supplementaries first.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I expressely proposed to take the Supplementaries because they were not opposed. These Supplementary Estimates were brought down after the express declaration made by the Finance Minister repeatedly that further Supplementary Estimates would not be submitted. I might have pointed out this fact and objected.

Mr. FOSTER. They are not Supplementary Estimates as generally considered.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I could have taken strong objection to any further Supplementary Estimates being considered, but I did not do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Four items of the main Estimates remain. The Sault Ste. Marie

Canal has already been discussed for two months.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, in the Public Accounts Committee, and the evidence has been reported and is now in shape for discussion. If we sit until four or five o'clock in the morning hon. members are not in a fit condition for to-morrow's work.

To enable the Dairy Commissioner to promote the dairying interest of Canada by making provision for the placing of fresh-made creamery butter on the British markets in regular shipments, without deterioration in quality, and for securing recognition of its quality there.. $20,000

Mr. McMILLAN. I want a full statement of what is to be done with this money. It was on a simple motion like this that the Government last winter took advantage of buying a quantity of butter, not from the farmers but from a great many of the dealers and sent it to the old country. I have a most decided objection to public money being spent by this Government for purchasing butter and putting it on the British market. It would be better for Canada to-day, and our butter would have stood higher, if a single pound had never been put upon the British market by the Dairy Commissioner. In 1892 and 1893, I interviewed one of the commission men in the old country who handled a large quantity of Canadian butter, and I could get no information on the matter until I called for a report that he had sent to Canada. That report, as well as the last report of the Dairy Commissioner, shows that a quantity of the butter shipped to England should never have been sent there. Butter made in the month of January was sent over in the month of April, when it was off flavour, as well as being too salty and too highly coloured. If there is any of this money to be used, either directly or indirectly, for purchasing butter for England, I most strongly take objection to it. I had been led to understand that only some $7,000 or $8,000 would be required to assist in establishing refrigerators both on the trains and on the ships.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I can give my hon. friend the information in a few words. We have already discussed the question of purchasing butter, and as it is not intended to spend any of this money in the purchase of butter for the English market it is not necessary to refer to the question now. This vote is for the purpose of providing cold storage. It is expected that this sum will enable the Dominion Government not only to supply steamships with fittings that will last for a number of years, but that it will also enable Canada to place upon the British market 2,000,000 pounds of cream-Canadian creamery butter the sale of which abroad will relieve the congested market at home. Cold storage has been arranged for upon the railways, and at Montreal, and across the Atlantic. The railways arranged with are the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, and the arrangement with them is as follows :— The Government guarantees to the railway two-thirds of the price ordinarily charged for carloads from the point of shipment to Montreal. Then the shipper is charged by the railway the full ordinary, less the carload rates, from the shipping points to Montreal, and the sum which is received by the railway from the shippers is credited to the Government and set off against the amount which is guaranteed. That, it is believed in many cases, will pay the whole of the sum which is guaranteed to the railway by the Government. But in case it does not, a small sum is asked for and part of this money will be used for the purpose of assisting in that. So far as the cold storage in Montreal is concerned, we have made arrangements with the Montreal Cold Storage and Freezing Company. We get the storage there at lower than usual rates, namely, 8 cents per 100 pounds of butter for the first fifteen days, temperature not exceeding 20 degrees, and 12½ cents for each subsequent thirty days. The Government bears part of this expense and offers to those who comply with the requirements as to shipping, a rate of 5 cents per 100 pounds for the first fifteen days, and for the following thirty days or a less period, 8 cents per 100 pounds. We fit up the ocean steamships ourselves at a cost of from $250 to $350 each per ship. Each compartment will hold about a ton by cubic measurement, and the charge from Montreal to Liverpool is to be 15 shillings per ton measurement. The charge from Montreal to Bristol is to be 20 shillings per ton measurement. Each one of these compartments will carry about one thousand packages of butter, and each package of butter will contain about 70 pounds.

Mr. McMILLAN. How long is that arrangement entered into by the Government for ? Is it for more than one year ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

Mr. McMILLAN. Has the Government anything to do with putting butter on the British market ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Nothing in the world, except in assisting by cold storage.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not agree with the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) who appears to criticise the Government adversely for buying butter and putting it on the English market, because I am informed by men who are in the business in my part of the country, that they are very much in favour of this system. In support of that I may read a letter which I received from the proprietor of one of the largest creameries in my district, namely, Mr. W. D. Rorke, of

Meaford. A short debate took place on this matter at the beginning of the session, and I sent him a copy of the "Hansard" containing the report. In reply to my letter he wrote as follows :—

Your kind letter in reply to mine of 4th instant received, with copy of "Hansard." Please accept my thanks for the same, and, if not intruding on the Minister, please convey to him for myself and other creamery men thanks for his kind assurance. I was speaking yesterday to a pronounced Grit, who said : "I do not go with the Government, but I give them credit for an honest effort to benefit the trade." I met many of my patrons on Saturday, the 8th instant, when the question of continuing the experiments of last winter——

He refers to buying the butter and shipping it to the old country :

—the question of continuing the experiment of last winter was pretty freely canvassed, and I did not hear one unfavourable comment, but many of warm approval.

Mr. MULOCK. That must be a pretty ancient letter ?

Mr. SPROULE. Well, it is dated on the 11th June so that it cannot be so ancient. It is not fit to take down and dust like some of the arguments my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) advanced last year. This is from a live creamery man, and an active man in the business who is and has one of the largest creameries in the country. Out of three letters received by me, every one of them is favourable towards the Government continuing the experiments made last year. As has been pointed out, the experiment was stopped at the very time it would be valuable. One of the unfortunate conditions of our butter in the old country is, that our shipments are periodical, and for a certain length of time none is sent over there. Consequently the English people do not get accustomed to the butter as they would if it were shipped at frequent intervals. The Minister has stated that an arrangement has been made with the Grand Trunk Railway, whereby a train would be run from Windsor, and another on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and also that a train would be run from Owen Sound, one from west of that, and another east of Toronto. I find that in that arrangement he has left out the Northern Railway entirely, and I think the Nipissing and Midland Railway. This man lives at the terminus of the Northern Railway, and he is unable to take advantage of this arrangement, unless some further provision is made for that purpose. I wrote to the Minister some two weeks ago about it, but received no answer. I hope some change in the arrangements will be made whereby this man and others living along the line may take advantage of it.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am not the least astonished that butter-makers should wish the Government to continue the arrangement by which they were getting 20 cents a pound for butter which only brought 15 cents in the British market. A very large quantity was purchased from dealers in Montreal at 20 cents and sold in the British market at 15 cents. Is it any wonder that they should be in favour of the Government continuing that arrangement ? But the Government cannot, under any circumstances, exercise the same care as dealers who have been in the business for years. In 1892 and 1893 we were told that we had established a great reputation for our butter on the English market, and that this was going to be of great benefit to us ; but in 1894, the Dairy Commissioner did not put a pound of butter on the British market. I am favourable to refrigerators in vessels and cars, but I am not in favour of anything further than that being done by the Government.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I notice that in this arrangement the Government include only creamery butter, although the Dairy Commissioner states that the quantity of dairy butter produced in Ontario is some 3,000,000 pounds, whereas the amount of creamery butter produced is only 1,750,000. In western Ontario there are very few creameries. The farmers themselves manufacture the butter, and in many cases it is just as good butter as the creamery butter ; but they have not facilities for handling it. This cold storage is going to be of great benefit in sections where the trains will run. But I notice that the Huron and Bruce branch, and the branch from Sarnia to Stratford, have not been included in the arrangement. These districts include the largest dairying section in Ontario, and I think they should be included. I think also if the Government would establish cold storage at some point in the west, say Stratford, and accumulate carloads of butter there, it would be a better arrangement than carrying it in small lots through to Montreal. I think it would also promote the quality of the butter to have it inspected at a point like Stratford.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for South Huron seems to think it was an inducement to dealers to sell their butter to be able to get 21 cents a pound for it. It is true, the arrangement was made when the price of butter was higher than it is to-day. Butter-makers would be glad now if they could get a much lower price than that. This gentleman says :

I have at present three tons of choice creamery butter, made on the 7th of May, and I can see no opening for it. We would be very glad if we could realize 15 cents a pound, if the Government would continue to buy at that price and put it on the market. The arrangement stopped at a time when we most needed it. Cold storage across the ocean is nothing unless it is supplemented by refrigerator cars and some agency for handling the butter in Montreal and in England. If the Government had continued, through the dairy commissioner, the advance of last winter, or even to the extent of 15 cents a pound, it would have materially changed the state of the market, and been of immense value.

Mr. McMILLAN. That individual must be very ignorant of the butter trade if he does not know that the butter trade of England is as open to the commission merchants as to the Government itself. No agent the Government can send to England could take precedence of the commission men, and any man in Canada is just as free to send butter to them as the Government is.

Mr. SPROULE. We have the assurance of the dairy commissioner that there should not only be cold storage in the vessels, but that cold storage should be provided in England so that the butter would be put upon the market in good condition. In addition, some one is required to handle the butter and to put it on the market every two or three weeks. This man may be, as the hon. member says, ignorant of the butter trade, but he has been like the hon. member himself in the business for a long time. He agrees with what the Government has done, and he is only sorry that they do not continue it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In reply to my hon. friend who asks for arrangements to be made on additional lines, I wish to say that the commissioner has not made arrangements on as many lines as he wants, but he is trying to make arrangements for other lines. At points where a special car does not go through the railway will take butter in good condition to some such central point as Stratford, and it will be handled there.

Mr. McMULLEN. What amount will the Dominion lose by the wreck of the "Mexico ?"

Mr. MONTAGUE. The butter was not ours. All we lose is the cold storage.

Mr. McMULLEN. What amount was spent in putting that in ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. $250 or $300 for each boat.

Mr. CASEY. It is decidedly a breach of the arrangement for the Finance Minister to insist on bringing this item at this hour, as it was reserved on the ground of getting full information and discussion. It is manifest, for many reasons that we should have a Minister of Agriculture at this season of the year. It is stated in a French paper that we are not to have a Minister of Agriculture until next session. I call attention to the present condition of the department, which is that the dairy commissioner and the manager of the Experimental Farm are between them the Minister of Agriculture, and I ask the leader of the House for some explicit statements with regard to the report, apparently made with authority, in Government organs, that we are to have no Minister of Agriculture until another session.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the leader of the House if it is the intention of the Government to take up the Bill respecting the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway this session.

Mr. FOSTER. I think so.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 2.35 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 16th July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 131) to amend the Acts respecting Penitentiaries.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Bill (No. 143) to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.—(Mr. Foster.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. HAZEN. When this Bill was before the House on the last occasion, the opinion was expressed by several members that it would be only fair that provision should be made in this Bill that those members of the House who are officers of the active militia, and who attended camp during the session, should not have charged against them the $8 a day during the time they were so absent at camp. There seemed to be a general opinion that that was only a fair proposition, and I propose to move an amendment to this Bill embodying that provision.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Denison). Your amendment is out of order at this stage.

Bill reported.

THE CUSTOMS ACT.

On the Order for consideration of Bill (No. 140) further to amend the Customs Act as amended.—(Mr. Wallace.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I promised to make a statement before this Bill took the next stage, in reference to a

discussion which occurred a night or two ago. The Controller of Customs, having before him his record, gave to the House the information that on a certain day in January, 1894, the papers connected with the seizure of Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell had been referred to the Department of Justice, with very broad instructions. A letter was read—I will not refer to it more than to say that, apparently that explanation left it wholly upon the Department of Justice to fill up the gap in the explanation. I consulted the files in the department, as this was a matter relating to a period when I had nothing to do with the Department of Justice, and my officer laid before me the following letter, a copy of which is shown by the register to have been sent to the Controller of Customs on the 27th February. The letter is dated the 26th February, 1894 :

Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 30th ult., respecting the Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell seizure, Montreal, I have the honour, by direction, to inform you that the Minister of Justice thinks that, in view of the settlement made by your department in November last, it will be for you to consider whether criminal or other proceedings are to be taken against the members of the firm or either of them. I may add that from the papers it is evident that Mr. Boyd is criminally responsible in the matter, notwithstanding the settlement of the money claim. If you desire that proceedings, criminal or otherwise, should be taken against the firm or any member of it, and you will advise me of your decision, I will issue the necessary instructions in the matter.

I immediately communicated personally with the Controller of Customs, and ascertained from him the facts which he had subsequently discovered in connection with this letter, and those he can better state to the House himself on the present occasion. I will simply mention for the information of the House that when Sir John Thompson was presiding over the Department of Justice he proceeded upon the general rule, which obtains now, that in connection with the institution of proceedings the Department of Justice advises as to proceedings, whether civil or criminal, would lie, but the practice has always prevailed to leave it for the department particularly concerned to say whether proceedings are to be taken or not, because to that department we have to look for the expenses of any litigation which may follow.

Mr. WALLACE. On this subject my secretary wrote as follows :—

Ottawa, 1st July, 1895.

Dear Mr. Wallace,--Re Mr. Newcombe's letter of 26th February, a copy of which you showed me, I have looked over all the papers connected with the case, and no such letter is on file. No record of it is in the correspondence room, nor is any trace of such a letter among your private correspondence, where I searched as the last resort. No one here has any recollection of such a letter having been received, and under the circumstances I am as positive as any one can be that it has not been received.

Respectfully,
J. R. K. BRISTOL,
Private Secretary.

To the Hon. Controller of Customs.

So far as my department is concerned, no such letter was received. In reply, I addressed the following letter to the Minister of Justice :—

Ottawa, 15th July, 1895.

The Hon. Sir Charles H. Tupper,
Minister of Justice.

Dear Sir Charles Tupper,—On Thursday last I was shown a copy of a letter addressed by your deputy to my department under date 26th February, 1894, replying to my reference of the Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell seizure case, by letter of 30th January, for whatever action that your department might consider advisable and necessary in the interest of justice with respect to the criminality of Boyd. I beg to say that this letter was never received by this department so far as I can find, and I was awaiting action by your department, while apparently you were awaiting instructions from the Department of Customs, which I supposed had been communicated in my letter of 30th January, 1894.

If you still have reason to believe that criminal proceedings will lie, I think it would be to the interest of this department for such proceedings to be taken.

I feel it necessary, however, to refer you to the non-success of prosecutions made in almost exactly similar cases in other years. Vide remarks of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, when Minister of Customs, page 1298 of "Hansard" of 1889.

I am faithfully yours,
N. C. WALLACE.

I might say further that the present Premier, who was then Minister of Customs, in a speech he delivered in this House referred at great length to a large number of cases in which criminal proceedings had been taken by the Department of Customs against parties for violation of the customs laws and for having been guilty of criminal acts against those laws. The whole statement of the case, which is recorded in the "Hansard" of that day, shows that the Department of Customs had very seldom been successful in obtaining verdicts after instituting criminal proceedings, and it appears to me that although the evidence was conclusive in all the cases stated by the Minister, the juries failed to reach a verdict of guilty. In my own experience as Controller of Customs we have had criminal proceedings instituted, one case being that of a smuggling vessel under the command of Captain Bouchard, which was seized on the Lower St. Lawrence. The vessel was captured in the act of smuggling. The vessel was seized and it was found to be filled with smuggled liquor. The liquor was, of course, confiscated, the vessel was also confiscated, and criminal proceedings were instituted against Captain Bouchard. But I am sorry to have to say that, although the evidence appeared to my department as well as to the Department of Justice to

be absolutely conclusive, we failed to obtain a verdict against the captain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This appears to be a rather extraordinary case. So far as I could gather, the statement of the Controller of Customs and the statement of the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Justice expressly stated that sixteen or seventeen months ago a formal communication was sent from his department to the Customs Department, in which the opinion was expressed that this person was criminally liable and proceedings should be taken by the Controller of Customs. Now, the Controller tells the House, unless I misunderstood him, that this despatch was never received. That appears a very extraordinary occurrence between two such departments. One would have imagined that the Controller, if he received no reply, would have stimulated the memory of the Minister of Justice for the time being, and unless my recollection is wholly at fault, the Controller did state the other day that he had had verbal communication with the Minister of Justice. It does not appear that the explanation given is as satisfactory as I would wish, and in any case it reflects gravely either on the Controller of Customs or the Department of Justice, if a despatch of that importance was sent and did not reach its destination. One would have thought that a matter of this importance would have warranted some communication between the two officials. As to the illustration given by the Controller, I can scarcely attach very much importance to it. The two cases are not at all on all fours. In one case it was an ordinary smuggling proceeding, in consequence of an attempt made to bring liquor, and although the evidence may have been clear it would not be likely to result in conviction; but this case is one in which there is distinct and absolute proof of repeated forgery and repeated perjury, and it does not appear to be creditable to the way the administration is conducted that we should be offered eighteen months afterwards this very lame and halting explanation of a manifest miscarriage of justice.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. WALLACE moved third reading of Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. In committee we discussed the question which is involved in this Bill. It is proposed to establish a board of customs which is to consist of the officers of the department, and against that proposition it was argued in committee that a board of customs consisting of gentlemen independent of the department would be more in accordance with the wishes of those chiefly engaged in the business of importing. I propose to move an amendment, which does not, however, go the whole length of saying that the board shall be absolutely independent of the department, for, I think, a middle course would be the better and wiser one, namely, that the board of customs should be presided over by the Commissioner of Customs and that it should consist of gentlemen selected in the manner pointed out by the petition of the Montreal Board of Trade. Most of the objections urged in committee against this proposition appear to be objections to which the Bill as framed is equally open. Undoubtedly these gentlemen cannot all be at different places at one time, but no more can the board of customs that is proposed by this Bill. That objection was urged very strongly by the Controller, and it was pointed out how impossible it would be under the circumstances to perform the functions which the board was appointed to perform under the proposition made by the Montreal Board of Trade. Then it is not necessary, of course, that these gentlemen should be of the character or the kind of the appointees in the United States. The appointment rests wholly with the Department of Customs, but it is not to be presumed that that department would appoint parties who are not fit and competent to discharge the duties. The suggestion is that there should be an expert from the chief branches of trade. That expert might not be as competent in the other branches of trade as he would be in his own, but there is no reason to suppose that he would not be equally capable of discharging the duties involving upon him as any officer of the department. A man because he is in dry goods, is expected to have special knowledge of that branch of trade, but if he is an intelligent man he ought to be as competent in the other branches of trade as one of the Assistant Commissioners of Customs who is named in this Bill. If the House will reflect, I think it will be seen that satisfaction—and the only object of this amendment is to try to give satisfaction to the importers—will not be given by the proposition made in the Bill, and I therefore propose :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions that the Committee have power to consider in substitution of clause 2 of the said Bill, the following :—

"That the Board of Customs shall consist of a commissioner of customs or any officer for the time being acting as such, or five members to be appointed by the Governor General in Council, and who shall be experts in each of the principal branches of trade, as follows :—(1) dry goods, (2) hardware, (3) oils, paints, &c., (4) drugs and chemicals, (5) fancy goods, stationery and jewellery, (6) groceries, provisions and fruits, (7) leather and shoe findings; and that such board shall have special power to perform such duties as are assigned to it by any Act of the Parliament of Canada or by the Governor General in Council. Three members of such board shall form a quorum, to be competent to transact the business of the board at any meeting thereof, whether regular or fixed or special, to be called by the chairman."

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I want to say a word or two about a matter which engaged the attention of the House a moment before I came in. A letter appears to have been written by the Justice Department to the Controller of Customs respecting the charge made against Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell, of having defrauded the revenues of the country and been guilty of perjury and forgery. I understand that in response to the letter written by the Controller of Customs, the Justice Department informed the Controller that some, or all, of these gentlemen were liable to be prosecuted for having defrauded the country and for having committed the crimes that I have just enumerated. Now, the other afternoon the Controller of Customs stated to the House that he had had no communication at all with the Justice Department, save and except a letter he had written and some verbal communication with either the Minister of Justice or somebody in the department; and that the result was, that it was not thought advisable to prosecute these parties. The hon. gentleman told us at the same time, that the amount out of which these men had defrauded the country was something like $4,000 or $5,000. My information is that the total amount involved is something like $38,000. I am told, the Controller of Customs went back only for six years and held these parties responsible for the amount abstracted for these six years only, and that in fact the amount involved is something like $38,000. I would like the Controller of Customs to say whether that is correct or incorrect. Did he only go back for six years, or did he investigate the frauds for many years back from the time there was reason to believe these frauds first commenced. That is an important subject for consideration, and a question which I think the Controller of Customs has a right to answer. I was not in the House yesterday when the question was answered respecting the claim against W. W. Ogilvie, but the facts appear to be, that W. W. Ogilvie made a claim upon the department some twelve or fourteen months ago, amounting to some $4,000 or $5,000 for rebate of duty upon corn imported into the country. It appears from the answer of the Controller of Customs that in addition to the amount which the Ogilvies claim to be now in the hands of the department, they have already been paid on prior importations some $16,000 or $17,000. The House has a right to know whether the department investigated the propriety of the payments of the moneys which have been paid back to Ogilvie prior to twelve or fourteen months ago when the last claim was made by that firm upon the Government. The Controller of Customs was rather indefinite as to the reasons why the Government retained that money on hand. If Ogilvie & Company were entitled to be paid back that $5,000, it is somewhat remarkable that the Government should have retained possession of the money for fourteen or fifteen months after the claim was made. Either this firm is entitled to be paid back the full amount of the money or it is not. My hon. friend informs the House that an investigation took place and that the matter was placed in the hands of Mr. McLaughlin, an officer of customs of the city of Montreal; and the answer made by the Controller is, that the report made by that gentleman was not sufficiently satisfactory to the department to justify them in paying this rebate to Ogilvie. The House has the right to know why this report was not sufficiently satisfactory. Does that report show that Ogilvie & Company had been making a claim upon the department for a rebate, upon the ground that they had "kiln-dried, ground and sold for human food" the corn imported into this country? According to the amount of rebate that these people have received, and the amount they now claim, they appear to have imported over 300,000 bushels of corn into Canada. The charge made against them is that, instead of complying with the statute by kiln-drying the corn and selling it for human food, they sold it for animal food and other purposes, and therefore were not entitled to get the drawback at all. If the department have found on investigation that there is a doubt as to the right of Ogilvie to get back the $5,000, it seems to me that would be sufficient to justify the department in investigating the matter further, to see whether he was really entitled to be repaid the $16,000 which he got prior to making this last claim at all. There is another point about this matter which is somewhat suspicious. The claim to a drawback must be supported by an affidavit, either of the man who claims the money or by his agent acting for him and having a full knowledge of the facts. That affidavit should be filed with the department and should set forth that the law had been complied with—that is to say, that the corn imported had been used and sold according to law; and upon that affidavit, the department would be justified in paying the drawback. Now, it appears, according to the statement of my hon. friend, that such an affidavit was filed in the department. If so, it should still be in the department, and the hon. Controller should be able to inform the House who made that affidavit, before whom it was sworn, and every particular in reference to the case. If the affidavit is not in the possession of the department, I would ask the hon. Controller whether or not there is any truth at all in the statement that the affidavit was returned to Mr. Ogilvie, either directly or through somebody else; because, if it was returned to him, that would be an extraordinary proceeding on the part of the department, inasmuch as the department would be bound to keep the evidence of the claim in order to take whatever proceedings they might think necessary. Therefore, I would ask the hon.

Controller whether the investigation extended to the total importation of corn by Ogilvie since these regulations were in force, whether he knows as a matter of fact whether the affidavit made by Ogilvie or anybody else in support of the claim for $4,000 odd has been returned to Ogilvie directly or indirectly, or whether it is still in the hands of the department.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down is, as usual, inaccurate. He misquotes what I said when he states that I said I had no communication with the Department of Justice.

Mr. LISTER. I did not say that.

Mr. WALLACE. I made no such assertion at all. I said that in a file of the department which I had in my hand, and which I had not time to look over, there appeared to be no such letter. Since then my secretary has looked all through it, and finds no such letter in it. Before the hon. gentleman came into the House to-day I read a statement of my secretary in reference to that. No such letter and no record of it can be found in the department. The hon. gentleman also states that I thought it not advisable to prosecute these parties. I made no such assertion. What I did say was simply what was in the letter. Then the hon. gentleman says: "You have only gone back six years; why do you not go back further than that?" Well, if the hon. gentleman wants to learn a little law, I may tell him that you can only go back six years for the collecting of a debt.

Mr. LISTER. I know that perfectly well.

Mr. WALLACE. More than that, if he wants to learn a little more law, you can only go back three years for the imposition of a penalty.

Mr. LISTER. I know that perfectly well, too.

Mr. WALLACE. If he knew that perfectly well, why did he say: "Why do you not go back for these penalties more than six years?" He either had a lamentable ignorance of the law, or he was trying to mislead the House. His statement is that there were cases in which the penalties amounted to $38,000.

Mr. LISTER. No, not penalties.

Mr. WALLACE. What then?

Mr. LISTER. Defrauding the revenue.

Mr. WALLACE. Defrauding the revenue to the amount of $38,000. All I can say is that our officers went back as far as the law would permit. We seized all the books, all the invoices, all the papers, letters and records of every description. We had three very competent men working for many weeks and taking account of every business transaction of that firm, as recorded in their own books. Their books were taken without their knowledge that we were going to come down upon them. Those books were carefully gone over, and tabulated statements were made of all their business during the time we could, according to law, impose penalties; and the seizing officers who were interested in the seizure, were anxious to make that seizure as large as possible—not to omit one dollar which could be legally claimed by the department against the parties; and their report was that $4,800 odd was the amount of money of which those parties had defrauded the Government.

Mr. LISTER. For six years?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think they were in business six years. At any rate, we went back to the limit the law permitted us, and we found that $4,800 was the total amount; and when the hon. gentleman says that they defrauded the Government of $38,000, I would like him to produce some proof of his statement. I presume that every record connected with the seizure is in Montreal, in the possession of the department. With reference to the case of W. W. Ogilvie, the hon. gentleman asks me whether we investigated the propriety of going back a number of years to find whether the payments that had been made to him were properly made. I did not go back, I did not investigate the action of my predecessor in office at all. I was administering the department, and took up the cases, as they came before me, in the regular form of business. We made two payments to Messrs. Ogilvie after I became Controller of Customs, which I referred to yesterday: One of $650 in January and the other of $730 in March, 1893. These were the only payments made to Messrs. Ogilvie since I became Controller. I further stated that there were claims put in for over $4,000, which claims were not paid as the evidence, in the opinion of our officers, was not sufficiently conclusive to warrant us in paying them. Then the hon. gentleman asked another question. There was an affidavit, and he asked: Who made the affidavit? I gave full particulars of that yesterday. He asks: Was the affidavit returned to Mr. Ogilvie? I do not know that such affidavit was returned to him; does the hon. gentleman know that it was? What information has he about it? He has made some statements. I know nothing in this matter but what was straight, fair and correct; and if the hon. gentleman knows anything else, let him make the statement and not deal in innuendoes and insinuations. So far as I know, no affidavit was returned to Mr. Ogilvie—certainly not with my knowledge or consent. If the affidavits which Mr. Ogilvie made were returned, what would be the effect? Simply that the department would have no evidence to justify them in giving Messrs. Ogilvie the refund. Mr. Ogilvie and nobody else will be the loser.

The Government received the duty on the corn and the refund of 90 per cent was applied for. The conditions under which such refund was made were considered as not having been complied with, and the moneys were not refunded. The Government, on the contrary, retained the money paid for the duty on the corn when the corn was imported. Now, I will deal for a few moments, Sir, with the amendment placed in your hands by the hon. member for North Simcoe. That hon. gentleman moved in amendment that a board of experts be appointed. He copied his motion from the petition of the Montreal Board of Trade. That a board of experts be appointed which shall consist of five experts, one for each of the principal branches of trade, namely: dry goods; hardware, oils, paints, &c.; drugs and chemicals; fancy goods, stationery and jewellery; groceries, provisions and fruits; leather and shoe findings. Then the document from which he copied his amendment goes on to say that such a board of experts has for some years been in operation in the United States, where it appears to have insured to the Government the payment of full customs dues and to have at the same time given satisfaction to the importers. I deny those propositions. As I stated some days ago, there is no such board of experts in the United States at all. The board of experts in the United States is an entirely different board and organization from that proposed by the Montreal Board of Trade and copied by the hon. member for North Simcoe. What is the personnel of that board of experts in the United States:

Hon. G. C. Tichenor, president of the board, was, previous to his appointment as general appraiser, Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, for about four years. Previous to that he was a special agent of the Treasury Department for about fifteen years, and previous to that he was engaged in the practice of the law.

Hon. Thad. Sharratts was, previous to his appointment as general appraiser, for four years customs appraiser at the port of Baltimore. Previous to that he was engaged in the practice of law.

Hon. C. H. Ham was, prior to his appointment as general appraiser, customs appraiser at the port of Chicago for three or four years, and, prior to his appointment in the customs, he was engaged in the practice of law.

Hon. G. H. Sharpe, prior to his appointment as general appraiser, was for three years surveyor of the port of New York. Prior to that he was engaged in the practice of law, and was a member for a number of years of the legislature of the State of New York, and was for a considerable period Speaker of the Assembly.

Hon. Col. J. A. Jewell was, prior to his appointment as general appraiser, supervising special agent of the Treasury Department for about four years. Prior to his employment in the customs he was engaged in the hotel business.

Hon. H. M. Somerville was, prior to his appointment as general appraiser, a practicing lawyer. During a number of years immediately prior to his appointment he was judge of the Supreme Court of Alabama.

Hon. J. S. Wilkinson, jun., prior to his appointment as general appraiser, was appraiser at the port of New Orleans for a number of years. Before his employment in the customs he was engaged in journalism.

Hon. F. N. Shirtleff was, for upwards of fifteen years previous to his appointment as general appraiser, deputy collector of customs at Portland, Oregon. His occupation or employment prior to his appointment in the customs could not be ascertained

Hon. Wilbur F. Lunt, prior to his appointment as general appraiser, was United States attorney for the state of Maine and a practising lawyer.

Mr. J. R. Lake, clerk of the board of general appraisers, was previously an assistant clerk of customs in the Treasury Department at Washington.

Thus, of the nine appraisers, six were lawyers by training and practice and the other three were specially trained during a number of years in the service of the Treasury Department. It is said among business men in New York that this board is not at all satisfactory to them. Further proof of this dissatisfaction is shown by the resolution of the merchants of Massachusetts, who complain that there was no uniformity in appraisements and that the working of the Customs Act, under this general board, was unsatisfactory in every respect. Supposing the board recommended by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) were appointed, and a question of the appraisement of dry goods came up before it, who would appraise the goods? There would be simply one appraiser. He would be the only expert on that board who would have any knowledge of the appraisement of dry goods, and therefore the only one competent, as an expert, to give a valuation or classification of the goods. The same might be said of hardware, dry goods, chemicals and the other classes into which he proposes to divide those experts. Then as to the salaries, the chairman of the board of experts of New York gets $9,000 a year, and each of the other members gets $7,000 a year. I presume the men in Canada would require to be as expert as those in New York, and if we gave them the same salaries we would have an expenditure of $44,000 a year. I claim that we have a better and more satisfactory system in the Customs Department to-day, and one certainly more satisfactory to the mercantile community than the proposed scheme, without any additional cost to the revenue, but simply a little additional work to our own officers. When a question comes up for classification or appraisement or value, we send the article, if it be dry goods, to the dry goods appraiser in Toronto, in Hamilton, Montreal, Halifax and St. John. In a few days we get the opinions of all those men, all experts in that particular line. They give expert opinions without any additional cost to the department. That is a more satisfactory appraisement than the one proposed by the hon. gentleman in

the amendment submitted to this House. We have the opinion of five or six experts in the dry goods trade as to the classification and appraisement of that article, while under this system we should have these difficulties adjudicated upon by a board consisting of a dry goods man, a hardware man, a druggist, a grocery man and a leather man, four of whom would be deciding questions they were not familiar with. Therefore, I say this amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe would be decidedly a more expensive system than the present, and the working would be prejudicial to the department, and would create dissatisfaction among the importers and manufacturers of this country. For these reasons, it should not be incorporated in the Customs Act.

Mr. SCRIVER. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) commends itself, in my judgment, as an eminently judicious and proper one. The Controller of Customs has briefly stated his objections to it. Some of the objections, I think, are not well founded. I think that the fact that such bodies as the boards of trade of several of the most important cities of the Dominion have asked for the constitution of such a board as this is evidence that the present system has not worked well. The Controller of Customs says that under the present system you have the advantage of receiving the opinion of five experts, the sample being sent to that number of appraisers. I may be permitted to say, without reflecting upon the competency of these appraisers, that they have not, in some instances, the full confidence of the business men of the different cities of the Dominion. It has been stated, I believe with some foundation, that these appointments are not always made because of the qualification of the individuals named for the offices for which they are appointed, but that political considerations have weight, and that, in some instances at all events, men not the most competent to be found in the various cities of the Dominion have been selected for these important positions. The Controller of Customs says that under the system suggested by the hon. member for North Simcoe you will have the opinion of only one man in each particular branch of trade, while four others who are not skilled in that department would be given the power to decide as to the classification and appraisement of the article placed before them. Well, it is not true that in a multitude of councillors always dwells safety. I think that if the man representing the particular branch of trade was honest and competent, he would be likely to be impartial, and his opinion would naturally sway the other members of the board of experts. Moreover, I do not think the question of expense should be taken into account. It is not at all likely, if such a board of experts were appointed, that we would rigidly follow the example of the great and rich country on the other side of the border. We should not be expected to pay these men such large salaries as are paid to members of the board of experts there, and it is not at all likely that the expense would be anything like that which has attended the carrying out of such a system in the United States. But, granting that it would be followed with some expense, if the end desired should be attained, the end of leading the various business men of the country, the members of these important bodies, the boards of trade, to feel satisfied with the establishment of a system which would afford them some protection against the occasional arbitrary action of the Board of Customs, I think the question of expense should not weigh with us very much. For my part, valuing highly, as I do, the opinion given by such a body of merchants and traders as those who compose the board of trade in Montreal, I am of opinion that the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Simcoe is, as I said before, an eminently judicious and proper one.

Mr. LAURIER. I should have hoped that the Government, in view of the opinion that has been expressed not only by the board of trade of Montreal, but, if I may say so, by the business men of Canada, would accept this proposition. The Controller of Customs stated a moment ago that the system which was proposed by my hon. friend from North Simcoe would not be as advantageous to the commercial community as is the present system. Well, against the opinion of the hon. gentleman there is the fact that he will seek in vain, I believe, amongst the business men of Canada for one single man who would approve of the present system. The hon. gentleman has stated to-day that all the members of the boards of trade have not pronounced against the present system. It may be they have not. But I think he will seek in vain for a board of trade that has pronounced in favour of the present system, and many are those that have pronounced in favour of the change proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe. What are the objections to the proposed system brought forward by the hon. gentleman? He says, in the first place, that it would be too expensive. Granted that it would entail some expense, that expense would not at all reach the figure stated by the hon. gentleman—$40,000 or $50,000 a year. The hon. gentleman makes up that whole amount by assuming that these officers would be paid as high salaries as they are paid in the United States. But no one supposes that such high salaries ought to be paid to such officers here. However, whatever the expense may be, I think it is childish for a great commercial country like Canada to stand upon considerations of expense if the system is to be improved. If a material im-

provement is to be made in the system, I am quite sure that the question of expenditure should not stand in the way. The other objection stated by the hon. gentleman is that the system in the United States, which is the prototype of the system now proposed, has not worked as satisfactorily—

Mr. WALLACE. The system in the United States is worked out under a board composed mainly of lawyers. It is proposed here to have a board of men who are experts in the various branches of trade. That is really what we have to-day.

Mr. McCARTHY. Are they necessarily lawyers ?

Mr. WALLACE. That seems to be the case.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it is quite fair to say that the system in force in the United States is the prototype of the system now proposed. I should hope that the manner in which the system is carried out in the United States would not be the prototype of the way it would be carried out here. For it is evident from what the hon. gentleman says that the system in the United States has been abused by the manner in which the appointments have been made. I gather from the statement made by the Controller of Customs that the system has not been properly carried out because the proper class of men have not been selected to fill the places. The board in the United States is composed of nine members. The Controller of Customs states that of these six are lawyers. It is evident that these lawyers could not have been selected because of their fitness as business men, but because of their political services. Another member of the board is a journalist. I suppose he was selected for the same reason. Another man is a hotel-keeper ; I do not see that he can have had any other qualification than that occupation would give him ; and the last had no occupation. It is evident, therefore, that in the United States, though the law was good, the object may have been defeated by the character of the men who were appointed. But the hon. gentleman can find an obvious way of reforming that evil ; it would be that the Governor in Council should not fill up those offices with lawyers, journalists, or hotel-keepers, but that they should be filled by men who are experts in the different branches of trade for which appraisers are needed. In this way he would meet the views of the Board of Trade of Montreal. I am sure that if the Montreal merchants, or Canadian merchants generally, expected that such appointments were to be filled with lawyers, journalists and hotel-keepers, they would say at once, Let us keep the system which is in existence. But as I should expect that the Government would follow the spirit and letter of the Act, then I would expect that the character of the men would be really what it is intended to be, that they should be really experts, and then all the advantage which the Government expects, would flow from that system. Now, how can the Government in face of the petition which has been presented to this House, covered, if I remember rightly, by over 600 signatures of men of all shades of politics—indeed, of no politics at all—and when the very first names on the petition are those of friends and supporters of the Government—how is it possible, I ask, in face of such a petition, in face of such a universal condemnation of the present system, for the Government to persist in maintaining it ?

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to refer to some statements made by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MARTIN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot speak again.

Mr. WALLACE. I ask it from the House as a favour. Of course, if the House does not wish to hear me——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot speak again, if objection is made.

Mr. FOSTER. It is an objection which is very seldom made to the responsible head of a department who wishes to make explanations.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Before the question is put, I think the House is entitled to a little further explanation from the Controller of Customs.

Mr. FOSTER. He cannot give it. He wished to give it, but it was objected to.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, perhaps the hon. gentleman cannct explain. The facts to which I wish to call the attention of the House are of a very important character. The hon. Controller of Customs, in speaking the other night, said that in the case of Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell, all his responsibility ceased with regard to the prosecution of Mr. Boyd, the moment he handed the papers over to the Department of Justice. The Minister of Justice told us a few moments ago that all he had to do was to advise the department whether there were grounds for prosecution—and that it was then for the department concerned to say whether the prosecution should go on. I think I have fairly set forth what was stated by the Minister of Justice. It appears that that opinion was conveyed to the Controller, and he was distinctly told by the Department of Justice that there were grounds for prosecution ; and, according to the statement of the Minister of Justice, the responsibility then rested upon the Controller of Customs as to whether that prosecution should go on. Very well, then, what becomes of the statement of the Controller of Customs, made the other day,

that his responsibility in the matter ceased when the papers were handed over to the Minister of Justice? It is evident from what has been told us to-day, that the non-prosecution of Mr. Boyd, who has been charged by the Controller of Customs himself with perjury and forgery, charged by him with those crimes in face of this House, and before the country—the responsibility, I say, for the non-prosecution of those charges rests entirely upon the Controller of Customs himself; he is responsible for the fact that this gentleman has not been prosecuted. He excuses himself for not having gone on with the prosecution on the ground, as he says, that on a recent occasion they failed to convict a man in the Gulf of St. Lawrence for smuggling whisky. Now, the public know perfectly well that with a smuggler, especially under the circumstances upon which the seizure referred to was made, there is always a great deal of sympathy, and one can very well understand that in the case of this man Bouchard, there was a failure of justice. Is that any reason why a man at the head of a great commercial concern, who is publicly charged here before the country with perjury and forgery, and the proofs of which, it is evident, from the statement of the Controller of Customs, are in his hands, is not to be prosecuted? Why, Sir, it is a premium upon fraud, it is a premium upon crime of that description, if a man occupying this position is to understand that he may make false affidavits, as he is charged by the Controller with making, that he may be guilty of forgery, as he is charged by the Controller with being guilty, and yet is not to be prosecuted because the department failed to convict a smuggler in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Now, that is exactly the position in which the Controller stands. I will call the attention of the House to the statement made by the leader of the House when this matter was under discussion. He stated that the matter was one that could not be allowed to rest there, that there must be an investigation. Well, now, is the leader of the House, who represents the head of the Government in this House, to allow this House to understand that a member of his Government, having before him proof of an act such as he has charged against this man Boyd is to permit that act to go without prosecution simply because of some such flimsy excuse as he stated? I say the duty of the Controller is plain, and there can be no question about it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, is making a mistake, and could not have followed the letter read by the Controller of Customs. The Controller read a letter to-day, sent to my department since the discovery of this letter of 1894, in which he gives positive instructions to the department to go on. The other portion of the letter to which the hon. gentleman refers, and which he apparently thinks was the only portion, was a mere remark as to the experience of the department in connection with this prosecution. But, as I heard the letter read to-day, it gave instructions to proceed and to enforce the criminal law. The hon. gentleman evidently did not understand that.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. gentleman, at any rate, cannot escape from the dilemma in which he placed himself by saying his responsibility ended by placing the matter in the hands of the Minister of Justice. But with whomsoever the responsibility rests, it is quite clear that the matter cannot be allowed to remain where it is, that charges of this kind cannot be made unless it is intended to prosecute them. The fact that this extraordinary condition of things existed between the two departments, that a letter of that importance should have been laid aside, and not have been acted upon for months, certainly indicates a looseness of administration for which responsibility must rest upon somebody. Of course I accept the statement. I did not understand the letter to be read as the Minister said it was read. I made all due diligence to ascertain what the Controller of Customs did say, but I did not so understand him, if the statement was made. If I have done him any injustice in regard to that matter, it is my duty to retract it, but at the same time the case is one that does not reflect the very highest credit upon that department.

House divided on amendment (Mr. McCarthy):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Landerkin,
Bain (Wentworth),	Langelier,
Béchard,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Leduc,
Borden,	Lister,
Boston,	Livingston,
Brodeur,	Lowell,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bruneau,	McCarthy,
Campbell,	McLean (King's),
Carroll.	McMillan,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McMullen,
Casey,	Martin,
Charlton,	Mignault,
Choquette,	Monet,
Christie,	Mulock,
Dawson,	O'Brien,
Delisle,	Perry,
Devlin,	Proulx,
Edgar,	Rider,
Fauvel,	Rinfret,
Flint.	Rowand,
Forbes,	Scriver,
Frémont,	Semple,
Gillmor,	Somerville,
Godbout,	Sutherland,
Guay,	Tarte, and
Harwood,	Vaillancourt.—59.
Innes,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adams,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baird,
Baker,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Blanchard,
Boyd,
Boyle,
Bryson,
Burnham,
Cargill,
Carling (Sir John),
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chesley,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis (Alberta),
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grandbois,
Grant (Sir James),
Guillet,
Haggart,
Haslam,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Jeannotte,
Lachapelle,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Leclair,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Macdowall,
Maclean (York),
McAlister,
McDonald (Assiniboia),
McDougald (Pictou),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McGreevy,
McInerney,
McKay,
McKeen,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Patterson (Huron),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Pridham,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Simard,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Turcotte,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westm'd).—115.

Amendment negatived.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the third reading of the Bill is taken, I wish to ask a question in regard to some documents which are lost, or alleged to have been lost. Perhaps the Controller has given that information, but amidst the confusion in the House I did not hear it. I wish to inquire if those documents have been returned to the Department of Customs, which were alleged to have been returned to parties who were intended to have been criminally prosecuted by the Controller? The attention of the Minister of Justice as well as that of the Controller was called to this point, and I understood an explanation was to be given on that point as well as on other points.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All the papers sent to the Department of Justice were returned in a letter of February, 1894.

Mr. MULOCK. What has become of the prosecution?

Mr. FOSTER. The Controller explained that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have not heard what become of the documents. The Controller was to have informed the House on that point.

Mr. WALLACE. In reply to the hon. member for Oxford, I have to say I know nothing of any papers having been returned. I asked the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), who referred to the matter, "Whether any papers were taken away, or any papers stolen?" He refused to answer. I know nothing more. If any member of the House does know anything more, I should like to have the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What we want to know is whether those documents are in the possession of the Controller?

Mr. WALLACE. No authority has been given to return any of the papers, but to retain all the papers.

Mr. MULOCK. What about the prosecution?

Mr. WALLACE. That has been explained.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has repeated the slander he uttered the other night.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LISTER. Or the insinuation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should withdraw the word.

Mr. LISTER. I withdraw the word "slander." The hon. gentleman insinuated, however——

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Lambton has spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman spoke to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Simcoe, and is in order in speaking to the motion now before the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman for a second or third time has thought proper to get up here and talk about the disappearance of these papers. I remind that hon.

gentleman that only the other night he stated that he had sent the papers to the Department of Justice and they had never been returned. The Department of Justice tells the hon. gentleman that they were returned.

Mr. WALLACE. I deny that.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman told us the other night that he wrote a despatch to the Department of Justice and that the only communication he had had since was verbal communication with the late Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice refutes the statement he made by telling the House that the department wrote the Controller and returned the papers to him. Where is the hon. gentleman's accuracy now? He is ready to charge other people with inaccuracy, and yet there is no more inaccurate man in this House to-day than the Controller himself. The hon. gentleman undertakes to teach people law. He knows more about brown sugar and black tobacco than about law. We on this side of the House know perfectly well that he would have to go back six years in order to prosecute those parties; but does he not know that it is necessary to go back even before that time in order to prosecute them and, in order to show venality, to show that the people are worthy of punishment beyond a fine. The hon. gentleman must not take to himself all knowledge possessed by members of the House of Commons. He cannot afford to talk to other people about how little they know. I should like to find a man who knows as little as the Controller, filling the position he fills or any position at all equal to it. He has not answered the charge made against his department. He has not told us what became of the affidavit made by Mr. Ogilvie, although he has given us to understand that the affidavit is not in his department. I asked the hon. gentleman before, and I repeat the question now, was that affidavit returned to Mr. Ogilvie? If so, why was that done in face of the fact that the department thought it necessary to appoint an officer to investigate the affairs of that mill and the claims of Mr. Ogilvie? Why should that affidavit have been returned? If the fact is established by the inspector or officer of the Government that there was fraud committed on the Government, then it was the duty of the Controller to have retained in his possession every evidence that would have proved that fraud in order that the offender might be punished, and the hon. gentleman, unless he is simple indeed, knows that if that affidavit has been surrendered by the department and if there has been wrong-doing in Ogilvie's mill, if this Government has paid back money which it had no right to pay back, the evidence to prove the guilt of the person who made the claim has been lost and no conviction could take place, and prosecution now would be utterly worthless and of no consequence because no conviction would take place. Now, Sir, having said this much, I warn the Controller to be more careful about his statements and I advise him to consult at all events his colleagues before he makes such a statement as he has made to this House in connection with this matter.

Mr. WALLACE. The Controller does not pretend to have all the knowledge of this House, but it appears that he does not require very much knowledge to teach the hon. member for Lambton. With respect to the affidavit in the Ogilvie case I have made inquiries in the department, and, as I stated yesterday, that document is not there. The accountant reports to me that it was delivered to Mr. Watters. That is the last record we have of it.

Mr. LISTER. With what instructions?

Mr. WALLACE. The accountant gave no instructions, and had no authority to give any instructions to his superior officer.

Mr. FOSTER. Another pointer.

Mr. LISTER. Is that a pointer?

Mr. WALLACE. With reference to returning the papers to the Department of Justice, I made no such statement as the hon. gentleman refers to. I made no further statement than that contained in the letter, saying that the file accompanied the letter, and that I would call the special attention of the Department of Justice to the report of Mr. Watters concerning the transactions of the firm of Boyd, Ryrie & Campbell. I knew nothing further of the papers, but supposed they were on the file which I held in my hand at the time. I have no reason to think otherwise now. The whole of the papers were not in that file, but they were a large packet of documents and were not in the department at Ottawa, so far as I can understand, but in the custody of the officer at Montreal.

Mr. CASEY. The Controller of Customs thinks he has taught the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) something, but I think the House will fail to see what instruction he has given him. He has at all events taught us that he is more anxious to say something which he thinks to be smart, than to give the explanation which his duty as a sworn Minister of the Crown demands of him. I ask the Controller of Customs not to leave the House while I am speaking. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Controller of Customs leaves the House in the middle of my remarks and while I am about to ask him a question. That shall not prevent me from asking the question, for I will make the House cognizant of what I would call his cowardice if it were parliamentary to do so, but I believe it is not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will withdraw the word cowardice.

Mr. CASEY. I have not used the word cowardice. I said I would use it if it were parliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman did use the word cowardice, and I ask him to withdraw.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the word cowardice was used more than once by the leader of the House yesterday.

Mr. SPEAKER. If my attention had been drawn to the fact that an hon. member of the House used that word I would have ruled it was not in order.

Mr. CASEY. I do not know who drew your attention to it this time, but according to your ruling I will withdraw the word. I am aware that a higher standard of courtesy is expected from members on this side of the House than from members on the other side.

The Controller of Customs told us yesterday that this affidavit was in the possession of his department, but he did not tell us what became of it. He told us to-day that it was given by the accountant of the department to Mr. Watters, who was the acting commissioner, and who is now uncomfortably situated. He was asked by my friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) what instructions were given, and the Controller had to show his smartness by saying that the accountant could not give instructions to a superior officer. He cannot expect the House to believe that the accountant acted on his own motion in giving up these papers to Mr. Watters. In the absence of the explanation which he has sought to avoid giving by leaving the House, we must believe that he told the accountant to give up this affidavit to the acting commissioner. This document has since disappeared, and its disappearance has rendered the prosecution of the suspected parties impossible. Until the Controller of Customs clears his skirts in this matter, he is directly responsible to the country for the action of the accountant and of the acting commissioner, and for the disappearance of this important legal document, and for the failure to be able to enter suit against the parties alleged to be guilty. He says he sent these papers to the Department of Justice and never got them back. The Minister of Justice says he did send them back. I leave the Minister of Justice and the Controller of Customs to settle the dispute between themselves as to the exchange of these papers between the two departments. It is a pretty state of affairs when the heads of two departments cannot agree as to what passed between them. It shows the utter lack of system and management that prevails in the Government. Until the Controller of Customs tells us by whose authority these papers were given by the accountant to Mr. Watters, he is responsible for their disappearance. It is a very serious charge to make against him, and I do not wonder he left the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that the Government can afford to leave the matter in its present condition. Although there are some points in controversy, yet certain facts admitted by the Government are sufficient to call for explanation and inquiry. It is admitted that a firm of importers were discovered in defrauding the revenue, and that, as a result of an inquiry before the Controller of Customs, a Mr. Boyd was found guilty of having committed forgery, perjury and fraud. The Controller made that statement on the floor of the House, and when it was asked, if Mr. Boyd had been brought to the bar of justice, the Controller was able to clear his skirts for the time being by reading a letter which purported to transmit to the Minister of Justice the forged documents with instructions to take such cognizance of the case as justice demanded. If I remember aright, that was in February, 1894.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was the hon. gentleman in the House when I read a letter which had been sent to the Department of Customs, and when the Controller read a letter of a recent date, either of yesterday or to-day, which had been sent finally to the Department of Justice?

Mr. MULOCK. I did not hear that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman would continue his line of argument, if he had been present. I read a letter of February, 1894, from the deputy of the late Minister of Justice to the Controller of Customs, stating that, under the facts, he was of opinion that Boyd was criminally responsible, and that the fine that had been inflicted would not interfere with criminal proceedings which would be taken, but that he waited further instruction as to whether these proceedings should be instituted or not. No answer was received to that letter. After this discussion, on search being made, and the record showing what I mentioned in the Department of Justice, I saw the Controller of Customs. He then stated to me, as he stated in the House, that there was no record in his department of that letter, and, in support of that statement, he read to the House a letter, which he showed to me from one of his officers, saying that further search had been made and there was no such letter on file. The papers which accompanied that letter of February, 1894, went back to the Department of Customs. My hon. friend then read a letter dated either to-day or yesterday, stating that he had not given instructions to the Department of Justice to proceed criminally. That was the statement of the facts as I heard it.

Mr. MULOCK. I am thankful to the hon. Minister for the information he has given to me. At the same time, it fails, I think, to meet the case. As far as the Department of Justice is concerned, they appear to have given certain advice to the Controller. My recollection was that the Controller had forwarded the alleged, I may say admitted, forgeries to the Minister of Justice in February, 1894, leaving the matter in his hands. Now, Sir, it seems to me incredible that the Controller of Customs could have entirely forgotten so serious a matter, and have failed to make inquiry of the Department of Justice why his letter had not been answered. In February, 1894, he lays a grave responsibility upon the Minister of Justice, and not until July, 1895, when the attention of Parliament is called to the matter, does he appear to have again intervened in the transaction. How he could have omitted for eighteen months to ask the department what had become of these documents, so important in the interest of justice, and how, after having gone through an inquiry involving a great deal of time and responsibility, he could have allowed the matter entirely to escape his memory, and have neglected to see why the accused had not been brought to the bar of justice, passes my comprehension. And to all that, the circumstance that the forged papers are not where they ought to be, in the custody of the law officers—where they are, I suppose, nobody knows—and that there is no record of the letter of the Department of Justice to the Controller's department——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is a record in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MULOCK. I am speaking of the Controller's office. The plainest man in the country knows what ought to have taken place. He knows that the moment the Minister got those papers, if justice had been done, a warrant would have been issued for the accused, a trial would have ensued, and the Controller and his officers would have been necessary witnesses at that trial. And yet we find the Controller of Customs without any record of a reply from the Department of Justice and failing to inquire why there was no reply; all these incriminating documents disappearing: an affidavit which was said to have afforded foundation for a criminal prosecution in another case also disappearing; and these matters brought to the knowledge of the people of Canada by a serious charge made by my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister), who said he could prove this charge and many others if a committee were appointed to examine witnesses under oath; and yet the Administration not being the first, as they ought to be, to court the fullest inquiry under the noonday sun that it would be possible to hold. Comment is hardly necessary. There is a failure of justice, whoever is responsible. The Minister of Justice will admit that. The public will demand an explanation of these transactions. There has been a breaking down in the administration of justice here, and there will be a withdrawal of public confidence from one of the most important departments of the public service. As I said when the matter was last before the committee, it is most unpleasant for any person to listen to accusations touching seriously the personal honour of a member of this House, be he occupying a high or a humble position; and when charges such as those made by the hon. member for West Lambton are promulgated in this House, there is but one course open for honourable men—to have an open and thorough inquiry that will dispel mystery, bring truth to light, lay bare all the facts, convict the guilty and acquit the innocent. Less than that will not satisfy my view of what the situation demands.

Mr. MARTIN. I think it is scarcely correct, as stated by the hon. Minister of Justice, that the letter read to us by the Controller of Customs is an explicit direction to the Department of Justice to prosecute Mr. Boyd; because in that letter it is stated that if the department are still of opinion that criminal proceedings would lie——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be satisfied if I tell him that I take that letter as sufficiently definite to institute proceedings.

Mr. MARTIN. That may be the view of the hon. gentleman. If the hon. gentleman chooses to take that letter as a direction, he may do so; but that does not excuse or palliate the very evident desire or intention of the hon. Controller of Customs to shield Mr. Boyd in this matter. He has done it most effectually, in the first place, by refraining for eighteen months from making any inquiries of the Department of Justice in reference to his letter to that department. Then, when it is brought home to him without any doubt that criminal proceedings could be effectually taken against Mr. Boyd, he writes a letter to the Department of Justice, which the Minister of Justice attempts to show is a clear and explicit direction to that department to act, but which I venture to say can be read very easily the other way; because in that letter the hon. Controller says: If the department is still of opinion that criminal proceedings will lie in this case, it would be in the interest of the department to take proceedings against this man; but I would point out that a former Minister of Customs stated in a long speech in the House of Commons in 1889 that proceedings which have been taken against smugglers had failed to result in conviction, and a prosecution which I took against whisky smugglers in the Gulf of St. Lawrence was equally unsuccessful. What is the object of the Controller in bringing these examples

of failure before the Minister of Justice? What is the object of the halting manner in which that application is made? And had it not been for the action of the hon. member for West Lambton, whom the hon. Controller of Customs has most unjustly abused for his conduct in this matter, it would have remained in this way without any action being taken. Let us look for a moment at the other case, which seems to me a very serious one, indeed, the case of Mr. Ogilvie. The hon. Controller of Customs says that it is a matter of indifference where that affidavit is. If the affidavit is not in the department, so much the worse for Mr. Ogilvie, because his claim for a rebate cannot be made unless the evidence contained in that affidavit is before the department. That affidavit contains the sworn statement of Mr. Ogilvie, which was necessary in order that he should get the rebate, and which, if true, entitled him to the rebate. The department refused to give Mr. Ogilvie that rebate. Therefore, in their opinion, Mr. Ogilvie's statements were not true, he was liable to prosecution for perjury, and it was the duty of the Controller of Customs to instruct the Department of Justice to prosecute him for perjury. Surely, either one thing or the other. Mr. Ogilvie imported a considerable quantity of corn. That corn he was entitled to kiln-dry and sell for human food, in which case he was entitled to a rebate. In his affidavit he stated that he had complied with the law, that he had kiln-dried the corn, and sold it for human food, and he asked a rebate of some $4,000. The department were apparently not satisfied with Mr. Ogilvie's affidavit, and deputed their officer to inquire into the circumstances. That officer did so, and reported that he could not advise the department to pay the rebate. What is the meaning of that report? It can only have one meaning, and that is that the statements contained in Mr. Ogilvie's affidavit were false and untrue. How, then, can the Controller of Customs say it is a matter of no importance to any one, except Mr. Ogilvie, in the prosecution of his claim against the Government where that affidavit is? Why, it is most important to the Department of Justice. That department will say at once: Furnish me with the affidavit if you desire me to prosecute Mr. Ogilvie for perjury; and surely either the Government must pay Mr. Ogilvie that $4,000 or prosecute him for perjury. There is no alternative. When the Government refuse to pay the $4,000 on the ground that the conditions of the law had not been complied with, and on the ground necessarily that Mr. Ogilvie's affidavit was a perjury, the Controller is not justified in refusing to go into matters which occurred before he was Controller. The facts having come to his knowledge, he is bound to inquire into the circumstances under which this same man, in the same way, obtained $16,000 from the public treasury. If Mr. Ogilvie had intended to defraud the revenue of $4,000 in this particular case, would it not justify the department inquiring into the circumstances by which that same man obtained, shortly before, the sum of $16,000 from the public treasury under a similar affidavit?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Although it is not necessary, I cannot refrain from saying one word, which, I think, will expose the very unfair line adopted by the hon. member for Winnipeg with regard to the Controller of Customs. He either listened to the debate which we have had on this matter on two or three occasions, or he did not. In any event, the argument he made to-day was one that could not be pressed by any fair-minded person. He argued that the Controller of Customs had endeavoured to shield this Mr. Boyd from a criminal prosecution and improperly attempted to prevent the law being enforced against him. How does he reconcile such a desire on the part of the Controller of Customs, when it is not disputed that at the outset, on the 30th June, 1894, these instructions were sent by the Controller of Customs to the Department of Justice. After mentioning the inclosure of the file relating to the subject, the Controller goes on to say:

> It seems clear that Andrew Boyd, the senior partner of the firm, has been guilty of defrauding the revenue by writing out false invoices, making false declarations, and possible forgery.

With that letter in the possession of the House for over a week——

Mr. MARTIN. That only makes it all the worse.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman from Winnipeg has that sort of mind that he does not hesitate to rise here and say that the member of the Government who gave instructions was anxious to shield Andrew Boyd. That is to say, the Controller could inform the Department of Justice that Andrew Boyd was, in his opinion, guilty of a crime, that he would submit the whole matter for whatever action the Minister of Justice might consider it advisable to take, and at the same time be most anxious to shield Boyd from crime.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—THE MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Although we have been discussing the Manitoba school question more or less for the last six or seven days, yet, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we have had any opportunity of considering the question upon its merits. And as, according

to the programme of the Government, we will be called upon at an early day—not later, at all events, than January—to receive from their hands a Bill for the carrying out of the remedial order, I think we ought not to separate without affording a full opportunity of having the question discussed and decided as to whether, when that Bill is presented, we will be prepared in this House to enforce that remedial order which the legislature of Manitoba has declined to obey. I propose to draw attention, not merely to the present policy of the Government, but to its policy in connection with this matter from the first. I go back to 1891 when the Government were first called upon, by a petition presented to them, to veto the legislation of the province; and I have always thought, as I now again repeat, that the one justifiable proceeding of the Government from first to last was the refusal which they then gave to veto the School Bill. It was impossible—regard being had to the history of the school question in Canada, regard being had to the many discussions and debates with reference to the New Brunswick school law, regard being had to the discussion also that took place, if not in this House, at all events, between the Department of Justice and the province of Prince Edward Island—for the Government to veto the law, for it has come to be accepted as the unwritten law that this Government will not interfere, by exercising the power of veto, with any law relating to education which may be passed by any province. I am, therefore, glad to know that in 1891, before the last election, despite the pressure, no doubt, of a very urgent character, which was brought to bear upon the Administration of that day, then led by the late Sir John Macdonald, the Government adhered to the policy which had been accepted by both political parties of this country and refused to interfere with the school law of the province. But, unfortunately, my commendation of the conduct of the Government must end there; for, from that time out, I venture to say that every step taken by them has been an unwise and impolitic step, until their course has, at last, landed us in the condition in which we found ourselves here last week—disintegration of the Government, disintegration of parties, perhaps, on both sides, at all events, of the party on this side; and the existence of a question of such magnitude and on such a subject that it is calculated to raise issues and feelings which no other question, since confederation, has brought so prominently to the front. In that report of Council the suggestion was made that if the petitioners should ask for the veto of the Bill and the law turned out to be within the constitutional power of the province to pass, the Government here would entertain the question of redressing the grievances of the minority in that province under the clause of the Manitoba constitution. When, in 1892, it was found, after a long and tedious course of litigation, under the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that the law was constitutional, that it did not deprive the minority of any right they were entitled to under the statute, that it was within the power of the province to pass—then, naturally enough, those who had been promised in 1891 that their grievances should be redressed if the event happened, which did happen, were back again at the Council Chamber demanding that the promise made to them should be kept. And what did the Government do? In 1891 there was no hesitation about the power of this Government to pass the remedial order. But no sooner had they started on the course of considering this question of the infringement of the rights of the minority than they were suddenly seized with the consciousness that they might not have the power. Then, for the first time, did it occur to them that the promise which had been made in 1891 was a promise which was impossible of fulfilment. And the proceedings having been commenced with all due solemnity, a committee having been appointed, and a judicial inquiry, or so called judicial inquiry having been instituted—then, for the first time, the Government paused. Whether they paused for the purpose of making sure their jurisdiction was well founded, or whether they paused with the hope that the courts would say that they had no jurisdiction, I do not intend at this moment to offer an opinion. But, at all events, it gained delay. The questions were then referred to the court under the Act which had been passed at the preceding session upon the suggestion of Mr. Edward Blake for the purpose of informing the Governor General in Council whether or not His Excellency had power to entertain the appeal, as it was called, and to grant a remedial order, which was the measure of relief that the petitioners sought. The questions having gone from the Supreme Court to the judicial committee were, as we all know, ultimately determined by the judicial committee deciding in favour of the right of the petitioners to have their appeal entertained, and pronouncing that the Governor General in Council had the authority to deal with the matter and to grant the relief by the passage of a remedial order. Now, Sir, that is the first point upon which I desire to state, as emphatically as I possibly can, that I think the Government was wrong. I mean to say, Sir, that that question came before the Government as all other questions come before the Government, to be dealt with, I am not going to say, not in accord with justice, but according to justice and according to right and according to what was wise and prudent in the interest of the province and in the interest of the community as a whole. But I utterly deny, and I challenge any person to estab-

lish by any kind of reasoning or proof that in acting in that way His Excellency the Governor General and his advisers were a judicial body. The Government of this country has ceased to be a judicial body, or rather, the Government has never, since confederation, been a judicial body. Undoubtedly there was a time when our government, our kings, exercised judicial powers. But, since the abolition of the Star Chamber, that authority has been taken from the Government of England; and, so far as I know, the Government of Canada never possessed it. And, when we have a Supreme Court, it would be an extraordinary proceeding that the Supreme Court, deciding matters judicially, should be passed by, and the political body, the Government should be called upon to pronounce upon questions with judicial authority. Therefore, Sir, this question came before the Government just as would any other question. I do not mean to say that the Government were not at liberty, if they thought fit, to hear both sides. The Government have in many cases, adopted that course. But it does not follow that because the Government, in the exercise of the authority vested in it in any matter, thinks fit or proper to call the party opposing the claim to argue or state his reasons therefor, the Government is acting judicially. If the Government were acting not upon the responsibility of Ministers of the Crown but as judges, then the Government could not be held responsible for any conclusion they might honestly arrive at, no matter how erroneous it might be, any more than a judge upon the bench could be held responsible for the wrong conclusions he reaches—and we all know that our judges do frequently arrive at wrong conclusions. But, Sir, according to that view the Government would have to be perfectly free from all political considerations, they would have to act as our judges act—with a single eye to the judicial office and judicial duty which they had assumed. Now in this case we perfectly well know that that was not the character assumed. Why, Sir, the Minister of Public Works, a short time before the hearing of this appeal, publicly announced at a meeting that unless a remedial order was made, his duty would be to retire from the Government. Now, it is impossible to suppose a judge or any gentleman filling a judicial position, in anticipation of the argument of the case declaring that if the case was not decided in a particular way his duty would be plain and clear—to abandon his position.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman know that that has been denied?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have the proof here, and if it is denied, I will be most happy to submit it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You say he stated that if the remedial order was not passed he would retire.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not pretend to use the exact words of the hon. Minister, but I gave the substance of what he said; and I think that the hon. Minister of Public Works, when I quote from his statement, will not say that my recollection of his language on that occasion is not substantially correct. The speech made by the hon. Minister at St. Hyacinthe reported in the Government organs of the 25th February, 1895, was as follows:—

> Mr. Ouimet said he was one of those who demanded that justice should be given to the minority. They had taken an appeal to England at their own expense, and had been successful. The appeal of the minority had not only been maintained, but had been solemnly confirmed. The Privy Council had once for all decided that not only had the minority in Manitoba a right to schools of their own choice, but that nobody had a right to deprive the minority of their schools. The course now open to the minority was to demand the re-establishment of the separate schools which they formally enjoyed. Mr. Ouimet stated there was unanimity amongst the members of the Government on this question. A time had been fixed for the advocates of the minority to plead their cause, and to show what remedial legislation should be passed. The Cabinet would be called upon to act in accordance with the judgment of the Privy Council. As soon as the case was heard, a decision would be rendered, and Mr. Ouimet added that if that decision was not in accordance with the constitution, there would be but one thing for them to do, and that was to retire from the Government.

Now, Sir, I think that what I said was substantially true. If the hon. gentleman is quibbling, or desires to quibble, and wishes to state that the decision was not in accordance with the constitution, and did not mean that there should be a remedial order, I would be quite willing to accept the hon. gentleman's statement. But I do not think the hon. gentleman would stand up in this House and say that the constitution did not require of him and his colleagues that a remedial order should be made. So that I am right, I think, in the statement I made that this so-called judicial officer, in anticipation of the argument, announced at a political meeting that if the order was not made, that if the constitution, according to his interpretation of it—and that meant the passage of the order—was not obeyed, then he would retire from the Government, and that was the only course left for him to do. Now, Sir, it is plain that he thought there was a chance that this remedial order could not be enforced, and would be of no effect. No judge who had paid the expenses of an appeal to England—because that is one of the boasts that the hon. gentleman made—no judge who had made such a statement as that, could be permitted to sit upon a cause, and if he did sit there, the conclusion arrived at by him would not, of course, be worth the paper it was written on. It is only fair, however, to say that when I

was pressing this point before the Council, the Prime Minister, and I think one of his colleagues, I am not quite certain but that it was the Minister of Justice, said that if I was dealing with the question of their responsibility, I need not press the matter further, because they admitted their full responsibility for the order which they proposed to make. Therefore, I think it will not be necessary to do more now than just state that, notwithstanding the language used in the statute, which uses the term "appeal," regard being had to the manner in which this so-called appeal was to be prosecuted, it must be treated and looked upon as an application, made like any other application, to the Governor General in Council, with regard to which the Governor General acts upon the advice of his responsible Ministry. And we find the proceedings in accordance with that. A report is made to His Excellency, which His Excellency adopts, and if my hon. friends will take the trouble to look at it they will find that this is the ordinary way in which the affairs of our Administration are carried on. The Governor General acts by Order in Council, and all the proceedings in this case were as usual, with the single exception that the gentlemen of the Privy Council chose to call themselves a judicial body, chose to treat the matter as if it was a legal trial; but ultimately they adopted the procedure which is usual in all matters which come before the Council, and which ultimately have to receive the sanction of the Governor General. Now, Sir, the only importance at present to be attached to that is that an effort has been made, in my section of the country, at all events, to disclaim responsibility. I do not think it was so in the province of Quebec. There, glory was taken; there, it was a matter of triumph; there, the Government asked the public to remember that they had passed the remedial order at considerable risk, and that they were entitled to every credit for it. But, up West, the line taken has been different. We had an example of it here the other night from the whip of the party. I heard him make the same statement in the county of Haldimand. There he said that the Governor General had passed on to Manitoba the Order of Her Majesty the Queen, through the Privy Council; the Government had no responsibility whatever. They represented to the people that the Government had to obey the law and constitution, and they had, consequently, passed on the order to Manitoba, and there was no responsibility. The Secretary of State told us the other day that he, at all events —and I allude to it now because it was not in debate, but simply in a discussion that took place on the ministerial explanations —had made his views on that subject perfectly clear to his constituents; that he did not do as the leader of the Opposition had done, observe a judicious silence on the subject. Well, Sir, I am bound to say that I heard the Secretary of State, I am bound to say that I have read on more than one occasion his utterances on that subject, and I think I am also bound to add that you can understand his language in that sense. It is impossible to say, in fairness to the hon. gentleman, that his language does not mean that; but it is equally impossible to say that his language does not mean the reverse. There was no such statement made in Haldimand as was made in Verchères and in Antigonish, there was no clear and definite promise of remedial legislation. There was a statement of the law and constitution, and the people were told, as we heard here the other night, that neither was the Government, nor the Secretary of State, nor anybody else, responsible for what had been done; that it was cruel to speak of the matter, cruel to hold him to any account; that his duty commenced and ended with passing the order on to the province of Manitoba. Sir, this trouble might have been saved, these difficulties, which are now causing a disruption, the end of which no man in this House is probably able to foresee, might all have been avoided by a little firmness in the beginning. I do not mean to say that there should not have been every effort to conciliate, that there should not have been communications with Manitoba, as there ought to be when complaint was made by any section of the community upon a question as to which this Government had authority and jurisdiction. But I do mean to say that if the Government had consulted Manitoba, had invited, as the Government afterwards did with reference to the North-west, a statement from Manitoba of the causes which led to the change of the school law, the matter ought to have ended at that time. Why, Sir, we have had here within recent years a complaint made by the same ecclesiastical authorities with reference to the administration of the school law in the North-west Territories, where they had separate schools. There was a formal complaint and petition, accompanied by all the usual circumstances, and that petition was sent on to Mr. Haultain, the gentleman who administered the affairs of that territory, and his answer having been received, and the Committee of the Privy Council here having investigated it, thought that the answer had disposed of the alleged grievances, which were stated in the petition, and no redress was given to them with regard to the North-west. We had complete power and authority, either to veto their laws or to repeal them; this was not a province, but merely a territory; and yet that was the result of the investigation that was made of the so-called grievances with regard to the separate school system in the North-west Territories. But, Sir, the Governments controlled by the same influence that is controlling still, by

the influence of hon. gentlemen opposite, who held the pistol to their heads and threatened their destruction, the Government, regardless of the consequences, and to escape the difficulties which then presented themselves, said they would deal with this matter in such a way as, if possible, to save themselves the responsibility, but also to enable the minority to have their separate schools re-established in the province of Manitoba. And so the remedial order was made. The circumstances attending the making of that remedial order have been already adverted to. I will pass over them very briefly: I want to make my statement here complete, or I would not refer to them at all. I ask you, Sir, and this House to remember that the Government which finds delay now such an important matter, a matter that ought to entitle them to credit at the hands of this House, acted with undue precipitation with respect to dealing with the province. Let me give the dates. The judgment of the Privy Council was pronounced on 29th of last January; the order was not made till 2nd February. I am informed, and I think I am correctly informed, that it was not until the 19th February that the formal order reached this country. I may be wrong as to that, for the time seems long, but that is my information; and three days before, the province was summoned by telegram, on the 16th, to appear ten days afterwards at the bar of justice here, or injustice, whichever you may choose to term it, to show cause why a remedial order should not be issued. Ten days is the time allowed, in ordinary suits between parties; but ten days' notice of trial is given with the knowledge that a day has been fixed for trial, and if the case is coming on, the defendant will have notice ten days before. But here the province is summoned, and summoned by telegram, with only ten days' notice, to appear to answer for its legislation on, perhaps, the most important subject within its jurisdiction. Well, Sir, I received instructions on behalf of the province to appear, I think it was on the 24th, the hearing being fixed for the 26th; that was two days before the time fixed for the hearing. I appeared on the 26th, and asked for delay. I asked for delay until the session of the legislature closed. I pointed out that no one was competent, or as competent, at all events, to state to this Government why it was that the legislation had been changed as the Attorney General of the province, who was the head of the department; but he was then engaged in leading the House, the Prime Minister of the province being ill in bed. That indulgence was found to be impossible. I was granted—for I was appointed without any instructions except the remedial order papers—a delay in order that I might communicate, and either go to Winnipeg to get information on the subject, or to get a gentleman to come from Winnipeg and inform me. But that is not what I asked, and it was not what the province was entitled to expect. And why was this hurry? The hurry was because Mr. Ewart, on the other side, said the minority had been suffering so long they could not allow a session to pass, they must have redress this coming session, they must insist on that. That was the view which prevailed. The order passed in order that this House might be within its jurisdiction during the present session in implementing that order if it became necessary to do so. The order was made, and since then we have had conflicting statements in regard to the effect of the remedial order, and with respect to the responsibility of the Government according to the quarter in which those statements were made. It seems there is another view, a view which certainly had not occurred to me before, in addition to the view put forward by the hon. member for Leeds, that this was merely passing on Her Majesty's order to the province of Manitoba, and it is not a view which is accepted by every one who discusses this question. The other view is that the Government felt they were bound, irrespective of the merits of the case altogether, and without regard to its merits, in disregard, I may say, of its merits, to pass the remedial order in the most ample terms in which it could be passed, granting every demand made by petition, so that the petitioners might come here, and this House would have jurisdiction to take into consideration their case, their hardships and their grievances, and deal with them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the new policy, the last worship; and I trust we shall hear no more about passing on the order to Manitoba, that we shall hear no more about Her Majesty having commanded the Canadian Government, because it is a slander on Her Majesty. Her Majesty does not interfere in England on a matter of this kind, and certainly she does not interfere in Canada. The theory is that when they apply here, it is not the duty of the Government to consider the merits of the case, but it is their duty so to open the parliamentary doors that the minority may come here and get remedial legislation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is your own view.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought it was accepted, judging by the cheers that came from the Treasury benches.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It was your own argument. I will read you your argument, if you like.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will state my own argument, and therefore it is not necessary to read it. I cannot refer, of course, to what was said in another debate, but I am in the judgment of the House as to whe-

ther I have misinterpreted the view of the Government. What I am anxious to do is to try and fix the Government down to some statement; I want to know exactly where they stand, what their view is. Is it merely passing on the order, is it that they were bound to open the parliamentary doors, is it that they considered the merits of the case? Let us know what their position is. The merits of the case were presented on behalf of the minority by my friend, Mr. Ewart, and I suppose he made the best case the circumstances would admit. And what was the case that gentleman made, and on which the Privy Council pronounced? First, it was that, according to the treaty which was entered into at the time Manitoba became a part of Canada, there was a guarantee given to the minority that they should have their separate schools. Then there were several statements made that at various times in the history of the province, promises had been made by members of various Governments that the separate schools should not be taken from them. Those latter statements were supported by certain affidavits, but the affidavits having been read and filed without notice, they were withdrawn sooner than allow an answer by affidavit to be made. And so the affidavits which should not have appeared in this blue-book, unfairly appeared in this blue-book which has been circulated all over the country, casting reflection upon my hon. friend for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), and making statements with reference to Mr. Greenway and other gentlemen. These were affidavits which were formally withdrawn at the time of the hearing, and as to which there was no opportunity of making a reply. In printing them here, and circulating them throughout the country for the purpose of damaging men and damaging parties who had no opportunity of answering them, the Government were guilty of a transaction which I wish I could characterize within parliamentary terms. Well, Sir, the case that Mr. Ewart presented was this simple fact as to which there was no possible dispute, and as to which there could be no possible dispute: That separate schools had been established in Manitoba in 1871, and that separate schools had been abolished in 1890. If that constituted a ground for relief, then undoubtedly the case for the petitioners was complete, and, in fact, there was no necessity for argument, and the whole thing was a gigantic farce, because that was the basis on which the hearing of the case was heard. The Privy Council had determined that under the words of the constitution of Manitoba, as contained in the Manitoba Act, the establishment of separate schools subsequent to confederation, and the repeal of that separate school Act, constituted what, for want of a better term, is called a grievance; constituted, at all events, the right to give the minority the power to come to the Privy Council and ask for a reconsideration of the question, and authorized the Government to make a remedial order, which being disobeyed, gives this Parliament jurisdiction to carry out the terms of the remedial order so far as that is within the constitution and jurisdiction of the province. But, Sir, I want first to deal with a matter which has affected a good number of people. It has been determined as a matter of law that the constitution, as worded, and the Manitoba School Act, as drawn, did not guarantee to the minority separate schools. It has been determined that the rights which were guaranteed to the denominations in Manitoba—and it was a right appertaining not merely to the Roman Catholics, but to the Anglicans and Presbyterians and possibly the Methodists—was a right to do as they had been doing at the time that part of Rupert's Land became a province. That was the right, and that is the right alone which is guaranteed now under the highest interpretation of the statute which we have got from the Judicial Committee. Therefore, as a simple question of the construction of the constitution, there is no more to be said about it. But, Sir, I go a long way with those who say: If the constitution by a slip of the pen has omitted to guarantee rights which were intended to be guaranteed by this Parliament, and which were the result of a treaty between the settlers at that time and the authorities here; and because the strict letter of the law does not give that right, would you deny it to the people of the province? Well, I have two observations to make about that. In the first place, when you speak of this as a treaty it must be borne in mind that Rupert's Land had become a part of this Dominion. We had purchased the territory from the Hudson Bay Company. There was no such thing as a treaty acquiring it from a foreign, or even a quasi-foreign authority, and it is erroneous to speak of it as a treaty at all. What was intended by Her Majesty, and what was proclaimed to the settlers there at that time was that the rights of the individuals inhabiting that part of the country which Canada had acquired should be safeguarded to them, and the right, whatever it may be, is a personal right, differing in that respect altogether from the right that belongs, for instance, to the province of Quebec, by virtue of the treaty which was made at the time of the cession, between the King of France and the Crown of England. What Her Majesty the Queen authorized the Governor General to do here, and what the Governor General proclaimed he would do, and what this country, I venture to say, has done, was to guarantee to the people of that province—the few inhabitants as they were—protection in their rights and their privileges. That was an individual protection, and not one which by any possibility

of construction could extend to bind the province for all time. But, Sir, perhaps that view matters little. I am prepared to establish here by the most conclusive authority—and I am glad to know that if I do that I will remove the only cause which moves the Prime Minister of this country to adopt the policy of a remedial order and to promise to introduce a Bill. The Prime Minister is moved simply by the consideration that separate schools were guaranteed as part of the treaty, or part of the bargain made between the inhabitants of the Red River country at that time and the authorities here at Ottawa.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out, when the House rose for recess, that Mr. Ewart, in his presentation of the case on behalf of that portion of the Roman Catholic minority whom he represented, had taken altogether six grounds. The first ground was the historical one, that there had been a bargain entered into between the inhabitants of the Red River country and the people of Canada, as it then existed, that there should be separate schools, and that that bargain was to be considered as a treaty—as a parliamentary pact, to use the language of the Lord Chancellor—which ought to be given effect to, although it did not appear within the four corners of the Act of Parliament. The other arguments presented by Mr. Ewart—and I do not desire to do him any injustice—I will not trouble the House with, beyond mentioning, that when disputes arose with reference to the abolition of the Senate of Manitoba, certain guarantees had been given by the English, and that pledges had been given on behalf of the Liberal party, prior to the time they attained power in Manitoba. These arguments were supported by affidavits, and were withdrawn. The other argument was of a similar character, depending upon an express agreement or promise made or entered into by Mr. Greenway in person with the late Archbishop Taché. This also depended on affidavits, and was withdrawn. I now propose to establish, as I think I can in the most conclusive manner, that there was no bargain between the settlers and the authorities at Ottawa that they should have separate schools. It is as clear as anything can be that, in the disturbances that took place in the Red River district prior to its incorporation in the Dominion, there were two bills of rights, or lists of rights, as they were called. One list of rights, which was prepared, I think, in the month of November preceding the year in which the negotiations took place, I think in 1869, makes no reference at all to separate schools; it is not asserted by any person that it does.

The second list of rights was prepared by the 40 gentlemen—20 French-Canadian Half-breeds and 20 English—who were elected and called a provisional assembly. These lists of rights were submitted to Sir Donald Smith, the hon. gentleman whose place is beside mine here, and they are to be found in our parliamentary returns. Sir Donald Smith, who was sent with two other delegates from Ottawa, signified, on behalf of this Government—although, of course, he had no authority to bind the Government—what he supposed it would be prepared to do. But, Sir, that list of rights No. 2, which will be found in the sessional papers of the following year, does not contain, I think, nor is it pretended by any person that it does contain, any reference whatever to separate schools. So far there is no dispute. It is admitted on all hands that neither list of rights No. 1 nor list of rights No. 2 made any demand on behalf of the settlers of Red River for separate schools. The only demand that was made with reference to schools was that a grant of money—$30,000 per annum, I think—should be made towards the support of separate schools so long as that part remained a territory; for at that time it was not supposed that it would be incorporated into a province. A dispute arises as to whether there was a fourth list of rights—unquestionably, there was a third list of rights—because in what is called the fourth list of rights there is a demand for separate schools in paragraph 7; and the whole of this controversy turns on whether or not the fourth list of rights is a genuine document or a spurious document—whether, in point of fact, there was a fourth Bill of Rights, or whether No. 3 was the last and the one which was brought here by the delegates, and on which negotiations took place for the settlement of the terms for the admission of Manitoba as a province of the Dominion. Now, Sir, let me, as briefly as I can, give to the House the relation with regard to the fourth list of rights. It is claimed that that document was in the possession of a gentleman who is still living, a Father Ritchot, and that upon it there were marginal notes made by him as one of the delegates to Ottawa, indicating that that was the document on which the negotiations had taken place. He was the chief of the three negotiators sent from the Red River down to Ottawa to enter into negotiations with the Government here with reference to the admission of that territory as a province. It is admitted, Sir, that that document is not now to be found. It is claimed, however, that a copy of it was put in at the trial of Lépine, who was tried for high treason, I think, as late as 1874. It is said that Father Ritchot appeared as a witness at that trial and produced the original document, which has been mislaid. But fortunately, it is said, a copy was made of the original document, which copy was sent here to the Department of Justice; and a

certified copy of that document was produced before the Privy Council at the argument to which I have referred. Nobody heard of it ; though, when I say that, of course, I have to assume, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, that those who were at the trial of Lépine heard of it ; but it was not generally spoken of or known as a claim that was put forward by any section of the population until 1889, when the agitation with regard to separate schools arose. Then Archbishop Taché produced a copy of this fourth list of rights, which contained a claim for separate schools as they existed in Ontario and Quebec ; and he claimed that it was agreed to on the part of the authorities here, and should have been, if it was not actually, incorporated in the Manitoba constitution. That was very promptly controverted ; but I desire first to make plain exactly all that was said in favour of, all that there is with reference to this so-called fourth bill of rights, and I think I have recapitulated with perfect fairness all that is said in its favour. Now, the third bill of rights is undoubtedly an authentic document. No one pretends that there was not a third bill of rights ; no one pretends that a third bill of rights was not framed by the provisional council of which Riel was the head, composed out of a body of forty, who were elected in the month of March, 1870. Remember, I have told you that bill of rights number two was the first outcome of this council—that is of the whole body of forty, to which it was submitted, and that appears in our own sessional papers. Then there was the other document, this third bill of rights, framed by the provisional government of which Riel was the head and Mr. Bunn was the secretary. There is no doubt whatever that there was this third bill of rights. There is no doubt it was prepared by the provisional government ; but the dispute turns on the fact as to whether this third bill of rights was the document handed the delegates sent to Ottawa, or whether the provisional government, of which Riel was the head, had not altered the third bill of rights and made a fourth bill of rights, and that that was the document which was sent here to Ottawa. Let me give the evidence, which appears to me absolutely conclusive, that no such bill of rights as the one denominated "number four" ever existed. First and foremost, the delegates left Winnipeg on the 23rd March. They left with a letter of instructions from Mr. Bunn, the secretary, of a most formal character, giving them their instructions, instructing them that they were entrusted with a bill of rights, and that they had discretion as to some of the articles contained in it, but no discretion as to others. That letter is published in the blue-book containing the argument that took place before the Privy Council, at page 113, and it reads as follows :—

Sir,--The president of the provisional government of Assiniboia in Council appoints you, by these presents, in authority and in delegation—you the Reverend Messieur J. N. Ritchot, in company with John Black, Esquire, and the Hon. A. Scott—in order that you may proceed to Ottawa, Canada, and that there you may place before the Canadian Parliament the list entrusted to you with these presents, said list containing the conditions and propositions under which the people of Assiniboia will consent to enter into confederation with the other provinces of Canada.

Signed, 22nd day of March, 1870.

By order,
THOS. BUNN,
Secretary of State.

Then the other document that was referred to in his letter of instructions is still more explicit :

To the Rev. Mons. Joseph N. Ritchot.

Inclosed with this letter, you will receive your commission and a copy of the conditions under which the people of this country will consent to enter the Canadian confederation. You will arrive at Ottawa promptly as possible, and on arrival you will, in company with the Hon. M. A. Scott and the Hon. John Black, enter immediately with the Government of the Dominion into the negotiations which are the subject of your commission.

Please observe that, as regards articles numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 17, 19 and 20, you may, in concert with the other commissioners, exercise your discretion ; but you must never forget that, since the entire confidence of the people rests on you, we look to you to do all in your power, in the use of this discretion, to assure to us the rights and liberties which have been until now refused to us.

With reference to the other articles, I am directed to inform you that they are peremptory. I must further notify you that you have not at all the power to bring to a final conclusion any arrangement, that any negotiation conducted by you with the Government of Canada must first receive the sanction of the provisional government.

I have the honour, &c.,
THOS. BUNN,
Secretary of State.

Now, mark the date of this letter, the 22nd of March. Mark the further fact that it was on the 23rd March these delegates left for Ottawa. And the question comes up, what document is referred to here as the document containing the list of articles and propositions upon which Assiniboia, as it was called, was prepared to enter confederation ? The first important fact, and it is a historical fact which has never been disputed, is that on the day these delegates left, namely, the 23rd March, this provisional government published a manifesto to the people of Red River stating that delegates had been sent and that the terms and conditions upon which they were authorized to treat were those contained in the bill of rights No. 3. Now, that is a fact which has never been called in question. It is stated and known perfectly well in Winnipeg and it has never been disputed or denied. What the late Archbishop Taché said was that notwithstanding this, the provisional coun-

cil had altered bill of rights No. 3 and converted it into bill of rights No. 4. If so, it was most extraordinary that the provisional government should have issued a manifesto to the people in which they related that the bill of rights which they sent was the one we now know as bill of rights No. 3. But the matter is settled now beyond all controversy by the English blue-book containing these documents, which was brought down at the time, and which contains correspondence from the then Governor General, Lord Lisgar. In a despatch of 29th April, Sir John Young as he was then, in writing to the Colonial Secretary, adds this postcript to the communication :

I think it is right to forward to Your Lordship a copy of the terms and conditions brought by the delegates of the North-west, which formed the subject of the conference.

On page 130 of the blue-book, it is stated as follows :—

A list of the rights and a list of the terms and conditions referred to in your letter of instruction.

(Signed) THOS. BUNN,
Secretary.

To John Black, Esquire, one of the delegates.

So, if anything at all is capable of proof, I think it is established, beyond all reasonable controversy, that the document which was brought down, upon which, as His Excellency then informed the Home Government, the conference had taken place, was not the so-called bill of rights No. 4, but the bill of rights No. 3, and that bill of rights contains no allusion whatever to the question of schools. It will be asked, perhaps, how then came the bill of rights No. 4 ? I do not think it is difficult to account for. Remember that this so-called provisional government was in direct defiance of the authority of the Crown, and when these delegates came to Ottawa, as Father Ritchot afterwards related in his report made in Winnipeg, the Government ostensibly refused—Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier being the gentlemen delegated to speak on behalf of the Government—to treat with these gentlemen as delegates from a provisional government which the Governor General could not allow them to recognize. At the same time, the document was produced, and, of course, was returned amongst the correspondence we find here. And when Father Ritchot went home to Winnipeg, he complained in his report—and it will be found in the blue-book here; for I cited it in full from a paper called the "New Nation" published at the time—he complained that down here in Ottawa, while they declined to treat with him upon the bill of rights which he and his colleagues had brought down, they put a list of rights or so-called list of rights in his hands, which formed, as it were, the basis of the terms upon which this country was prepared to treat with the settlers of the Red River. Upon this the note in Father Ritchot's handwriting appears and explains, as it appears to me reasonably without imputing bad faith or concoction of this document to anybody, which it is not necessary I should do. Then what conclusion are we driven to ? That in the three different lists of rights prepared by the people of the Red River, one in November, one in the early part of March, one in the latter part of March—one by the council in November, one by the council of forty and one by the provincial government—no claim was made in reference to the schools except in one, I have forgotten which, that they should have a certain amount of money annually for the support of their schools. We are therefore left in this position—that whatever appears in the Act of Parliament was the free grant or free gift of the people who were negotiating here; it was not the result of any demand, it was not in consequence of any claim ; but it was probably suggested here by the same influence, which have from first to last claimed that in all our constitutions of the North-west and wherever we had the power, we should insert not merely a clause of this kind, but also a clause with reference to the dual language. Now, I think that is a fair explanation of it, and the conclusion of it is this—whatever the Act of Parliament gives, and to the extent that the Act of Parliament gives, we are bound to respect it, we are bound to abide by it so long as it is the law of the land. But when it is claimed on behalf of the minority that they are entitled to get something beyond what the Act of Parliament contains, something that they say ought to have been included, but which through inadvertance was omitted, I think I have shown satisfactorily to any impartial man that the claim utterly and entirely fails and that there is no ground whatever for supposing that they are entitled to anything outside the four corners of the document itself. Sir, intrinsically, it is impossible to imagine that there could have been any such claim. One of the paragraphs which these delegates were permitted to treat about, that is to surrender or not to insist upon, is paragraph No. 7. This paragraph No. 7 is the one said to contain the claim to separate schools. But paragraph No. 7 as it reads here, is as follows :—

That a sum of money, equal to 80 cents per head of the population, shall be paid by the Dominion of Canada to the local legislature until such time,——

And so on. A very natural one to be treated about ; a very proper one for negotiation. But if you insert instead of that the clause with reference to the schools, and if you imagine the people there are interested in their schools and separate schools to the extent that has been represented, it is evident that the delegates would not have had any power to abandon it or to escape insisting upon it. Then, Sir, I come back to the cases that is presented—and I adopt this case

because I think that it is fitting that I should do so. I know of no place where the claims of the minority have been so formally set forth as in this deliberate argument by the counsel; and therefore I take it as the best case that could be put forth on their behalf. But before I pass to the main question I propose to deal with, let me clear up a matter about which I am afraid there is a good deal of misapprehension in the minds of members of this House, or some of them at all events. I do not think that the hearsay that has been so industriously circulated that the action of the Government here was in pursuance of the mandate of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, has been yet entirely cleared away; and that is a point upon which I desire now, with the indulgence of the House, to cite not so much my own view, which is perfectly well known and, perhaps, goes for very little, but the view propounded by the gentleman who argued the case before the Judicial Committee. I will fortify that with the language of the Law Lords who heard the case, and I will add perhaps something that has not yet been brought to the notice of the Canadian Parliament, although I see it was referred to by the Attorney General in the discussion which took place in Manitoba. Now, in the first place, I do not think my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, who may perhaps take part in this discussion, will risk his reputation as a lawyer by contending there that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had jurisdiction to give a mandate to the Governor General of this country, or that the Judicial Committee had authority to say what this Parliament should or should not do. Sir, the Judicial Committee merely stood in the place of the Supreme Court of Canada. Their only jurisdiction is derived from the fact that by our own Act of Parliament we authorized the Governor General in Council to submit questions of difficulty either in fact or law for the information of the Government to the Supreme Court of this country. And we gave the right to any person who was interested in the decision of our Supreme Court to carry the case to the Judicial Committee. And it will be remembered, for it has been often cited, that when Mr. Blake made the proposition that such a Bill ought to be passed, Sir John Macdonald took exception to the argument that Mr. Blake presented. He based his objection on the misunderstanding, as it afterwards turned out, that Mr. Blake proposed to substitute the opinion of the court for that of the Privy Council of this country and to remove from the Privy Council its ministerial responsibility. Sir John said: "Believing as I do in responsible government, I will be no party to any system which will lessen the responsibility which ought to be borne by the Government, or allow the courts to say what the Government of this country should or should not do." And, in the Act Parliament framed upon that it will be found that care was taken to let it be made perfectly clear and plain that the questions to be submitted to the court were for the information of the Privy Council. I need not quote the words of Sir John Macdonald, for his statement has been referred to frequently before. But I will read Mr. Blake's expression of opinion upon the same subject when he made his proposition:

> I by no means propose to withdraw from the executive its duty; my object is to aid it in the efficient execution of its duty.

Further on in his speech he said:

> It is but an enabling proposition; it but empowers the executive to obtain—by a procedure replete with the essential requisites for the production of a sound opinion—the views on legal questions, leaving to the executive so aided the responsibility of final action.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman any more of Mr. Blake's speech there as to the reasons for his action?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I took this from "Hansard," but I have only the paragraph applicable to this point. Look at the Act of Parliament framed upon that, and it will be found that it declares that questions may be put to the Supreme Court for the information of the Governor in Council. Well, now, questions were put, the Supreme Court answered those questions. The parties who were interested appealed from the decision to the Judicial Committee, and that committee said that in some respects the answers of the Supreme Court were erroneous and ought to be corrected, and they corrected them accordingly. How, then, can it be said that the Judicial Committee, speaking in appeal from the Supreme Court, pronouncing the judgment that the Supreme Court ought to have pronounced, and that alone—that anything that fell from that judicial body could be treated here as a mandate to the Government of this country? Why, Sir, that question never was before the Supreme Court. They were asked whether a grievance had occurred, and whether there was jurisdiction, and the answer is in the affirmative. It was not denied that we had jurisdiction, but how that jurisdiction was to be exercised, was not before the courts, was not argued, and is not present. How, therefore, could their decision possibly be a binding decision?—how be of any effect at all one way or the other, upon the Government of this country? Sir, I do not think this great Parliament, and the Government which leads this Parliament, have yet come to the position of being obedient to the mandate of any court. I know no court which can command the Governor General of this country. What is done here is done by the Administration of this country in the name of the Crown, in the name of His Excellency the Governor General, who represents the Crown. They

are his advisers, but the acts of the Administration is the act of the representative of the Crown. But if there was any possible question about it, that is absolutely set at rest when one reads the discussion that took place before that body. I am really ashamed to occupy the attention of this House with a discussion of what seems to me perfectly clear; but I know that amongst many members with whom I have had the honour of conversing, doubts are entertained, from reading newspapers, and probably newspapers on one side of politics only, where it has been persistently and industriously stated and circulated that the Government here, in order to escape responsibility—I am speaking now of the newspaper argument in their behalf—had merely done what they were obliged to do, and what they had been ordered to do, and such as all loyal and good subjects ought to have done. For a moment, however, I will trespass upon the time of the House by referring to the argument before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Mr. Blake was the leading counsel in that argument, and, at the very beginning of his statement, which will be found on page 26 of the Manitoba School case, the Lord Chancellor interrogated him as to what was the meaning of the appeal, what were the facts involved in it, and Mr. Blake very frankly and very properly answered in this wise:

The LORD CHANCELLOR. It is not before us, what should be declared, is it?

Mr. BLAKE. No; what is before Your Lordships is, whether there is a case for appeal.

The LORD CHANCELLOR. What is before us is the functions of the Governor General.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, and not the methods in which he shall exercise them—not the discretion which he shall use, but whether a case has arisen on the facts on which he has jurisdiction to intervene. That is all that is before Your Lordships.

Mr. Blake repeatedly referred to it again. I will trespass upon the House by reading one or two references more from Mr. Blake, on page 32. Mr. Blake is here quoting from the minute made by the Council, of which Sir John Thompson was chairman, and he says:

Your Lordships will observe the phrase "at present."

He is speaking of the Minute of Council in which this language is used:

The application comes before Your Excellency in a manner differing from applications which are ordinarily made under the constitution to Your Excellency in Council. In the opinion of the sub-committee, the application is not to be dealt with at present as a matter of political character or involving political action on the part of Your Excellency's advisers.

What does Mr. Blake say to that?

Your Lordships will observe the phrase "at present." On the preliminary question, which is a question whether there are grounds to entertain an appeal, the committee thought they were going to act judicially, but, very properly, they added the words "at present," because it is quite obvious that when they enter upon the sphere of action of entertaining an appeal, their functions must be political, of expediency and of discretion, just as much as the functions which, in the last resort upon their recommendation, are assigned to the Parliament of Canada itself, of course, a political body.

How can anything be plainer than that, so far as Mr. Blake's opinion goes, the gentleman who is acting on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority that is referred to repeatedly all through the argument. For instance, at page 37, Lord Shand says:

If the appeal is before the Governor, would he be entitled to take political considerations into view?

Mr. BLAKE. Doubtless.

Lord SHAND. That is what you get into if your appeal is a successful appeal?

Mr. BLAKE. I should say so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You call that obiter, I suppose?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, not obiter, because the courts there are ascertaining what they have got to decide. Counsel representing them says: With these questions Your Lordships are not to be troubled. If the counsel representing them says to the court, We do not want information upon that point, how can it be claimed that the court is giving an opinion which my hon. friends here are bound to obey? It is a concession on the part of the appellant counsel, that upon these questions, which, in themselves, are plain enough, there is no jurisdiction for the Judicial Committee, any more than there was for the Supreme Court of Canada, to determine the responsibility of the Governor General in Council. Lord Watson says, at page 39:

I suppose we are not asked to give any such finding or opinion as would tie the Governor General to follow any recommendation of the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think Your Lordships are. I do not like to make an absolute concession at this time.

Lord WATSON. I rather took it from your statement that we are in a position in which we ought not to do that.

Mr. BLAKE. I think Your Lordships are not bound to go further.

Lord WATSON. I suppose we are bound to give him advice in this appeal. He has asked nothing else but advice throughout. He has not asked for a political decision which shall fetter him in any way.

Mr. BLAKE. It could not be. The law which creates the tribunal for the purpose of giving advice, expressly states that in their political capacity they are not bound by that advice.

That is the law to which I referred a moment ago. The Lord Chancellor, at page 62, says:

The question seems to me to be this: If you are right in saying that the abolition of a system

of denominational education which was created by a post-union legislation, is within the 2nd section of the Manitoba Act and the 3rd subsection of the other, if it apply, then you say there is a case for the jurisdiction of the Governor General, and that is all we have to decide.

Mr. BLAKE. That is all your Lordships have to decide. What remedy he shall propose to apply is quite a different thing.

At page 87, Lord Shand intervened :

There must be a marked difference, with reference to anything interfering with what was the state of matters at the union, and anything interfering with the state of matters which had been changed by the legislature after the union. In the one case it would be bad in point of law and 'ultra vires," in the other you can destroy the right, but that destruction of the right is liable to appeal.

Mr. BLAKE. That is precisely the line which I am about to adopt.

Lord WATSON. It may be qualified or abrogated.

Mr. BLAKE. The case does not arise, if there are privileges which have not been broken. I suggest that the provision of the enabling clause, with subsection 1, is absolutely complete in itself.

That is the first clause, which restrained the legislature from making laws which would deprive any religious denomination, or any class of persons, of the rights which they possessed at the time of the union.

It requires in its nature no supplement of any kind—no appeal to a political executive tribunal, as the Privy Council of Canada—no appeal to a legislative tribunal, as the Parliament of Canada, is wanted. Nothing exists for the executive tribunal or for the legislative tribunal to operate upon. No question of expediency, no question of discretion arises. The course of the law is all, and it is enough. That is the whole theory.

Again, at page 88, I find :

The appeal is to a political and non-judicial tribunal.

And it goes on to show how absurd it would be to suppose that the appeal was to anybody except a non-judicial tribunal. I now will mention Mr. Blake's references, on page 193 :

Lord WATSON. I apprehend that the appeal to the Governor is an appeal to the Governor's discretion. It is a political administrative appeal, and not a judicial appeal in any proper sense of the term, and in the same way, after he has decided, the same latitude of discretion is given to the Dominion Parliament. They may legislate or not, as they think fit.

Mr. BLAKE. Only within the limits of his discretion ; they cannot go beyond.

The closing words of his reply may be referred to with advantage. At page 266 will be found his last words :

Mr. BLAKE. What we ask your Lordships is, What the privileges were, and how far they have been infringed ; and then we propose to ask the Governor General to determine how far he will go. I do not ask your Lordship to make any suggestion as to his action, which, I conceive, from the beginning is political. He is to be instructed as to the law ; and then his action and the action of the Parliament will carry the thing out.

There is no doubt at all that the instruction or direction was as to the question of law. I will come in a moment to the questions that were asked, and we will find to what extent the Judicial Committee has power to go, and then I will allow the hon. gentleman who may follow me to seek, if he likes, shelter under the direction of the Judicial Committee, if he thinks that argument will avail him. I call attention now to what Mr. Ewart said, at page 180. Mr. Ewart is asked this question by Lord Watson :

Lord WATSON. The power given of appeal to the Government, and upon request by the Government to the Legislature of Canada, seems to be wholly discretionary in both.

Mr. EWART. No doubt.

My hon. friend the Minister of Justice will perhaps endeavour to reconcile a mandatory order with this statement of the law, which say it is discretionary. I leave that for the hon. gentleman to do. Lord Watson then said :

Lord WATSON. Both in the Government and in the Legislature.

Mr. EWART. Yes.

At page 183, Mr. Ewart says :

Before closing, I would like to say a word or two as to what we are seeking. As it has been already remarked, we are not asking for any declaration as to the extent of the relief to be given by the Governor General.

Although it was not asked, we are now told it was ordered.

We merely ask that it should be held that he has jurisdiction to hear our prayer and to grant us some relief, if he thinks proper to do so.

One or two extracts from the opinion of the Law Lords during the course of the argument. At page 121, to which I have not referred, Lord Watson makes this emphatic declaration. Mr. Haldane's argument was that this clause applied to clause No. 1, that the right of appeal only existed where clause No. 1, which was prohibition, had been violated. The argument on the other side was that clause No. 1 was complete in itself ; that clause No. 1 said it could not be done, but it was done ; the law was all-powerful to give redress and afford relief. The clause under consideration could not be held applicable to that, and in order to give a fair and reasonable meaning it must be held to apply to some other part of the constitution.

Lord WATSON. I am prepared to advise the Governor General and decide on the meaning of this clause, but I am not prepared to relieve him of the duty of considering how far he ought to interfere.

Lord Watson, at page 180, said :

Lord WATSON. The power given of appeal to the Government, and, upon request by the

Government to the legislature of Canada, seems to be wholly discretionary in both.

I think I read this quotation before in connection with Mr. Ewart. Mr. Ewart said, "No doubt." At pages 258-59, Lord Macnaghten made these observations :

Lord MACNAGHTEN. We are a judicial body, and he is not sitting as a judicial body.

The learned judge seemed to have anticipated the argument which might possibly be made.

Mr. HALDANE. There come in those considerations which I will not venture to repeat.
Lord MACNAGHTEN. He is to take into consideration many things which we have not to.

Then the Lord Chancellor interrupts.

The LORD CHANCELLOR. He cannot do anything himself. At the last resort the only person or body who can do anything more are the Parliament of Canada, who are certainly not under legal compulsion to act, and certainly would not act unless they conceived there was some substantial ground for it.
Mr. HALDANE. Certainly not.

I think I have read opinions expressed by Lord Watson, Lord Shand and Lord Macnaghten, and the Lord Chancellor in two or three places, though not in all the places in which he made remarks. So far as I have gone, if I am not misrepresenting all that occurred, if I am not citing passages without their appropriate context, which would lead to a different conclusion, every hon. member must realize that beyond all question it cannot be said that in anything the Government were doing they were acting under compulsion or in obedience to any mandatory order. Let me now submit the questions which were asked, and on which this jurisdiction was founded. Hon. members will not find in this list of questions submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada, and which afterwards came before the Judicial Committee, one solitary word of comfort for the case I am now anticipating. There is not a question here which in the slightest degree gives countenance to it. There are six questions. No. 1 was :

(1.) Is the appeal referred to in the memorials and petitions stated in and made part of the case and asserted thereby, such an appeal as is admissible by subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act of 1867, or by subsection 2 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act, 33 Victoria (1870), chapter 3, (Canada) ?

That was decided, as we know, in this wise, that the appeal was not well founded under the British North America Act, but that it was well founded under the Manitoba Act. The second question was :

(2.) Are the grounds set forth in the petitions and memorials such as may be the subject of an appeal under the authority of the subsections above referred to, or either of them ?

The answer was, Yes. In other words, that the post union establishment of separate schools and the abrogation of separate schools gives the right of appeal. It was a cause, or in language with which I am more familiar, it was a cause of action. The answer to the third question is :

That the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Barrett against the city of Winnipeg, and Logan against the city of Winnipeg, does not dispose of nor conclude, the application for redress based on the contention that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority which accrued to them after the union under the statutes of the province have been interfered with by the two statutes of 1890 complained of in the said petitions and memorials.

The answer was, therefore, that the decisions in the cases of Logan and Barrett, did not conclude or determine the complaint which is made now. It was not pretended it did. All that Logan and Barrett determines was that the Act of 1890 was intra vires, that the legislature had the power to pass it, and the question which now arises is of quite a different character. The fourth question I have dealt with because it is included in question No. 1, and merely repeated. The fifth question was :

Has His Excellency the Governor General in Council power to make the declarations or remedial orders ?

Has His Excellency "power." The question is not : Is he bound to make the declarations, but has he power to make them. In other words, has he the authority to make these declarations.

(5.) Has His Excellency the Governor General in Council power to make the declarations or remedial orders which are asked for in the said memorials or petitions, assuming the material facts to be stated as therein, or has His Excellency the Governor General in Council any other jurisdiction in the premises ?

The answer to that question was, that His Excellency the Governor General had the power, and I will read the answer in detail :

(5.) Answer to the fifth question—That the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction and the appeal is well founded, but that the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute ; that the general character of the steps to be taken is sufficiently defined by subsection 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act of 1870.

These answers are all that we are bound by, and we are not bound by them, according to the opinion of Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Blake, which was, that this was only for the information of the Governor in Council. Speaking technically, and speaking strictly, of course they were not binding upon the Government, and if they were not binding upon the Government, of course they cannot be binding upon Parliament. Many people think that the two judgments of the Judicial Committee cannot be reconciled. For my part, I am able to see the distinction

and can realize how the Law Lords arrived at the conclusions they did. I do not attempt to set up my authority or my opinion against the decision of the highest court in the realm. Two observations are to be made with regard to the answer to question No. 5. One is, that their Lordships have gone beyond the question, and to the extent which they have gone beyond the question, if it was at all important, which I do not think it is, it is not binding in any sense. Let me see if I am not right in that. The two questions are asked with reference to jurisdiction, and therefore if their Lordships had gone on beyond the simple answer which would have been quite sufficient by the word "yes," it is simply something that their Lordships were not invited to give their opinion upon, and of course the Government would not be bound in any sense to follow it. But what their Lordships did was to say; That the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction and the appeal is well founded, but the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities. That is, by the Governor in Council, to whom it has been referred by the statute. Then they go on to say, which is a mere obiter, and which after all does not add to what we know, and does not take from it in the slightest degree:

That the general character of the steps to be taken is sufficiently defined by subsection 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act of 1870.

That is the judgment, and now let me come to the reasons for the judgment. When their Lordships were dealing with this matter in the judgment (and that is what we heard so much of) their Lordships say this:

For the reasons which have been given, their Lordships are of opinion that the second subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act is the governing enactment.

In other words, the British North America Act does not apply:

And that the appeal to the Governor General in Council was admissible by virtue of that enactment, on the ground set forth in the memorials and petitions, inasmuch as the Acts of 1890 affected rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education within the meaning of that subsection.

No person disputes that, at this date at all events. Whatever controversy there may have been as to whether there was an appeal upon these subsections before, this decision has now set at rest, and it is completely and absolutely concluded by this judgment. Their Lordships go on:

The further question is submitted, whether the Governor General in Council has power to make the declarations or remedial orders asked for in the memorials or petitions, or has any other jurisdiction in the premises. Their lordships have decided that the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction, and that the appeal is well founded, but the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by this statute. It is not fair for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken.

Perhaps my hon. friend will base an argument, because they say the "precise" steps to be taken, but I point out to the House, that we did not ask what precise steps should be taken. What we asked was: Has the Government jurisdiction to entertain this appeal? To put it in plain language so that every one can understand it, what we asked was: Was the repeal of the Act of 1871, (which was passed after the union), by the Act of 1890, a deprivation of the rights which the Roman Catholic minority then enjoyed which gives them the right to come here and complain. These were the two questions and they exhaust the whole subject. Their Lordships say:

Their general character is sufficiently defined by the third subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act.

Negatively their Lordships add what their Lordships are not called upon to add:

It is certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted or that the precise provisions of those statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890, no doubt, commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the province. All legitimate ground of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions.

There is the whole of it, and that is perfectly true. That statement is an opinion, and a very correct opinion. If this petition was to be entertained, if the order was to be made, their Lordships intimated, just for what it was worth, that the order need not require the repeal of the Acts of 1890 and the re-enactment of the Acts of 1871, but that all legitimate causes of complaint would be removed if a statute or statutes were passed adapted to and grafted upon the Public School Act of 1890, which would practically restore to the Catholics the rights they had enjoyed prior to that enactment. Now, Sir, it certainly will not be argued by any person who cares at all for his standing in the community as a professional man, that there is anything in this that is mandatory or compulsory—that there was not the most complete and ample discretion to be exercised on the part of His Excellency's advisers—that they might have gone so far, or might have gone the whole length, as they have done, or might have dismissed the petition and said, All things considered, there is no sufficient ground to call upon us to interfere. For, Sir, the position of the Governor General is this: He has to act before this Parliament can be called upon to act; he is interposed between the local legislature and the Dominion Parliament. I can quote the language of the Law Lords to that effect. Before the minority can come to this

arena, the Governor General must have passed upon the question; so that there was not to be a direct appeal from the local legislature to the Dominion Parliament. The Governor General in Council, upon his responsibility, was to investigate the claim for redress put forward in the petition, and unless he saw sufficient cause, this Parliament was not to have any jurisdiction to intervene. Now, Sir, Mr. Christopher Robinson is a gentleman of whom I am sure my hon. friend has the highest opinion as a professional man, and we have Mr. Christopher Robinson's opinion, obtained by the Attorney General of Manitoba, on this very question. It was stated on the platform in Haldimand —in an election campaign it is not to be expected that the imagination will be kept within ordinary bounds—that Mr. Christopher Robinson had given an opinion that the Governor General in Council was bound to pass the remedial order. In the Winnipeg "Tribune," I find in Mr. Sifton's speech the opinion of Mr. Robinson set forth. He is asked the question: Whether the Governor General's determination upon the application or appeal was not a question of political policy, and whether he was bound to make an order by anything called for either by the statute or by the judgment of the Judicial Committee. Mr. Robinson's opinion is as follows:—

> The restoration of the privileges of Roman Catholics in Manitoba is undoubtedly left open by the judgment, in the sense that it is entirely in the discretion, both of the Governor General in Council and of the Dominion Parliament, to what extent, if at all, they will act upon the appeal or upon the Order in Council, respectively, in affording a remedy.
>
> It cannot, I think, be said that the mere fact of right of the Roman Catholic or Protestant minority in relation to education having been affected by provincial legislation, entitles them, in every case and under all circumstances, to the restoration of such right, or to any relief. Their right is to appeal, but the result of such appeal must depend, as I have said, upon the judgment of the Governor General in Council and of the Dominion Parliament, whose course would no doubt be determined by a sense of justice and right, and by a due regard to the letter and spirit of the constitution, in view of all the surrounding facts and circumstances in each particular case.
>
> The expressions of opinion of the Judicial Committee in this matter are in no legal sense binding upon the members of the Dominion Government, or of the Parliament of Canada, so far as any action to be taken by either is concerned.
>
> Both are at liberty to exercise their own discretion, and not the less because it is declared that a grievance exists. As I understand the judgment, it cannot be said, strictly speaking, to decide more than that the appeal will lie.

That is all, and that is as far as I am willing to go. It is quite sufficient, of course, to give the jurisdiction to the Governor General in Council, and quite sufficient if the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches are prepared to accept the responsibility of their action. I am only arguing that they cannot shelter themselves under any assumption that they were ordered to do what they have done. Frankly, if they had passed the order, deliberately accepting the responsibility of it, I would have nothing more to say in regard to that. I do not pretend that it was not open to them to pass the order; and I could not challenge the propriety of their action if they had been acting judicially, and had been ordered by a higher power to do what they have done. Now, in what way should this question have been viewed by the Governor General in Council? The province had exclusive power in educational matters. It had the right to pass the School Act of 1871, and it had the right to repeal that Act, as it did repeal it, by the School Act of 1890. That is perfectly valid law; and until repealed by the Parliament of Canada, so far as the Parliament of Canada has power, or until repealed by the local legislature, that law stands; there is no doubt about that. When the minority appealed here, what consideration should have actuated the Privy Council of this country, upon whom the high and responsible duty was cast of investigating this question? Was it, Sir, simply that separate schools had been established, and that separate schools had been abolished? If so, why all this argument? Why these four days of discussion? Because that statement could not be denied —separate schools had been established and separate schools had been abolished. Is that all? Why cite, as Mr. Ewart did, the fictitious bill of rights No. 4? Why try to prove that my hon. friend from Winnipeg had gone into some county and pledged his government that they would not abolish separate schools? Why try to prove that Mr. Greenway had visited Archbishop Taché and entered into a compact with His Grace that if he got the support of the Roman Catholics he would stand by separate schools? What is all that for if the simple statement that separate schools had existed and that separate schools had been abolished made it incumbent upon the Governor General in Council to re-establish them? Sir, I scout any such proposition; it cannot be accepted by any person. But, Sir, I will venture to point out, and prove conclusively, that there was no other principle. I am speaking now as if this were a judicial body. I am not going to make charges of bad faith or corruption—I am speaking, of course, in the broadest sense of the term—against the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches. I am assuming that they were actuated by proper motives, and not by the mere counting of party noses, and by the consideration of what would best suit party exigencies; and I venture to say that if you read Mr. Ewart's argument from beginning to end, you will not find in it one word that will justify this Council or this Parliament in over-riding the will of the local legislature and re-establishing separate schools in Manitoba. When this question came, in

1890, before the province, what was the proper ground for the province to consider? That system of schools has been in force for nineteen or twenty years. There had been separate schools for the Catholic and the Protestants, and there were the results to be found from this system—results patent and open, results well known throughout the whole of Winnipeg and the province. And it is because the results of that system have been absolutely and utterly disastrous, because there was not, as I believe, one solitary soul ever emerged from a separate school emerged from his original position, because illiteracy prevailed from beginning to end of them. Because the public money was wasted which the local legislature were entrusted with to provide for the education of the people, because the object of a school system was not attained, that the legislature, after due and careful consideration, decided that what should be done was to establish a system of public and national schools. That was the ground upon which their decision was based. That ground was frequently established, and has never been contravened. Not one word will be found in the argument presented, and upon which the Council acted, not one word will be found in the remedial order to show that the question ever entered the consideration of hon. gentlemen; but they, in haste, as if it were a matter of no consequence whatever, laid a mandatory order, commanding a great province, not very fully represented in this House, and represented by gentlemen who do not seem to care very much what becomes of the province—they are being wakened up, I am glad to see; the hon. Minister near me has been called upon to hand in his resignation.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what you want.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend seems always to dread that above everything else. He never dreads anything but that.

An hon. MEMBER. That remark does not come in very gracefully from you.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does it not? Here is a province with six representatives in this House.

Mr. DALY. Quite capable of looking after themselves and the interests of their province.

Mr. McCARTHY. We will see about that. In the meantime, I draw attention to the fact that the province is but a small one, so far as numerical representation goes; but I venture to say the hopes of this country depend upon Manitoba and the North-west, and you are disturbing it; you are interfering with Manitoba

Mr. DALY. Who?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not speaking of my hon. friend, but of the interfering by this remedial order. You are interfering with Manitoba, you are oppressing, you are attempting to coerce Manitoba, and you will yet live to rue the day when you attempted to trample upon the rights of a province without cause, without any ground, without consideration or investigation. It appears that of the public money granted to Roman Catholic schools, there was no audit, no account, and the same system was to be restored under the remedial order.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). No.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman has not read it or he would not say that. The remedial order requires that system to be restored, and I will refer to it in a moment if the hon. gentleman doubts it. Under that system, public moneys were distributed to schools which were not kept open more than a day or two in the week; and by some hocus pocus, which I am not able to fathom or understand, it went to Roman Catholic and Protestant teachers in the ratio of $349 to Roman Catholics against $170 to Protestants, although it should have been distributed on an equal basis. And these schools, which were supposed to be kept open, taught by Roman Catholic priests, were kept open a day or two here or there, and the money went to the maintenance of the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. GILLIES. Where does that appear?

Mr. McCARTHY. In the statement of Mr Sifton.

Mr. GILLIES. That is not law.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is fact.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There was an electoral campaign on where Mr. Sifton made these statements.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know what my hon. friend did in the election campaign.

Mr. BERGIN. You know what you did yourself.

Mr. McCARTHY. I challenge my hon. friend to show that Mr. Sifton made any statement on any platform from which he spoke in Haldimand or Ontario which was not based on fact.

Mr. TISDALE. They were contradicted, every one of them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I challenge my hon. friend to produce a single proof of his statements.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is a pretty barren kind of challenge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You made the statements.

Mr. McCARTHY. I gave the hon. gentleman my authority. I suppose that the head of the Education Department ought to be an authority?

Mr. BERGERON. Does the hon. gentleman know that a gentleman in the other House denied the whole of these charges ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not at liberty to refer to what took place in the other House.

Mr. BERGERON. It is published in the newspapers.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have made my statements, and if the commission is issued, which the local government invites, I have no doubt they will be proved up to the hilt. Why does the Government not accept the challenge which the local government have thrown down in answer to their remedial order ? The Manitoba Government say they will facilitate an investigation, but this Government will none of it. The challenge is not accepted, and no attempt is to be made to see whether the charge is or is not true. There is another cause which renders Manitoba a province where it is almost impossible to support a system of separate schools. The province of Manitoba is as large as the province of New Brunswick, and larger than Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island taken together. It has not yet a population of 200,000. It had at this time a population of about 150,000 scattered over the province. It is a country, to use Mr. Sifton's own statement, of magnificent distances. It is a country in which the people are sparsely settled, and I give one more statement on the authority of Mr. Sifton. There are now in Manitoba, 884 schools in operation, as they call it, according to the last returns.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Are those inclusive of the schools supported by voluntary subscription ?

Mr. HUGHES. Do they include the separate schools ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know whether they include separate schools or not, but I will give the number of separate schools, which does not materially increase or diminish. The number of separate schools now is only thirty-eight, and probably those are not included. I suppose these 884 schools are the public schools. Now, it was proposed by the Attorney General himself to withdraw the grant of public money from schools in which there is not an average attendance of seven ; but upon investigation it appears that if that enactment was made, it would deprive no less than 150 schools of these 884 of a share of the public grant, and virtually close them up. Now, if you separate and divide in a country like that, you make it almost impossible to educate the people at all. Why, with the public schools, in 150 of which there is not actually an average attendance of seven pupils ? But you are to divide them, you are to separate them, you are to re-enact the law which says that no Protestant shall contribute to a Catholic school, and that no Catholic shall pay a tax to a Protestant school, in order to advance the educational interest of the people of Manitoba. These are considerations, I think, that ought to weigh with this Parliament and ought to have weighed with the Governor in Council. The cost of the schools, of course, is very great. The scattered nature of the population increases the per capita expenditure upon the schools. Are these considerations that should have weighed with the advisers of His Excellency ? Were they taken into account ? Let me give the population as divided between Roman Catholics and Protestants. That is a consideration. I do not put it on the ground that the minority is very small and that the right which would be granted to a larger minority this smaller minority are not entitled to. But I put it upon the plain, practical ground that with a small Catholic population and a proportionately large number of Protestants, the policy of separating the two in educational matters could not be of advantage to either section of the population. For this is not merely a question of Catholic or Protestant. Even in this province, if you divide a school section—and perhaps the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) will be able to back me up in that statement—and make a separate school and public school, and you must enhance the cost of education and make it less efficient.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that why you are in favour of separate schools ?

Mr. McCARTHY. When the hon. gentleman asks me something sensible, I will answer him. In 1871, the total population of Manitoba was 12,000, of whom about 10,000 were half-breeds—5,000 French and 5,000 Scotch half-breeds—and the other 2,000 were the pioneers who had gone in there to gain such advantages as early settlers may look for. In 1881, when the first census was taken, the population had increased to nearly 66,000, of who 12,000 were Catholics. In 1885 the population was 108,000, the Catholics being 14,000, or 13 per cent. They were over 50 per cent in 1877, they were 18 per cent in 1881, 13 per cent in 1885, and in 1891, at the last census, there were 20,000 Roman Catholics out of a population of 152,000, making the same proportion as before—13 per cent. The only separation of half-breeds from the Quebec French was made in 1885, when the number of half-breeds was shown to be 4,369. I see it now stated that the half-breeds are practically extinct. I do not give that on any authority, and I do not know that it is correct. Compare the figures I have given with those of the other provinces, where we get on fairly well without the separate schools. In British Columbia the Roman Catholics are 21 per cent of the population. They have no separate schools. In New Brunswick, about which we had so much trouble in the times

gone by, there are no separate schools. There are little infractions of the law permitted, I am told, and they enable the people to get on without difficulty

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes ; I have heard that there are little infractions of the law ; but I do not know. If you will trust the local legislatures and not mandate them and not command them, you will find the people settle down very well. But if you attempt to pass remedial orders, you will find your Government disintegrated and crises continuous, and perhaps have to ask another six months to arrange matters without the time being given you for that purpose. In New Brunswick, the Catholics are 36 per cent of the population ; in Nova Scotia they are 27 per cent ; and in Prince Edward Island they are 43 per cent. And Prince Edward Island fought hard, as we remember, when the present hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was Premier of the local administration, for the right to manage the schools, and against the principle of denominational or church schools. Looking at these figures, one is at a loss to understand how it is that this 13 per cent of the population of this province of Manitoba—who are by no means unanimous—must have separate schools or this confederation is to be torn asunder, the Dominion is to be shaken to its centre. Unless these 20,000 Roman Catholics are to have separate schools managed by themselves under their ecclesiastical authorities, the life of this Dominion of Canada is not worth forty-eight hours' purchase. That is the story we are told. It seems incredible ; it seems strange to imagine that we are standing upon so insecure a foundation. Some of these reasons—I will not say all—were presented to the Privy Council. All of them would have been heard if the Privy Council had granted reasonable delay. Many of them, no doubt, the Minister representing Manitoba has urged upon his colleagues. And against these reasons not one argument was urged on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority who claimed the re-establishment of Roman Catholic separate schools. But the Roman Catholics are not unanimous in that claim. A gentleman appeared before the Council who came all the way from Winnipeg to speak on behalf of himself and other Roman Catholics who differed from those who wanted separate schools. He said, in substance, that, having to travel through the province in the course of his occupation, he had ascertained that these schools were most inefficient, that there was not a master, except in Winnipeg possibly, that understood a word of the English language ; that he became convinced years and years ago that the separate school system was not giving the Roman Catholic children of the province the chances they were entitled to, and for his part he was in favour of the public school system ; that his daughter, although a perfectly good Catholic, was a teacher in one of the public schools, and he himself was one of the school trustees in the city of Winnipeg.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He was condemned by a resolution of a public meeting, a Catholic meeting.

Mr. McCARTHY. Undoubtedly. I do not think there is any difficulty in the priests getting up a meeting of that kind. But my hon. friend will not contradict what I said, that he was elected as school trustee in a Catholic ward, and that his daughter was engaged as teacher in one of the schools.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, it is not an exclusively Catholic ward.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understood that the ward in which Mr. O'Donoghue lived, was a Catholic ward.

Mr. MARTIN. There are a good number of Roman Catholics there, but I do not think it can be called a Catholic ward.

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman say what other Roman Catholics Mr. O'Donoghue came down here to represent ?

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend has asked me something that I know nothing about.

Mr. DEVLIN. Can he give one name ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I know nothing about Mr. O'Donoghue more than that he came here desiring to represent himself, he being a Roman Catholic, and said that he was asked to represent others.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The best proof that the hon. gentleman knows nothing about him, is that he accepts his statement.

Mr. BERGERON. Does he know how to read ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have just stated what took place, and I leave hon. gentlemen to draw their own conclusions. Certainly, he did not come down here, and run the risk of the odium that he has had to undergo, without having a good deal of moral courage, at all events, and, perhaps, more than is possessed by those who conveniently assail him behind his back.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not wish the hon. gentleman to imagine for a moment that I was assailing him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was not alluding to the hon. gentleman, I was alluding to the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière). Now, I have reached this conclusion, and I ask the House to follow me, that, under the circumstances, this remedial order ought not to have been made. I have endeavour- to give my reasons why that order should not have been made. I think I have satisfied those hon. gentlemen open

to conviction, that certainly there was no compulsion on the part of the executive, and that it was a matter wholly within their political discretion, and when I use the word "political" I do not use it in the low sense in which the word politics may be used. I use it in the highest sense, in the light in which it was before the executive. What was before the executive was this: In the interest of this province, whose educational system they were asked to interfere with, ought they to act? The province is clothed with authority in this matter, and has thought it wise to establish this national system of schools; ought the executive, who has the power, to interfere with the province? I submit that such interference could only be based upon the establishment of the fact that the system was incompatible with the object the province wished to attain, namely, the educational advancement of its people. But it will be said, no doubt, that the gross injustice of this system calls for relief, that justice to the minority, of which we hear so much, required the interference of this parliamentary body. Now, I want to know in what that injustice consisted? It consisted in the fact that certainly they had a better system of education, so far as secular education goes, than they had before. It will not be denied that the former system was inefficient, that in a sparse Roman Catholic population it must always be inefficient—I am speaking within reasonable limits; and that so far as education goes, all the people who availed themselves of the public school system, were advantaged by the change. Now, I do not think that will be questioned. But it is said, it was stated across the Chamber, and I may, perhaps, refer to it, that it was robbery—and I was called the accomplice of robbers—I am not sure but that I was called a robber myself—because this system enabled the majority to tax the minority for the support of the public schools. Now, let us consider, for a moment, what right has the state to tax for educational purposes at all. It is quite true, as has been argued, that education belongs to the parent, and when the state intervenes it is because the parent has failed to perform his duty, and because the interests of the state, and of a democracy such as this, all depend upon the people being educated. That is the sole ground upon which there is any interference by the state in the subject of education; and the state does not do its duty, does not discharge its obligations to the citizens whose money it takes, unless it sees that value is given for the money, and that the child is being educated. Then, what great injury is done? What is the system that prevails there? Why, it is urged that they are Protestant schools, that Roman Catholic children are compelled to attend Protestant schools, or, at all events, to pay towards their maintenance; and that they do not, and cannot avail themselves of the benefits flowing from that system. They are not Protestant schools. That question was conclusively decided in Barrett's case. I am not now speaking of the administration of the schools. We are dealing with an Act of Parliament, we are dealing with the School Act of 1890, against which the appeal was taken; and in the very first clause of that Act is the declaration that the schools shall be non-sectarian. If the schools are not administered as non-sectarian, redress can be had by the laws of the land, and by appeal to the courts of the province. If they had been Protestant schools by act of the legislature, the judgment in Barrett's case would have been reversed. It could not but have been a deprivation of privileges to compel Roman Catholics to contribute to schools which are Protestant, and which their conscience could not permit them to attend.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There were other schools open to them, the voluntary schools that they had before.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; I am saying that according to the decision in Barrett's case, they were not Protestant schools. My hon. friend shakes his head. I can give him the passage if he wants it. The point was distinctly argued, I argued it myself, and it was decided that they were not Protestant schools.

Mr. BERGERON. It seems they are now.

Mr. McCARTHY. If they are, they are not in accordance with the Act of the legislature, and it was the Act that the appeal asked to be set aside. If an Act of Parliament is not obeyed, the hon. gentleman knows that redress can be had in the courts, because the Act says that the schools shall be non-sectarian. And it says that no religion shall be taught in the school—and in that respect they would almost satisfy the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes)—unless by order of the trustees; and that whatever religious exercises are to be allowed, they must be such as are prescribed by the advisory board.

Mr. AMYOT. Does the hon. gentleman understand that under the present law the schools are neutral, and that no religion whatever can be taught in them?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have said that the schools are non-sectarian. I have said that, according to the Act of the legislature, no religious exercises are to be permitted in any school unless the trustees allow it.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Allow me to read the clause.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have said that if religious exercises are allowed the religious exercises are those prescribed by the advisory board.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Clause 7 of the Act reads as follows :—

Religious exercises shall be held in the public school entirely at the option of the school trustees of the district, and upon receiving written authority from the trustees it shall be the duty of the teacher to hold such religious exercises.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is exactly what I said ; I am glad the hon. gentleman read the passage. Now, what are the religious exercises ? The religious exercises are here.

Mr. BERGERON. Those are non-sectarian schools.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what the hon. gentleman does not seem to understand. If they are not non-sectarian the hon. gentleman's coadjutor can appeal to the court, because the Act says they must be non-sectarian. If the hon. gentleman will read an earlier section, section 2, I think, it is, he will find that the schools must be non-sectarian. So if the hon. gentleman finds the schools are not non-sectarian, then the schools are not conducted according to the Act of Parliament, and therefore an appeal will lie to the courts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. These are the words "except as above provided." I will read the clause as made in a quotation given by Mr. Ewart in his argument. He is quoting from the Act and he reads the first part :

The public school shall be entirely non-sectarian, and no religious exercises shall be allowed therein, except as above provided.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman has not read from the Act of Parliament.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am only reading a quotation from Mr. Ewart's argument.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. Minister will find that it is the first or second section of the Act.

Mr. WELDON. It is section 8, which says that public schools shall be entirely non-sectarian, and that no religious exercises shall be conducted, except as above provided.

Mr. McCARTHY. If "as above provided" is giving the advisory board power to regulate those exercises, it also provides that a school shall be non-sectarian. If the administration of the schools as carried on by the advisory board is inconsistent with non-sectarianism, of course the Act is misconstrued, and condemnation should lie against the administration of the Act and not against the Act itself. Let me point out what the religious exercises consist of, and what the objections are to them. They consist of a short form of prayer and the reading in either version of the Bible, either the Douay version or the version used by Protestants, of certain chapters. Everything that Roman Catholic ecclesiastics could object to is eliminated. There is no possibility of any portion of scripture being read in the public school that is not such as in Ontario would form a part of what we know there as the Ross Bible, which was approved and corrected by the late Archbishop of the province. A simple prayer is allowed, a copy of which I am sorry I have not here to read, as it might do this House a great deal of good, although I do not want to interfere with the privilege of Mr. Speaker in that respect.

Mr. FORBES. Get the hon. member for Haldimand to give it.

Mr. McCARTHY. No doubt he would do it better than I, he having more experience. To these simple religious exercises no hon. gentleman who belongs to the Christian religion will object. We are Christians in common, and perhaps we are very common Christians.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Speak for yourself.

Mr. McCARTHY. But so far as that goes there is no question about this, there is not an hon. gentleman who would object to the simple prayer the children are taught to repeat at the closing exercises of the day. The whole objection made by Mr. Ewart to the curriculum in force under the authority of this advisory board, which provides for eight grades altogether, was as regards the history of religious movements, Henry VIII. and Mary. The only objection that the Roman Catholic minority make to the book—because, of course, we all understand that it is not a question merely of teaching, but the Roman Catholics want the children to be taught history from the Roman Catholic standpoint and not from the Protestant standpoint—was as I have indicated. No doubt the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) would like history taught from the French instead of the English standpoint.

Mr. BERGERON. It depends.

Mr. McCARTHY. The only objection made by the Roman Catholic minority was as regards the subject of "Religious Movements, Henry VIII. and Mary." The answer is, that if this history is an untrue representation of the events of that period it should not be in that curriculum. But when complaints were made of that book or of the other history, that of Buckley, the advisory board inquired into the complaint and found that this very history was in use at the convent at Winnipeg, and therefore the board did not think it should be expunged from the curriculum of the public schools. I happen to know that this is the history which is used in the separate schools in the North-west Territories with the sanction and under the bidding of the ecclesiastical authorities who are in connection with the school

board there. So we have got a system of public schools; we have a declaration that they are to be non-sectarian; we have religious exercises on which all agree—they may not go far enough, but so far as they go no person dissents from them—and we have the permission to read certain chapters in the Scriptures taken from the version in which we all coincide. Is that a great hardship? What is to be done in a new country with 150,000 or 200,000 people scattered over a vast territory? Are the Anglicans to have separate schools, because the Lord Bishop asked for them? Are the Icelanders to have them, for they want them?

Mr. DALY. The Icelanders never asked for such schools.

Mr. McCARTHY. They do not want to be taught at all.

Mr. DALY. They are very intelligent people.

Mr. McCARTHY. If they do ask for them, will they be denied them?

Mr. DALY. They never asked for them.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman cannot deny that the Anglican Church and the Lord Bishop want them. We want to have schools for all, and therefore if a new country like that, and in every province of this Dominion it ought to be the same, there should be public schools which all can attend, in which everything offensive to any denomination will be eliminated, a school system made free and equal for all classes is what consorts with the principals of our constitution and the underlying doctrine which pertains to our social state. Some hon. gentleman will think this a monstrous state of things, that these few half-breeds or French or Catholics, call them altogether 20,000 people if you like, should be compelled to go to those schools. But a higher authority than hon. gentlemen have pronounced on this subject. Monsignor Satolli, who has been sent to this country for the purpose of superintending Roman Catholic affairs for the continent.

Mr. AMYOT. No, Sir, not to this country.

Mr. McCARTHY. To this continent I should have said.

Mr. AMYOT. We are in the continent here.

Mr. McCARTHY. He is sent to this continent.

Mr. AMYOT. He is not sent to the continent; he is not sent to Canada.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, I stand corrected. He is sent to the smaller half of the continent. Will that do the hon. gentleman (Mr. Amyot)? He has been sent here to superintend Catholic affairs, and when he came here he found a dispute raging in the church as to whether Catholic children should or should not attend public schools? And what was his decision, and what was his conclusion. Why, Sir, his decision and his conclusion was, and it is here to be read and seen; he was representing His Holiness of Rome, and I suppose it applies to the Catholic church of the continent, to French as well as to English, and to all classes of the community. He commends in very clear and definite terms, that the children are to attend the best schools, even if they have the choice of going to separate schools, and that where there is no choice they are to attend the public schools, and they are not to be, nor are their parents to be denied the rights of the church because they do attend public schools. The Archbishop says:

> When there is no Catholic school at all, or when the one that is available is little fitted for giving the children an education in keeping with their condition, then the public schools may be attended with a safe conscience, the danger of perversion being rendered remote by opportune remedial——

That is where the term remedial order comes from, I suppose.

> —by opportune remedial and precautionary measures; a matter which is to be left to the conscience of the ordinaries. We strictly forbid any one——

This applies to my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) I suppose:

> —whether bishop or priest,——

Mr. AMYOT. Oh, no, that does not apply to me.

Mr. McCARTHY:

> —We strictly forbid any one, whether bishop or priest, and this is the express prohibition of the Sovereign Pontiff, through the Sacred Congregation either by act or by threat to exclude from the sacraments, as unworthy, parents (who choose to send their children to the public schools). As regards the children themselves, this enactment applies with still greater force.
>
> To the Catholic Church belongs the duty and the divine right of teaching all nations to believe the truth of the Gospel, and to observe whatsoever Christ commanded (Matthew, xxvii., 19); in her likewise is vested the divine right of instructing the young, in so far as theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven (Mark, x., 14); that is to say, she holds for herself the right of teaching the truths of faith and the law of morals, in order to bring up youth in the habits of a Christian life. Hence, absolutely and universally speaking, there is no repugnance in their learning the first elements and the higher branches of the arts and the natural sciences in public schools controlled by the state, whose office is to provide maintain and protect everything by which its citizens are formed to moral goodness, while they live peaceably together with a sufficiency of temporal goods, under laws promulgated by civil authority, &c., &c.

Well, Sir, we have a little experience of that in the province from which I come. We have separate schools there, but my hon. friend (Mr. Amyot) will hardly be-

lieve it, that more than half of the Roman Catholic children attend public schools. More than half of them, I say, even though they have the option of separate schools, and the privilege of separate schools. Why, Sir, in the county which I have the honour to come from, I made a calculation the other day, and I find there are 2,300 Roman Catholic children of school age, and the school accommodation for them in the separate schools is less than 300, and the other 2,000 are attending the public schools.

Mr. MASSON. Or not any.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; the majority of them are attending the public schools. That is the case in places where they are sufficiently numerous to establish a school, if it was advisable to do so. In one township I know, where there is a church big enough to hold a thousand people, and where there are two priests (it has been an established parish as long as I can remember) there are no separate schools.

Mr. AMYOT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask if they are French schools?

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope not. They ought not to be. We do not want French schools.

Mr. BERGERON. That is very frank, anyhow.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very frank. I have never disguised that in the least. Now, Sir, that being the condition of things, what great hardship is it in that portion of the North-west that there should not be separate schools, and that there should only be the public school system of schools. But it may be said, that this iniquity was perpetrated by the Liberal party, and to many hon. gentlemen here, perhaps the fact that it was a Liberal enactment is sufficient, of itself to condemn it. They think that prima facie it must be wrong, if the Liberal party introduced the national school system. I will comfort these hon. gentlemen by reading to them the declaration of the Conservative party of Manitoba. The Act was passed in 1890. It was passed by a Parliament which was two or three years elected. It was passed by a body which had received no direct mandate from the people, and the argument, and the strong argument used was, that when that particular legislature had been returned, the change in the school system had not been prominently brought to the attention of the electors. But, Sir, another election took place, and at that election, both political parties declared themselves upon the school question, and the Conservatives as well as the Liberals placed themselves upon record on that subject, and they declared in the clearest possible way that they were in favour of a system of public schools, and they went one better than the Liberal party, and resolved:

1. That they are in favour of one uniform system of public schools for the province;
2. That they are ready and willing to loyally carry out the present School Act, should it be held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of Great Britain to be within the legislative power of the province;
3. That, in the event of such School Act being held by the Judicial Committtee of the Privy Council of Great Britain to be beyond the legislative power of the province; then, they will endeavour to secure such amendments to the British North America Act and the "Manitoba Act" as will place educational matters wholly within the legislative power of the province of Manitoba, without appeal to the Governor General in Council or the Parliament of Canada.

So that both Liberals and Conservatives at the elections which followed the passing of the Act united in declaring for a public school system. In the following session, when a Bill was brought in to repeal that Act, out of forty members, thirty-nine being present, all but four, if my memory serves me right, voted in favour of the School Act, and against this repeal. We, therefore, have the deliberate and practically unanimous view pronounced by both parties in Manitoba that the school law should not be interfered with. And now, Sir, I come down to the point at which we have arrived; and in doing so I shall have to pass hastily over some matters which ought perhaps to have been mentioned. For my part, I frankly accept the declaration made by the hon. gentleman on the treasury benches. I cannot conceive that there is one hon. gentleman among their own followers who will pay them so poor a compliment as to suppose that in the statements they have made to this House there is any reservation, mental or otherwise. I think that if I can go so far as to take them at their word, their own followers are bound to do so without question and without cavil. They have had a struggle lasting over several days. It has been an internecine war. It was doubtful which would gain the upper hand. We have not a record of the pros and cons; we have merely the results.

Mr. FOSTER. The member for L'Islet will tell you all.

Mr. TARTE. "La Minerve" wrote it; I did not. My hands are clean as to that.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman has advantages that I have not. All I know is the result. I know that from day to day we asked for the position of the Government, and from day to day we were put off; and at last, when their position was announced, it led to a terrible upheaval. That breaking up may have been real or it may have been fictitious. One of the hon. gentlemen may have gone out to watch that more headstrong and giddy creature outside who required control. If so, he performed his functions admirably; he kept his hand upon the pulse of the patient, and

at the proper moment, when the reaction set in, he was brought back in docility to the fold. That thick witted gentleman, I think, must always remember the part that was played upon him, if that is not a misconception of the situation. But undoubtedly, one hon. gentleman did resign; he has actually retired, given up his portfolio, shown his good faith; and several hon. gentlemen in this House have indicated that they have lost confidence in the promises of the Administration—and I do not wonder at it. For my part, standing in their shoes, and looking at the different declarations that were made to them, looking at the passage of the remedial order—which certainly bound the Government in good faith to go as far as was necessary—looking at all that, I do not wonder that these hon. gentlemen began to think that they were being trifled with; and therefore their rebellion is not very extraordinary. But I think we are bound to accept that there was a deliberate resolve upon the part of the Government to threaten Manitoba—because that was what it comes to—that if before the first Thursday of January she did not undo what she had done last June, this Government would press with all its power and force, and with all the aid of the party behind it, the passage of a remedial Bill. There was perhaps room in the statements that were made for an escape from this result—so it seems to have been thought. I should not have thought so. I should have thought that every gentleman, whether in this Administration or whether in the one that is to succeed it, was bound in honour to stand by the pledge, given in pursuance of the compromise agreed to in the Cabinet. I should have thought, when this Government obtained authority from His Excellency to announce to this Parliament that with his consent this House is not to be dissolved, but is to be summoned again before a certain day, that no self-respecting man would ever go back of that pledge or promise. But, Sir, it seems that my hon. friend from Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Girouard) doubted; although, so far as he was interviewed, he appeared to be satisfied. But he evidently was considered a proper medium for clinching the matter. The difficulty felt seems to have been this: You may negotiate with Manitoba, and you may get some kind of a promise from Manitoba—possibly that when the legislature meets they will reconsider the situation—and you may come down in January next and say, the negotiations is going on very satisfactorily indeed, and every hope is held out that a satisfactory solution of this unfortunate difficulty will be arrived at, and it would be unwise for us to interfere with the province under these circumstances. But my hon. friend shut the door upon that possibility by asking the question which I will read. Not that he is likely ever to forget it, because I think it formed the turning point of his allegiance. The question which the hon. gentleman asked, and which the hon. Minister answered in his place in Parliament was:

> Will the negotiations to be entered into with Manitoba, relating to the schools, unless they bring an acceptable arrangement on the lines of the remedial order and the terms of the judgment of the Privy Council of the 29th January, 1895, preclude or postpone the introduction of the remedial legislation announced in your statement of Monday last?
>
> Mr. FOSTER. My answer simply is, they will not.

Now, Sir, that certainly defines what a satisfactory settlement of the question would be. The doubt arose from these words in the statement of the Government:

> A communication will be sent immediately to the Manitoba Government on the subject, with a view to ascertaining whether that Government is disposed to make a settlement of the question which will be reasonably satisfactory to the minority of that province, without making it necessary to call into requisition the powers of the Dominion Parliament.

Now, the question that troubled my hon. friend was, what is "reasonably satisfactory?" It may not be very satisfactory to some of the Government's supporters in this House. What is meant by that? So he asks the question, and he is told that nothing will be satisfactory that is not on the lines of the remedial order and the judgment of the Privy Council. Well, Sir, if that be so, we know exactly where we stand. The hon. gentleman got it clearly enough that nothing would be deemed satisfactory "unless they bring an acceptable arrangement on the lines of the remedial order and the terms of the judgment of the Privy Council of the 29th of January, 1895." Why, Sir, if Manitoba does not do that, we are to have the Bill next January. And what Bill are we to have? We are to have a Bill, also, on the lines of the remedial order and the judgment of the Privy Council. That is what we are to have. The difference in phraseology is not intended to imply a difference in meaning:

> The Government shall introduce and press to a conclusion such legislation as will afford an adequate measure of relief to the said minority, based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895.

Now, if no arrangement will be satisfactory which is not based on the lines of the remedial order, no Bill can be adequate which is not based on the same lines. Surely that must be so. You are not going to insist that Manitoba shall do more than you are going to do yourself. You have stated what Manitoba must do, and, therefore, we have got to know what you propose that we shall do.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. An hon. gentleman says, "Hear, hear." I do not know whether he approves of or disagrees from my statement, but I think it is a reasonable conclusion. I do not know, in the intricacies of this wonderful question, whether the English language fails in exactness to convey its meaning.

Mr. FOSTER. You should try French.

Mr. McCARTHY. French is the language of diplomacy, and I suppose in order to be perfectly exact and precise, the declaration of the Government ought to be in French. We have got it here, and I ask what does it mean. Perhaps we will have some explanation before this debate closes. What does a Bill, based on the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order, mean? Surely we are entitled to know. Here is the remedial order. What does it say? It says this:

That the said appeal be, and the same is, hereby allowed, in so far it relates to rights acquired by the said Roman Catholic minority under legislation of the province of Manitoba, passed subsequent to the union of that province with the Dominion of Canada, and His Excellency the Governor General in Council was pleased to adjudge and declare, and it is hereby adjudged and declared, that, by the two Acts passed by the legislature of the province of Manitoba, on the 1st day of May, 1890, intituled, respectively, "An Act respecting the Department of Education" and "An Act respecting Public Schools," the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority of the said province, in relation to education, prior to the 1st day of May, 1890, has been affected by depriving the Roman Catholic minority of the following rights and privileges, which, previous to and until the 1st day of May, 1890, such minority had, viz.:—

Now, what were they deprived of? They were deprived of, in the words of the judgment:

Of the right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support Roman Catholic schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes which were repealed by the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid.

They were deprived of the right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for the purposes of education.

They were deprived of the right of exception of such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic schools, from all payments or contribution to the support of any other schools.

Then, it was ordered that these rights should be restored. Does the Government mean, or does the Government not mean that these rights are to be restored? I think my hon. friends from Quebec are entitled to know that. I think the hon. member for Provencher is entitled to know that. Nothing less than that will satisfy the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. No, nothing less.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is any thing else intended? Is anything else suggested? And if so, what? Because Manitoba was commanded to do this, and Manitoba has declined. Manitoba is again to be commanded to do this, if I understand it, and Manitoba, of course, may reasonably be supposed to decline. Then, we are face to face with a remedial Bill. I therefore think it is not inappropriate that I should call the attention of the House to this policy on the part of the Government. Am I wrong in saying that this Government exists solely for the purpose of implementing the remedial order? Am I wrong in saying that we are to have a sixth session of this Parliament solely for the purpose of carrying a remedial Bill? Am I wrong in supposing that if it were not for this, there would have been a dissolution before January next? Am I wrong, accepting, as I do, in all sincerity and honesty, the good faith of the Government, in supposing that that is the whole object and end of the January session, namely, to carry through a remedial Bill, without having, as far as we know, any other duty to perform except to vote the supplies? Am I wrong in saying that now is the time to challenge that policy and express our opinion about it? Sir, hon. gentlemen are satisfied to swallow the policy because it grants a temporary relief. They are willing, in order that they may escape from their present embarrassment, to do what? To vote approval, possibly of this policy. I shall put it as plain as I can in the resolution in your hands; I shall put it as clear and as plain as language can make it. I do not desire to have my hon. friend accuse me of any catch resolution. I think that those who differ from the Government have the right to challenge their position. I think that those who are prepared to say that, under no circumstances, will they pass a remedial Bill in the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order, ought to say so now. It is not fair by the Government, it is not fair by the country, it is not fair by anybody, to go on for six, or more, months longer, simply to come here next session and vote against the remedial Bill. It is not fair for the hon. gentleman, the Controller of Customs, whom I do not see, and who ought to be with me on this vote, to go out of this House and not vote on this question, or to stay in the Government and vote down this resolution, for between this and next January I trust that the country will understand this question, I trust that every school-house on every concession line will be seized of it and that no man will be called on to cast his ballot without a perfect understanding of the position he takes.

Mr. HUGHES. He is following distinguished English precedent.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the hon. gentleman authorized in stating that?

Mr. HUGHES. I speak for no one but myself.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought the hon. gentleman was speaking on behalf of the Controller of Customs. If not, we must proceed in the absence of the Controller of Customs. I believe the English practice, to which the hon. gentleman appealed, is this. That a Controller of Customs, up to the time he is called on to vote, not being in the Cabinet, is not bound by the policy or acts of the Government; but, from the time that he knew this remedial order was passed, unless he was assured by his colleagues that they did not mean it, that they did not intend anything more than merely to open the legislative door, and that they did not propose to carry the remedial order into effect, I think in honour he was bound to let his colleagues know that he could not support them in it and to offer his resignation, which it was their business to accept or not, as they pleased. But from the time when they announced on the floor of the House that this is their policy and their only policy, I do not understand how any gentleman who differs from them on this great question, for it is admitted to be a great question, the greatest since confederation some say, though that may be an exaggeration—can remain quiet and, as public men, deny his advice and assistance to prevent it being enacted into law. I can understand those gentlemen who agree with the policy supporting the Government, and of course every gentleman is entitled to his own opinion. Sir, it is said that the Government have not yet exhausted all means of settlement with Manitoba, and that they are bound to do so before resorting to the extraordinary measure of passing legislation in this Chamber. I am not going to repeat what was so much better said than I could say it by the leader of the Opposition, to the effect that the time for conciliation was before and not after the Order in Council. I agree with that, but I will not trouble the House with a repetition of it. But I hold that no reasonable man can read the Order in Council and read the answer to it, and consider the position of the province of Manitoba to-day, and then rise in this House and declare that there is a possibility of Manitoba changing its course. I am bound in a parliamentary sense to believe any gentleman in this House who declares such opinions, but it is only in that sense that one is bound to accept so extraordinary a statement. Manitoba, in her answer, has declared that she cannot take the responsibility of obeying, and has pointed out many reasons why she should not obey. She has invited an investigation which the Government have officially announced they do not propose to make. And she winds up her answer with these words:

> We respectfully suggest to Your Excellency in Council, that all of the above considerations call most strongly for full and careful deliberation, and for such course of action as will avoid irritating complications.
>
> We deem it proper, also, to call attention to the fact that it is only a few months since the latest decision upon the subject was given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Previously to that time a majority of the members of the legislative assembly of Manitoba had either expressly or impliedly given pledges to their constituents which they feel in honour bound loyally to fulfil.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. "Hear, hear," some hon. members say. This same legislative body is still in existence and will be in existence until January next. The same reasons of honour which prevented these gentlemen from breaking their pledges must continue to exist unless the House be dissolved for the purpose of settling this question, of which there is no suggestion.

> We understand that it has been lately suggested that private funds of the Roman Catholic Church and people had been invested in school buildings and land that are now appropriated for public school purposes. No evidence of such fact has ever been laid before us, so far as we can ascertain, but we profess ourselves willing, if any such injustice can be established, to make full and fair compensation therefor.

That is the only promise or suggestion that is made. Confident in the strength of their position, they commence, by saying:

> We cannot accept the responsibility of carrying into effect the terms of the remedial order.

They point out the objections in a community such as that of Manitoba of having separate and distinctive school education, they draw attention to the territorial difficulties under which they labour, owing to the sparseness of their population and the smallness of their resources. They add that when the remedial order was passed, His Excellency's advisers had not the knowledge before them of the form and working of the system, and they believed there was lacking the means of forming the correct judgment of the effect upon the province of the changes indicated; and having professed these views, they invited inquiry—and this is the olive branch that we have heard so much about—into the allegations of which they have no evidence before them, that the property of Roman Catholics was taken away, upon the establishment of which as a fact they are ready to make restitution. Is there any reasonable man in this House who thinks that in the five and a half months left there is any possibility of a settlement of this question under which Manitoba will do differently. Are we not bound to stop this agitation? Are we not bound to let the Government know our position? Or have the thirty-nine stray sheep that wandered came back into the fold again? There is a policy which was expressed here, in language which I will not sully my lips or offend your ears, Mr. Speaker, by re-

peating. But let me translate it, Sir. It is to keep the opposite party out, no matter on what consideration. On one hand is the policy, "hands off Manitoba," and on the other the policy of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). On the other hand, some of those who want a remedial Bill are satisfied with the promises they have got. But, Sir, there is not a man from the province of Quebec who would stand by the Government if the Government announced they were not going to introduce a remedial Bill, and if they did not believe or affect to believe that the Government would carry out that promise. But the Government supporters from the other provinces may probably think differently. Holding views on this question just as strong as my own that in this community no Government can ever pass a remedial Bill; that, while it may do much by advice and conciliation and suggestion, just as we are doing with the Government of the North-west with reference to their schools, no Government could live forty-eight hours after announcing its policy of carrying out a remedial Bill. Who is asking for it, I should like to know? What did the educational returns from Manitoba show? Let the hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec drop this agitation and this question will settle itself in two years. Why, Sir, out of ninety separate schools that were in existence at the time the law was passed, there are only thirty-eight now left in which the separate school system is kept up. I have here the exact number of those who have come in under the present school system. Out of 91, there are 51 that have either disbanded or have come under the public school system, and but 38 are out, and these 38 are out, remember, with all this agitation, with all this fight, with all this hope that remedial legislation may be carried; and I venture to think that if it was not for that agitation, all these people would have come in long before, the question would have been amicably adjusted in that province, and amongst the people who are concerned in it, and it would not have become a bone of contention in this Parliament. I have to apologize to the House for the length of time that I have been obliged to occupy in endeavouring to make plain the view which I hold upon this question, and I conclude by moving this amendment:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"this House has heard with regret the statements recently made defining the policy of the Government respecting the Manitoba school question, and is unwilling by silence to allow it to be assumed that, at the session to be held in January next, any more than at the present session, it is prepared to pass a law to restore the system of separate schools in Manitoba on the lines of the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In rising to oppose the amendment which has been put into your hands, I cannot refrain from giving expression to a conviction under which I have laboured during the hon. gentleman's argument. That argument has not been made for the first time by the member for North Simcoe to-day. Every argument, especially every argument he has used except those in the last twenty minutes of his speech, is familiar to me, and must be familiar to those who have followed this question from its inception, or from the time when, to use his own language, the member for Simcoe brought this bone of contention into the political arena. The hon. gentleman, however, made me feel that if there be merit in his position, if there be force in his argument, it is a great pity that he was born so late in the Canadian confederation. Those arguments would have been pertinent, those arguments were used, many of them, in 1870, a considerable length of time ago in the history of this new country. The arguments he has used to-day, I venture to say, were put with just as great force, were put with just as much support in the country, in the year 1870, as they have been in 1895. The conviction of the Canadian Parliament at that time was that the constitution of Manitoba should follow as nearly as possible on the lines of the constitutions of some of the older provinces, with the object and the hope that by such a constitution we might happily get rid of the quarrels and troubles which, before 1867, threatened dire disaster to many of Her Majesty's possessions in British North America; and the statesmen of that day, both Liberal and Conservative, joined in a policy of harmony and conciliation, and a policy of compromise. Able men, Liberal and Conservative, who were just as ardently, and, I believe, far more sincerely, opposed to the separate school system, than the hon. member for Simcoe, were willing to sink their opinions for the sake of harmony, recognizing, as they had to do, the fact that the two great creeds of this country, Protestant and Catholic, nearly balanced each other; and that every interest we had, the interest of home and the interest of country, would be conserved by making the constitution which they did make, and by making it to mean what the Law Lords have decided it to mean, and to imply, notwithstanding all the technical criticisms which the hon. gentleman furnished up for no other purpose than to make, if he could, that decision of Her Majesty's Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of small weight in this House, and in this country. That he has failed, there can be no manner of doubt. His course, from the time when he began his dangerous agitation in this country, is one track of failures from the start, in 1889. Whether he took his stand on legal or constitutional questions, we have lived to learn, and this country knows now, that whether in the Imperial Privy Council, or whether at the

polls, where the voices of his fellow-country men are to be heard, his course and his opinions have met with signal condemnation. And so he was driven, in his desperation, a day or two ago, to refer to this "hateful" system of separate schools, a system with which his own province is most familiar, a system which has operated well in his own province, and, during which that province has been able to hold the premier rank in this country, a system that obtained, with the consent and approval of almost the entire population of the great province of Quebec, and a system which, I would remind him, in 1894, he was willing to see fastened on the North-west Territories. I hold under my hand the proof of that important statement, that, notwithstanding all the hon. gentleman has said about the iniquity of this system, about the dire consequences that flow from it, about the injury to the youth and to the people of a country, about the spread of disunion among the population, the hon. gentleman was willing to put it on the statute-book in regard to the constitution of the North-west Territories. In 1894, when pleading with this House to adopt an amendment in that direction in connection with the constitution of the North-west Territories, the hon. member for Simcoe said:

> If the people of the North-west adopt a scheme of separate schools and afterwards apply for admission into the confederation, there will be no great harm done to say: Very well, nothing in any law we can give you shall prejudicially affect any rights or privileges with reference to denominational schools.

Grant him his way, grant him his whim in that respect, and he was willing to put upon the statute-book, in connection with the North-west Territories, for all time to come, a system that he has denounced to-night in unmeasured terms.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is absolutely incorrect. What I said was that I had nothing at all to do with the system which the North-west people chose to adopt; but what I desired was to remove from the statute-book a law which compelled them to have separate schools. I thought it was for the people of the North-west to have separate schools or public schools, which ever system they chose, and the hon. gentleman cannot find a word that I ever spoke different from that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have read the statement as reported in the "Hansard." The hon. gentleman can say, if he likes, that it is incorrectly reported.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, no.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But if that is a correct statement, I have nothing to withdraw. My interpretation is entirely based upon the language as given in the "Hansard," and I repeat it, and no language of mine could be more emphatic on the point, that he was willing to secure, for all time to come, a system of separate schools in the North-west Territories if the people there at the outset, demanded it. But in this case the hon. gentleman has attempted, with all the ingenuity he could command, and with all the technicalities of which he is master, to show that the people in Manitoba, that the half-breeds or the original settlers there, never made, in a clear and unequivocal manner, a formal demand, and he has conjured up arguments to show that the treaty, though in terms it might imply rights on the part of the people in those Territories, was of no avail and no effect. But I will come to that a little later on. What I desire to do, and to do so earnestly as I possibly can, is to warn, if not this House, for it may not need the warning, the country against crediting the hon. member for Simcoe with too much earnestness in this matter. I cannot impute motives here; but if the facts warrant it, it is my duty, it is the duty of every Canadian to sound a note of warning in regard to the political tactics adopted by that hon. member from the day he became, if not a political outcast, at all events a political desparado, ready on each and every occasion to tear down the party to which he was once proud to belong, and he came to such a pittable plight yesterday that he found himself unable to find a resting place in the House when a vote was taken on one of the issues raised by his mischievous campaign in 1889. The hon. gentleman says there are English precedents for it. I am glad he did not mention an English statesman's name in connection with such a course. I have seen a cartoon where I think Lord John Russell was represented as having put on a placard "No Popery" and immediately he proceeded to run away. Perhaps that is the precedent to which the hon. gentleman referred. But I think this House will be somewhat surprised and students of English parliamentary history will be somewhat surprised to find any similar case of such extraordinary conduct on the part of the chief agitator, and by a gentleman whose utterances here must be considered in connection with another important fact. I may be wrong, but I will go to English precedents, and up to this time I have searched in vain for a case where a member of Parliament under circumstances such as those connected with the member for Simcoe was allowed to make a speech such as he had on this occasion, was allowed to open his lips either to inflame members of the House or to inflame the hearts of his countrymen, or was allowed to give his opinion on a matter on which he had been paid advocate outside the House. Following English precedents the hon. gentleman's lips would be dumb on such an occasion. In England nothing is better understood than this. If

it is not the absolute rule, good taste has commanded silence on the part of men whether distinguished or not distinguished, whether sitting on the front benches or on the back benches, who having received retainers in the profession to which the hon. gentleman belongs venture to discuss those questions which they have put before the tribunal, or canvass for votes in the Parliament of the country. Why, even in the case of the Parnell Commission, there was a discussion when the Attorney General and the learned gentleman who succeeded him as Attorney General gave information to the House of Commons. A discussion was brought up on that subject, and the Speaker of the House gave it as his opinion that while the practice had been in the line of commanding silence on the part of gentlemen engaged professionally in the courts as regards discussing those opinions on the floor of the House, on this matter before him it was largely a question of good faith. I mention this, however, for another purpose. The hon. member for Simcoe to-night, violating as, I think, the practice of the English Parliament, and the very proper practice, has done what? He has done simply this, he has argued the case over as he argued it when a counsel, paid as he was and retained as he was on the other side, and when there was a counsel to reply to him. He has argued before the Parliament of Canada the case which he argued previously before the Privy Council of Canada, and on that occasion he sought to depreciate the weight of his opponent's argument (Mr. Ewart), by referring to the fact that he had been so long a time identified with the case he was then advocating that he could not be considered to be in a judicial frame of mind. What is the frame of mind of the hon. member for Simcoe? What is the frame of mind of an hon. gentleman who went out to that province in 1889, before this legislation was put upon the statute-book, and there, speaking with inflammatory language, raised the whole question that has been disturbing every province in Canada from that time down to the present. After playing that rôle in that year, and legislation having been put upon the statute-book, what then do we find? We find the hon. gentleman engaged in litigation. He has told us himself that he was engaged in the Barrett case, that he was employed to make the arguments he has just used. That was in 1891. Again, before the Privy Council of Canada he came, an interested party in the sordid sense on this question, and to-night he is the last of all men who while attempting to deal with the merits of the question, should have departed from his brief for a moment to lecture independent members of this Parliament, to lecture the Controller of Customs, and to attempt to frighten other hon. members who only differ from the hon. gentleman in that they are independent, that they are not counsel for the Manitoba Government, that they have received no money for their opinions or their votes; and yet the hon. gentleman presumed in this House to talk about the course which hon. gentlemen, and independent hon. gentlemen, ought to take upon this question. Let the hon. gentleman cite English precedents for such a course, and he will fail to find a single man pretending to be a statesman or a reputable member who, holding a position professionally, which the hon. gentleman does to-day in connection with this question, undertook to lead the opinion in the House of Commons for a single moment. But his record on this question does not fit him to lecture any one. Either as counsel or as statesman silence on his part would have been far the best course for the hon. gentleman to pursue. On every ground this was an occasion when he should have said little. We have had the history of the Mantoba school question. It began in 1889. Legislation followed, and on the floor of this Parliament the hon. gentleman was busy instructing the members of the House as to the legal intricacies and difficulties. He it was who sneered at the late Minister of Justice for thinking he could find some new constitutional method of settling this question. And to-night while he said that no one pretended the Barrett case concluded the consideration of the general subject, and the Law Lords had so held, I have to remind him that no less a man than the hon. member for Simcoe was of that opinion until the last decision of the Privy Council showed not only that he was wrong, but the able counsel on the side he represented, Mr. Cousens Hardy, thought the point so poor that in answer to the court's question he said he would not pretend to argue what the hon. member for Simcoe thought to be without doubt when addressing this House on a recent occasion. And so, in connection with Sir John Thompson's course it has been found to be singularly correct in every particular. Although treading in a new field, those who will take the trouble to look back to his reports in this matter will find no vacillation and no hesitation, but with great care and great caution, and with that extraordinary perception that marked him as a statesman and as a counsel, every course he marked out as the proper course to be taken was decided by the Privy Council to be the proper course, I can give to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) other points to prove my statement, that on this subject he is not in a position either to lecture this House or to discuss so lightly the opinions of their lordships of the Privy Council. Before the Privy Council of Canada and to some extent to-night, we heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) say, that the decision of the Privy Council was not required by the statute and was unnecessary. He told us

that on one matter they had gone wrong in their history, and he did not hesitate to say that the draughtsman of the Manitoba Act had evidently not been used to that sort of work. Again in another part of his argument, he told us how little Lord Herschell understood in regard to the matter. Said the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) before the Privy Council of Canada:

> With all deference be it said, it shows how little the Lord Chancellor understood the question, when he seemed to think that an Act to supplement an Act of this kind might be passed without interfering with the Public School Act.

The member for North Simcoe has stated the position of this Government to be clear and definite, but for over an hour he has endeavoured to show that at some time in the history of this question we were not clear and definite, or that we were not correct in some interlocutory stage. The great point he endeavoured to make was, that while the Canadian Privy Council had attached great weight to the reasons in the judgment of Her Majesty's Privy Council, he challenged any one to say that that judgment was obligatory on Her Majesty's Privy Council in Canada. His position is correct in the main part, as is also the position of the Government shown by the remedial order and the decision in that communication. The extent to which the Canadian Government went, and the great force of their position was, that whether the decision of the Imperial Privy Council in any regard was advisory or mandatory, yet it was so well considered, and so well reasoned, that under the peculiar difficulty of the circumstances of the case, it was more valuable than any utterance on that question could be in Canada or out of it. If we could obtain what the fathers of that Act desired we should obtain; if we could obtain anything like a judicial settlement, a quasi judicial settlement if you like, it would be the happiest possible way of doing exactly what Mr. Blake and Sir John A. Macdonald desired should be accomplished when they secured the passage of the Act by which that question was remitted to the Privy Council in England. We were right in saying to the people of this country that in connection with that remedial order, we were carrying out the judgment of the highest tribunal in the Empire. Whether the court was acting in an advisory or mandatory manner, whether any part of the judgment was obiter, or whether it was all germane to the point under discussion, the result was the same. The conclusion that the Law Lords of the Judicial Committee had reached was clear and distinct, and having consulted them on this question for the second time, the Catholics abiding content with the first decision, it would have been absolute madness to sit down and pick out of that judgment just such portions as the Government of the day might think politically expedient or advisable. It was natural for the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) to desire that we should take a technical attitude all through, that we should cut and carve on that judgment, that we should take the questions and carefully examine the judgment and drop out every unnecessary sentence, and pare it down to simply "yes" or "no." That would have perhaps left him in a better position. Judging from his argument to-night, that would have given him great comfort, but I venture to say: No matter what the ultimate result may be, this country would not have been enjoying the quiet that it does enjoy, owing to the great weight and the great importance that that judgment had in the minds of all reasonable men in Canada whether Liberal or Conservative. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) was careful not to state one of the extravagant positions which he took before the Privy Council of Canada when arguing his case. I must remind him of it, however, because I desire, if I possibly can, to destroy by fair argument the position which he may for the time being occupy in the minds of my countrymen in so important a matter as this. He argued against separate schools before the Privy Council of Canada, but his argument was in favour of bad faith, the worst of bad faith, the absolute, ignoring of the constitution, or of the Acts of Parliament. He argued that Her Majesty's Privy Council in Canada should do all this. It was idle for him to make that argument before the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council; but before a tribunal which he said was not judicial, and which he says he believed was entirely political, he did not blush to say that in his opinion no effect ought to be given to section 22 of the Manitoba Act. That statement is so startling that I wish to confirm what I say by reading the answer of the hon. member (Mr. McCarthy), given to a question put by my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia (Mr. Dickey):

> Mr. DICKEY. I understand you to say that, in your view, that section of the Manitoba Act should not under any circumstances be given effect to.
>
> Mr. McCARTHY. That is my view, speaking here on behalf of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Read page 42.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman asks me to read page 42, and the position of the hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) is explained there as follows:—

> Mr. McCARTHY. I think there would be the difficulty pointed out but, in the case of the Minister of Justice, when the law is decided, there still remains a question of policy, which it is for him to decide.

Then I asked:

> Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would you go so far as to say that the main consideration in a matter of this kind should be the poli-

tical effect of our action, and not the actual merits and rights of it ?

That is a frank question ; and Mr. McCarthy's answer is as follows :—

Mr. McCARTHY. That is undoubtedly my position. That is a duty you have to exercise. Let me crystalize it. The Privy Council has determined that there is a grievance ; they have determined that there is jurisdiction in the Governor General to pass a remedial order. If that order is to be passed, 'ex debito justitiae,' there is an end of the matter. Why all this ceremony, why all this talk ?

Hon. Mr. CURRAN. It may be necessary to hear why justice should not be done. But there is a grievance.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not going to say that there is not a grievance ; I am precluded from that by the judgment.

That was his position as a counsel ; it was after all his position to-night, if his position amounts to anything—that no matter what was in the statute, before that statute was passed, the negotiations did not go so far. Grant all that he said ; grant all the conflicting statements as to whether the demand for separate schools was contained in bill of rights No. 3 or in bill of rights No. 4 ; but there is a statute and how does he meet it ? He meets it by saying that we should treat it as a dead letter. I at no time was willing and at no time shall be willing, to take that position in regard to the constitution of this country ; and we were right, therefore, in bringing to our aid, as we logically could bring to our aid, the judicial deliverance of the Imperial Privy Council in regard to this matter of guarantee, to which I will refer later on. For no man could use stronger language than is there found to show that there was a substantial and binding guarantee on the part of this Parliament with the Roman Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba ; and by that guarantee, as interpreted by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, this Government long ago decided, and has never swerved from that decision, to stand faithfully to the end. Now, the hon. gentleman says we promised redress of grievances if the courts dismissed the appeal at an early stage of the proceedings. I think that was a mistake on the part of the hon. gentleman ; and to correct that mistake, as it is important, I will refer to the minute of Council on the report of the Minister of Justice, as contained in Mr. Ewart's book, on pages 31 and 33, where the facts of the case are stated. The hon. gentleman was referring to what I may call the interlocutory proceedings, and to the steps taken before the opinion of the courts was obtained on this question. Said the Minister of Justice in his report :

If the appeal should be successful, these Acts will be annulled by judicial decision ; the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba will receive protection and redress. The Acts purporting to be repealed will remain in operation, and those whose views have been represented by a majority of the legislature cannot but recognize that the matter has been disposed of with due regard to the constitutional rights of the province.

If the legal controversy should result in the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench being sustained, the time will come for Your Excellency to consider the petitions which have been presented by and on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba for redress, under subsections 2 and 3 of section 22 of the "Manitoba Act," quoted in the early part of this report, and which are analogous to the provisions made by the British North America Act, in relation to the other provinces.

The statement of the hon. gentleman as it fell upon my ears was so inconsistent with the splendid course, as I think, adopted by Sir John Thompson from the outset of this difficult question down to the day of his death, that the correction is made necessary. Sir John Thompson's conduct in the handling of this matter was judicial ; all the records show it. He went over the province of Ontario ; he went practically over every district in this country between the passing of the legislation of 1890 and the end of 1894, and spoke frequently on this question, which was threatening to become a very burning and troublesome question ; but he never swerved from maintaining a judicial attitude upon it. We need not handy words, I think, at this juncture as to whether our duties were judicial or political. All that the people are interested in knowing is, whether we maintained a judicial attitude until the adoption of the remedial order ; and many eminent lawyers believe that our function in that regard was entirely judicial. But the hon. member for North Simcoe, before he began that long branch of his argument, told the House that the present Prime Minister frankly admitted on the hearing that the Government would assume full political responsibility for their decision in regard to the remedial order. There never was the slightest flinching in that respect on the part either of the present Prime Minister or of the late Prime Minister. Amidst tremendous difficulties and against extraordinary pressure, I do not hesitate to say so, the late Prime Minister maintained the same impartial attitude up to the day of his death. That was, that if the courts would settle this question one way or the other, so much the better for Canada, so much the better for all of us. Some would regret the decision, but all in the end would respect it. Keep it if we could out of Parliament ; keep it if we could from the polls. There was no cowardice in that position. In my opinion, it was the truest and highest type of statesmanship. But whether the policy was wise or unwise, that was his policy ; and all his colleagues, so far as I know, endeavoured to follow his advice When they met they endeavoured to treat the question in a judicial manner, and the hon. member for North Simcoe had no reason to com-

plain of the treatment he got. All the complaint the hon. member made to-day was that the notice was short. Now, to show, if I may say so, how unfair the hon. gentleman was in his argument, I have to call your attention and the attention of those who have read the blue-book which was distributed so long ago, to the fact that, notwithstanding all the time that has elapsed since that short notice was served upon the hon. gentleman, from away back in February down to this 16th of July; though he has been in consultation and campaigning with Mr. Sifton, and though he has been giving a great deal of attention to this subject, he has not been able to bring one single additional argument to this House beyond what is contained between these two covers. The only reference he has made to what is new is to transactions which occurred after the hearing. This shows that the hon. gentleman strained to make a case against his old friends and against the Government of the day. Referring again to the remedial order, I would like, in support of what I have said in regard to Sir John Thompson's attitude, to quote Sir John Thompson's language. In speaking in the House of Commons shortly before his death, he said:

> But, with regard to the questions which come up in the appeal, the course of action has to be reversed; and while, as I admit we are perfectly responsible for everything that we will do, we have to be guided, in some degree at least, by the judicial rather than the political sense in ascertaining what the rights were of those who appeal, and how they should be dealt with, because those rights are entrusted to our safekeeping by the constitution.

And again:

> A motion which declares that we have assumed judicial functions, and that that is entirely inconsistent with ministerial responsibilities. Sir, I do not hesitate to affirm, as my belief and as true constitutional doctrine, that for everything a minister does, he is responsible to parliament, as well as to the people.

Sir John Thompson was willing to go over further than the hon. member for North Simcoe, for that hon. gentleman was willing to exculpate us from all our discretionary mistakes when acting as members of the Railway Committee. He was willing to admit that when sitting as members of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council of Canada, we were exercising judicial functions. So that, I think, if it were important—and with all respect to the hon. gentleman, I do not think at this stage it is important—an argument could be made, assisted by some of the hon. gentleman's own admissions, to show that in a very large sense the Government, on that occasion, had judicial functions and were bound to act in a judicial spirit. At any rate all we can claim is that we strove to act in a judicial and impartial spirit. It was for our countrymen to judge whether we were sincere or successful in our efforts. But for those functions once performed, we never hesitated to admit our full political responsibility; and we have the satisfaction of knowing that to-day, the sixteenth of July, after Parliament has been in session for three months, after the remedial order has been adopted since 19th March, the hon. gentleman has never challenged that remedial order? Has he ever exercised his rights and asked this House to condemn the Government for adopting the remedial order. If that remedial order be so bad and if he thinks the Government merited condemnation for it, how is it that the remedial order practically stands unattacked? We know that since the date of the remedial order three or four elections have taken place in three provinces; and out of three of these elections, not a man came to this Parliament who did not assume responsibility for the remedial order. Reference was made to the hon. member for Antigonish. Well, the hon. member for Antigonish pledged himself up to the hilt to support the remedial order. He claimed that the Government had done nothing more than its duty and had no right to count on political support for having performed that duty. In the county of Haldimand, in the Protestant province of Ontario, the Secretary of State stood to win or lose on his responsibility as a party to the remedial order and gained a great victory. The hon. gentleman made another charge which, I think, was a small matter in connection with a debate of any importance; but as he made it, a reply is required, and I have a small answer which will completely dispose of his small point. He said that some affidavits reflecting on some parties had been printed in a blue-book, and that this blue-book was distributed throughout the country by the Government. Sir, I could not satiate the demand of the hon. gentleman himself for these books. He himself distributed more than his share, and was an applicant for them for the purposes of distribution. And it is to be said that in a great crisis, as he calls it, we are to be charged with distributing these slanders when he himself distributed more than his share? When we are attacked, it is a comfort to know that the hon. gentleman shares the responsibility. The hon. gentleman, coming to a larger aspect of the question, said that separate schools were not guaranteed for Manitoba. That is where the Government cannot go the full length with the hon. gentleman. If he says that there is no guarantee in terms, if he says that the statute differs in that particular from other statutory enactments in the British North America Act, there will be no great quarrel; but if he wishes to conclude from those terms that there was not a substantial guarantee, that it was not intended to guarantee to the minority their rights to separate schools in the province of Manitoba, there I am willing to join issue with him and there I think we can

make our case good indeed. We can refer, first of all, to history; we can refer to a discussion which went on similar lines to that which the hon. gentleman has forced upon this House on this occasion. We find that at the outset, before the Manitoba Act was considered, the people in Canada who were most anxious for that statutory guarantee in the British North America Act were the Protestants. I know, as a matter of fact, that the original draft of the British North America Act, under which the rights of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, are guaranteed, was in the hand writing of Sir Alexander Galt, who I take it, was the representative of the Protestants of Quebec in those negotiations. As to the parties most interested at that time, I think there is no room for dispute. I could produce also documentary evidence to show that when the British North America Act was being considered in London, the parties most interested and who were induced to memorialize the delegates in order that this guarantee should be made absolutely certain and sufficiently included in the Act, were the Protestants of the province of Quebec, represented by a Protestant clergymen and by a committee for that purpose. When this question was under consideration in this Parliament, all these various views again came to the front; and in dealing with Manitoba, some hon. gentleman retaining the views of years before, but older and wiser, knowing the difficulties that would exist were there no protection for the minority in the province of Manitoba voted for the constitution as it now stands, and the only thing which furnishes a foothold for the hon. gentleman's argument, namely: the difference between a guarantee and what we say practically and fairly construed amounts to a guarantee, the Law Lords of the Privy Council have explained. Whether the Catholics or the Protestants were in the ascendant, it was believed that when the school system would be established in that province, in the early history of it, the numbers would be as well balanced that this Parliament could rely on justice being done to the minority, whatever it might be. Under those circumstances, Parliament on that occasion came to the wisest and best conclusion and framed the Act as it is now. No man, looking at the discussion in this House, as reported in the papers at that time, or having regard to the opinions of the fathers of the confederation or the advice given from time to time by the former leader of the Opposition, Mr. Mackenzie, by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and on an occasion long ago by the present leader of the Opposition, can fail to admit that it was intended by all concerned and by the country at large, with hardly a difference of opinion, as a substantial guarantee of the rights of the minority. The minority happens to be Catholic: but the case would be precisely the same if they had happened to be Protestants. I would like to fortify my position by reference to the opinions of the Law Lords. And I would refer to the statements made by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Herschel, At page 198, Lord Herschel used this language:

> I mean it is very difficult to shut one's eyes to the fact that at the time the Manitoba Act was passed—one is entitled to look at the circumstances—you had a Catholic and Protestant population nearly balanced; you had notoriously (for that you may certainly look at this legislation, and indeed it is common knowledge) the Catholic part of the population set upon separate schools for their denomination. It is with a view to the protection of rights of that sort that this legislation is passed. Practically, your contention would place Manitoba in a worse position for the Catholic minority, as it might be, or the Protestant minority, as it might be, in a position of less protection than you get in Ontario.

The hon. gentleman tells us that there was no guarantee. That has been settled. That is good language, if you like for the courts; but it is not the language for the high court of Parliament; that is not the kind of argument by which nations are made or preserved. At page 204, referring to the same point, the Lord Cancellor says:

> Is it not conceivable legislation to say: We will trust to you, the provincial legislature, the power of dealing with education; but this is a question upon which there is known to be a keen feeling and a difference of opinion, and you are not to destroy any privileges or rights at the time of the union. Further than that, if you legislate within your powers, the minority shall not be without protection: there shall be then an appeal to a superior authority, the Governor General in Council, and, if he thinks that, within your powers, you have been depriving the minority of any right or privilege in relation to education, then he may express that decision, and effect shall be given to that decision, or may be given to that decision by the Dominion Parliament?

And at page 230, the Lord Chancellor says:

> Is it so extraordinary, when you remember that this was an arrangement made as one of the terms on which the union was to be effected?

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says the Lord Chancellor does not understand history. The hon. gentleman argues that these were not the terms——

Mr. McCARTHY. I mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Lord Chancellor had not any evidence before him on that point, either one way or the other—it was not submitted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think we will take it for granted that it would have been different if this had been presented by Mr. Ewart or Mr. Blake, who, forsooth, are quoted to-night as authorities, though they were counsel in the case, and we asked to attach the greatest imortance to their utterances. But when you come to what the Lord Chancellor said, we

are told we must not listen to it, we must not listen to what Lord Watson may say, for their duty was to say very little; and, so far as I have been able to understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) to say nothing that could possibly give comfort or strength to the minority in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman says that there is no evidence to support the Lord Chancellor when he asks that question:

Is it so extraordinary, when you remember that this was an arrangement made as one of the terms on which the union was to be effected?

There I am interrupted by the hon. member for North Simcoe. There the hon. member challenges the Lord Chancellor for his evidence, and no doubt in this connection arose the discussion about the bill of rights and the negotiations that took place. The Lord Chancellor, however, says:

It would be shutting one's eyes to the most obvious facts which were exhibited on the face of the British North America Act itself, if one were not to see that one of the obstacles to this federation scheme was the fear of educational legislation in the separate or distinct provinces which might affect the position of those who desired a denominational education. That runs through all the provisions of section 93, and it appears to me to be on the face of section 22 also. Therefore, it is not extraordinary in that case to find limitations and safeguards and superior legislative power given to the Dominion Parliament, which represents the country as a whole. It does not strike me as extraordinary.

And the hon. gentleman would ask us to turn aside to settle nice subtelties of law, to study with him fine distinctions, to go over historical documents, but to pay no attention to the language of a judge which he was careful to use only as a judge should use it. The hon. gentleman says there was no evidence, but the Lord Chancellor finds his evidence on the face of the Act. To the Lord Chancellor the matter was plain which the hon. gentleman thinks is wrapped in a certain amount of mystery and about which, certainly, there is dispute. At page 276—and I must ask the indulgence of the House while I give these authorities, because, to my mind, they answer far better than any argument I can conceive of the most important points made by the hon. member for Simcoe—the Lord Chancellor, in giving his reasons for the judgment said:

In their Lordship's opinions, the 2nd subsection is a substantial enactment, and is not designed merely as a means of enforcing the provision which precedes it.

And later on:

Those who were stipulating for these provisions of section 22 as a condition for the union, and those who gave their legislative assent to the Act by which it was brought about, had in view the perils then apprehended. The immediate adoption by the legislature of an educational system obnoxious either to Catholics or Protestants, would not be contemplated as possible. As has been already stated, the Roman Catholics and Protestants in the province were about equal in number. It was impossible at that time for either party to obtain legislative sanction to a scheme of education obnoxious to the other. The establishment of a system of public education in which both parties would concur, was probably then in immediate prospect. The legislature of Manitoba first met on the 15th of March, 1871. On the 3rd May following, the Education Act of 1871 received the Royal Assent. But the future was uncertain. Either Roman Catholics or Protestants might become the preponderating power in the legislature, and it might, under such conditions, be impossible for the minority to prevent the creation at the public cost of schools which, though acceptable to the majority, could only be taken advantage of by the minority on the terms of sacrificing their cherished convictions. Their change to a Roman Catholic system of public schools would have been regarded with as much distaste by the Protestants of the province as the change to an unsectarian system was to the Catholics.

Further, in his formal reasons for the judgments, at page 280, the Lord Chancellor says:

Bearing in mind the circumstances which existed in 1870, it does not appear to their Lordships an extravagant notion, that, in creating a legislature for the province with limited powers, it should have been thought expedient, in case either Catholics or Protestants became preponderant, and rights which had come into existence under different circumstances, were interfered with, to give the Dominion Parliament power to legislate upon matters of education, so far as was necessary to protect the Protestant or Catholic minority, as the case might be.

So Lord Watson, on page 205, interprets it. I will not trouble the House with that, but merely say that Lord Macnachten, at page 232, uses language to the same effect. But let us go back now to the father of confederation, so to speak, as I think Lord Carnarvon was Colonial Secretary at the time the British North America Act was being considered in the English Parliament. Judge Fournier, in his decision, quoted Lord Carnarvon when discussing the main Act, and most members in this House will admit that for all practical purposes, for all purposes of legislation, for all considerations that ought to weigh here, there is no difference between the Manitoba Act and the British North America Act, and that if we wished to find the history of the Manitoba Act, it is necessary to study the history of the provisions in the main Act. Lord Carnarvon, in 1867, speaking in the House of Lords, said:

If the object of the clause is to secure to the religious minority of one province the same rights and privileges and protection which the religious minority of another province may enjoy, the Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada, the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec, and the Roman Catholic minority of the maritime provinces, will thus stand on a footing of entire equality. But, in the event of any wrong at the hand of the local majority, the minority have a right to appeal to the Governor General in Council, and may claim the application of any remedial law may be necessary from the central Parliament of the confederation.

Now, I am not disputing the other point to which I may refer, that granting all that, it would remain for this Parliament to do as it pleased, in other words, this Parliament can do right or wrong—I would be willing to admit that so far as this case is concerned. We have power to do wrong. But to my mind I have never heard an argument, I certainly did not hear it to-day, which should weigh for a moment in the consideration of members of this House, that we did in this matter anything else than our duty; on the other hand, we should rather strive to act generously in keeping any faith that was pledged by this Parliament, and which this Parliament should regard as sacred. Now as to the real grievance on the part of the minority, I would like to refer again to the argument before the Law Lords. At page 39 Lord Watson said:

It may be, that after full consideration, and hearing the grievance out, we may come to be satisfied that there is no real grievance.

I refer to that, because it is important in connection with the hon. gentleman's argument. The court were of the opinion that they could have advised us to that effect, and the very fact that they were apprised of that, that they so viewed it, that they could come to a finding as to whether there was a grievance, should lend additional weight to the language they have used. On page 284 they state what in their opinion, constitutes a real and actual grievance on the part of the Roman Catholic minority:

The sole question to be determined is whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed, has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their Lordships are unable to see how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer. Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the Acts from which they appeal. Before these passed into law there existed denominational schools, of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching. These schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for these purposes by local assessment was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only towards the support of Catholic schools. What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the Acts of 1890? Schools of their own denomination, conducted according to their views, will receive no aid from the state. They must depend entirely upon the contributions of the Roman Catholic community, while the taxes out of which state aid is granted to the schools provided for by the state, fall alike on Catholics and Protestants. Moreover, while the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessments for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer destined to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools which they regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if they were distinctly Protestant in their character. In view of this comparison, it does not seem possible to say that the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education which existed prior to 1890, have not been affected.

Then on page 286 they go on to say:

Their Lordships have decided that the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction, and that the appeal is well founded.

The appeal set out the grievance categorically as the basis of the appeal, and all the points which were included in the paragraph I have just read on page 284, are found again in the remedial order, and this is the language which induced the Privy Council of Canada to make that remedial order:

But the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute. It is not for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken. Their general character is sufficiently defined by the 3rd subsection of section 22 of the Manitoba Act. It is certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted, or that the precise provisions of these statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890 no doubt commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of, the great majority of the inhabitants of the province.

Now comes very important language:

All legitimate ground of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions.

Now, then, the Law Lords find there was a grievance, the member for Simcoe admits there was a grievance. The Law Lords state what the grievance was, state how to remove it. We have that from the highest judicial tribunal in the British Empire, and considering all the difficulties, and many of them have already been referred to sufficiently, the Privy Council in Canada, keeping closely to that judgment, induced His Excellency to approve of the remedial order. Now, mark you, this order is not directly challenged, no one condemns us for passing that in terms. An omnibus resolution, a side attack, can be made upon it, but no direct attack has been made upon it. Why, the leader of the Opposition has not hesitated to say that we used language too peremptory, too stern, too dictatorial. The hon. member for Simcoe caught up the idea and found fault with the manner in which the order was framed. None of them have ventured to say that any precedent could be found for drafting a document known as the statutory order, for the statute speaks of the order, speaks of direction, which should not be in the nature of a command. There is not a disrespectful word in the document from beginning to end. The Manitoba legislature and the Manitoba Government have not said that.

That was left to the hon. gentlemen, who are, politically speaking, in desperate straits, who have no desire to pacify, who have no desire to preserve, apparently, anything. Their aim seems to me to tear down and destroy. So far as this House is concerned, and considering even the criticisms outside of this House, I can afford to pass by those arguments which are directed solely to the phraseology of the order. No man in his senses will deny that every member of the Manitoba legislature knew exactly what this Government wanted, knew exactly the position of this Government, both as regards the order, which was technical, and the utterances which came to their ears time and again as to the intense desire, not as partisans, not as Conservatives, but as Canadians, that the whole question should be compromised and settled on the floors of the legislature of Manitoba. We all wish that every Catholic and Protestant——

Mr. MARTIN. You took a strange way of showing it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am prepared for that; I am dealing with that argument, if it can be dignified with that name. That complaint does not come from Manitoba. Where is the document to show we offended either the Government or the legislature? Is it to be found in the answer? According to the hon. member for Simcoe, it is explicit, it is determined. Ought we to have quarrels when the hon. member for Simcoe as counsel for the Manitoba Government informed the Canadian Privy Council that no matter what order was passed they would defy? Ought we to have acted like children when we saw in the Speech from the Throne language that led to that conclusion? Ought we to have turned away from making every endeavour possibly to reach a friendly conclusion because any particular individual has said what the course would be, what he thought of our action. Lawyers know, the hon. member for Winnipeg knows, that the greatest possible care had to be used in drafting that order, and had it not been explicit, had it not been a direction, had it not been firm, had it not been decisive, it would not have been worth the paper on which it was written. It would have been absolutely a complete abortion. No action could have been founded on it, no remedial legislation could have been passed on it, and those who have looked into the question and studied it know that it is at all events strong enough to be able to withstand up to the present date any assault that has been directed upon it either with regard to any particular line or as to the phraseology of the whole. It is common information, it is notorious what the attitude of the Government has been as regards the Manitoba legislature. We do not, however, quarrel with them for keeping strictly to the lines of the order. Technically they may be right. Technically it was for them to answer back and to say: You have issued an order within your right, calling upon us to do so and so; we will not comply with your order. Now, having done that, we reply that we may find federal legislation necessary instead of provincial legislation on the subject. An issue has been reached, a step at all events has been taken—that is the legal effect. But when gentlemen speak as members of the Manitoba Government did speak—and I have the language under my hand ready to refer to it if necessary—on the line as reported, and answering back said: we cannot comply with that order as given, and when a large and influential section of this country as represented by the press, and by men both political and non-political but Canadians, had a feeling, an idea that it was quite possible that Manitoba would do something to settle this question, ardent advocate of remedial legislation as I was from the time when it was first considered by the Privy Council of Canada was of the opinion, and the Government was of the opinion, that we were bound, no matter what the political consequences might be, to exhaust even that hope, to sound everything in that direction, so that, to be frank with the House, when the time of action should come here we should have at our back not only those who were zealous or over zealous in the case, but have in support of remedial legislation the sound second thought of Canada, the middle mind, so to speak, and those not swerved by parties holding extreme views on one side or the other. We took this course so that when we act, to use the language of the Liberal leader, we shall be able to act with force, and because we believe we have not all that force at our back which we expect to be able to have; so we have called a halt for a time, to sound the Manitoba Government respectfully and in a most friendly manner and to exhaust every supposition that action will possibly be taken in that legislature. The hon. member for Simcoe does us the justice to say that the position is clear and the consequences are clear; and that there is no reason to believe that no action in that direction will be taken, then this Government in the next session of Parliament will be prepared to act, and I believe will be able to act with greater effect than if action were attempted at the present moment. I hesitate at this late hour, knowing that hon. gentlemen who are listening to me are familiar with everything I say on the subject, to go line for line over the argument of the hon. member for Simcoe. It is not because I have not the material. I hold the material in that blue-book. I followed the argument of the hon. gentleman carefully. Mr. Ewart has answered him, and has answered him effectively. The hon. member spoke, for instance, of the bill of rights and the dispute in that regard. He did not, however, deal as fully with that as I think he ought

to have done. For instance, there is a strange feature I think in the hon. gentleman's argument. The English blue-books contain Lord Lisgar's despatch (then Sir John Young), of the 29th April. It referred to the inclosure, and showed that this bill of rights did not correspond with bill No. 4. But the hon. gentleman did not state what seems to me an important fact in connection with that dispute—and I regard it simply as one of historical interest, as hon. gentlemen will see from the argument I have submitted—that the inclosure is a newspaper clipping from the Toronto "Globe" of 23rd April, 1870, and it is contained in a despatch of 29th April, 1870. This was not mentioned by the hon. member for Simcoe as a newspaper clipping; it was mentioned as an inclosure in a state document, and considering the strong evidence on the other side, not only that of Father Richot to whom reference was made, but that at a state trial which took place, this bill No. 4, was the bill there accepted as evidence—not entering into that—I merely mention that as one of the strongest features of the hon. gentleman's case and yet if fully presented it would seem to have not as much strength comparatively as might be supposed. Clearly that clipping could in no sense have been a careful copy of a state document, and a mistake may have arisen in that connection. Nevertheless the hon. gentleman said the English blue-book settled the whole question—the clipping of the "Globe" of 23rd April incorporated in the despatch of 29th April, set aside the evidence of Father Richot and all the documentary evidence on file in the Department of Justice. The hon. gentleman declared that there had been no demand made for separate schools. I will not go over my answer, but I will merely refer to it in this connection. That is disputed, but there is a statutory bargain, and it is upon the statute and not on the prior negotiations that I for one take my stand. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) said that if the Act of Parliament is definite that it would be conclusive. I have already given his evidence to show that no matter how definite you make an Act of Parliament, it is not always considered as conclusive by him. Even in this case where there was a remedy provided by law, the hon. gentleman's argument was that no remedy should be given. I referred a moment ago to the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) as to whether that decision was mandatory or not, and later on he referred to whether this Parliament was bound by it. No one contends that Parliament is in the slightest degree fettered by what has taken place. All that has happened is the vesting of Parliament with certain jurisdiction and powers to go to a certain extent, and a certain extent only. But it was strange to me to hear the hon. gentleman, able and distinguished as he is, labouring with that part of the case. It may be that I was not sufficiently well informed, but why he should argue at such length in regard to the history of this Act under which the reference was made, I am at a loss to understand. Why, the statute itself settles the whole point; the hon. gentleman discussed, for in subsection 6 of 37 it says:

> The opinion of the court upon any such reference, although advisory only, or for the purpose of appeal to be taken, is final.

That is the expressed provision and with the reason for that legislation I will not now further deal. The hour being late, I am hurrying, as the House will see, over the points as quickly as I can. The hon. gentleman spent a long time in an attack on the old system of separate schools in Manitoba as he called them. A great deal of what the hon. gentleman said might be admitted for the purpose of the point before us. A great deal of what the hon. gentleman said was no doubt true in his own province in its earlier history under their system of legislation. I think that is the common experience. There had not been many years for the Act to operate. This, however, is my position: While strongly in favour of remedial legislation, and anxious to promote it in every efficient and effective way, I am in no sense committed to the system of separate schools. But, be they good or bad, we know that a very large and a very respectable and very influential part of the population, almost half the population of Canada, believe in that system. And that system having been discussed, was engrafted on the province of Manitoba, and under the decision of the Privy Council, and in the opinion of the Law Lords, that system ought to be maintained, not in its weakness and not with any blots. And the Catholics of Manitoba so far as I understand it—and I have followed the history of the case pretty well—have not insisted on any inefficient system being restored to them. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) does not mean to say that we are bound to force on the province of Manitoba, if we attempt to act all the worst features of the old system. The hon. gentleman has referred to the draft Bill. It does not propose to revise those features of the old system which he condemns. None of the advocates of the rights of the minority are asking, for instance, to escape proper inspection.

Mr. McCARTHY. What does the draft Bill eliminate?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the draft Bill eliminates all these points upon which he was able to put his finger in connection with his attacks, except what he called misgovernment. He referred chiefly to what seemed to him mal-administration, or misgovernment, and the poor enforcement, or the non-inforce-

ment of the system. He has not attacked the school system in Ontario where the separate system obtains. The majority of the people of that province are proud of it, and are strengthening it and improving it every year. If it were necessary to enter on this question I believe that the minority could make a good case. For me, they need not go that far. For me it is sufficient to know or to believe, that a bargain was made, and a bargain being made, and it being part of the Canadian constitution, as a Conservative and as a Canadian I am willing to die for that, either politically or in any other way. I am ready to join with friends to my right, or to my left, or in front of me, ready to join hands with any loyal Canadians in maintaining each and every part of the Canadian constitution. It is in that cause that the present Government are now absolutely committed, and into that fight they will go with as stout hearts as men ever went into a political or any other battle. That, as I understand it, is the position of the Canadian Government. We may be right or we may be wrong in regard to what the substantial guarantee involves, but if time permitted (and perhaps on another occasion time will permit) I would refer with pleasure and with pride to the utterances of my old chieftain Sir John Macdonald, to that father of confederation, and to the utterances of every great public man, Liberal or Conservative, that Canada has produced. Every man who has had experience in the government of the confederation or of the older provinces, every man whose name has come down in our history, I am happy to know and believe are on record, as being in favour of separate schools, or when not in favour of separate schools they were in favour of a compromise such as was made in the old Canadas, and which was of such great importance to those two provinces. All these great men of our history are in favour of the bargain that was made with the minority, the undefined minority so to speak in Manitoba. Were these men living to-day, they would be found doing their utmost to see that good faith is carried out with that minority. I have confidence, that after those preliminary skirmishes are over on this question, and when our political opponents have got all the capital that may perhaps be fairly due to them in any difficulty that may surround the Government: I have abiding faith that when the time for action does come, the policy as enunciated by the leader of this Government will be supported by them, with as much zeal as by many hon. gentlemen who sit behind me. I know that in the Conservative party there are those who do not see eye to eye with the Government. All the greater regret, for the sake of the great cause. No one has hesitated to admit that these difficulties exist; and I am for that reason more rejoiced than ever that there is a Government that is able, under these trying circumstances, while differing with some of its friends, to stake its reputation and its standing in a great cause. While I do not profess to be a profound student of Canadian history, I do claim to be an ardent Canadian and an ardent student of our country's history; and with all my reading and with all the information I have been able to obtain, ever since this question was launched, properly or improperly, upon the thoughts of Canadians, I cannot conceive of a greater cause to struggle for—I cannot conceive of a cause in which our national reputation is more involved than in the cause of the minority, be it Catholic or Protestant, in Manitoba; but above and beyond all that, in the cause and for the sake of the Canadian constitution.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is rising to speak; but, after having received information as to the number who are anxious to speak, and who have very strongly preferred their request that they should not be obliged to speak at this hour, after our very late session of last night, I have come to the conclusion that perhaps it is better not to press the matter too strongly. I am anxious, as I am sure all men in this House are, to have our deliberations concluded and our work done, so that we may go home as soon as possible. At the same time, I do not want to press too strenuously upon hon. gentlemen who have something to say upon a question that interests them very much. Therefore, while consenting to an adjournment, which my hon. friend has asked to be allowed to move, I wish to press upon the House the necessity of our coming to a vote on this matter by six o'clock to-morrow afternoon if it is at all possible.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest to my hon. friend that perhaps it would be more advisable to resume this debate at eight o'clock to-morrow night.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we must go on in the afternoon.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think perhaps the House will tolerate me if I make an answer to the personal attack which the hon. Minister of Justice thought fit to launch upon me in his opening observations. Sir, it is a poor cause—and the hon. gentleman must have thought his cause a poor one—that requires to be sustained by personal vituperation and abuse. I do not think I said one word from beginning to end in the rather long and I daresay tedious speech I delivered to this House, that could be considered by any hon. member as offensive; certainly I did not intend to do so; and for the hon. gentleman to get up and tell me in the presence of this House that I was taking a position that was unwarranted, by reason

of my professional connection with the Manitoba Government, was, I venture to say, unjust, unparliamentary and without one tittle of justification. Sir, my right here I know perfectly well. When the hon. gentleman can find a precedent to show that the professional connection which I have had on two different occasions with the Manitoba Government—one in defending the constitutional Act of 1890 before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which is not now in question, and another, in appearing to oppose the passage of the remedial order—in the slightest degree disqualified me from speaking and acting——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask the hon. gentleman whether these were the only two occasions on which he advised the Manitoba Government?

Mr. McCARTHY. When the hon. gentleman has a right to interrogate me, Sir, I shall be perfectly willing to answer. I am not called upon here to disclose my professional conduct nor my professional dealings with any man or any Government. What I have done, I have done publicly and openly: and it was perfectly well known what my attitude was on this question before I spoke to the hon. gentleman as one of the members of the Privy Council here. The hon. gentleman perfectly well knows that I took part in the discussion on this very question which took place in this House two or three years ago. If the hon. gentleman will consult the practice, he will find that we have here no such rule as they have in England. But even in England, Sir—and I am quite willing to stand by the most extreme view of parliamentary practice—the late Attorney General, the present Lord Chief Justice, then Sir Charles Russell, and the Attorney General at the time, Sir Richard Webster, both took part in the debate upon the Parnell Commission, in connection with which both had been engaged professionally, and, I suppose, what they could do without remonstrance and without rebuke, I was perfectly right in doing. But from a gentleman who occupies the position of Minister of Justice in this House, from one of his name, the last thing to be expected was an attack of that kind upon me. The history of Canada has been disgraced by the connections of the hon. gentleman and by their conduct from first to last——

Mr. MONTAGUE. Order. That is not a personal explanation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not confined to a personal explanation. I am speaking on a motion to adjourn.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman rose to make a personal explanation, and while he did so I sat quiet. But if he is speaking on a motion to adjourn, I raise the point of order that he cannot refer to a past debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member can refer to the debate that is before the House on a motion to adjourn.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should have thought that the babies of the House knew that: I thought every one who was here a week understood that. It ill-becomes that hon. gentleman, I say, to taunt me, after my experience in public life, with having come here subsidized or in any way influenced by what has occurred in my professional proceedings. If I were to suggest that the hon. gentleman, sitting in Council year after year, votes to his own father $2,000 which the statute does not warrant, what justification could he offer for it? I desire to keep free from this kind of discussion; but I wish that hon. gentleman, as well as other hon. gentlemen in this House, to know that I am able to take care of and protect myself when I am assailed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the House would have considered my attack far more unfair and unjust if the hon. gentleman had been contented with dealing with the remarks which I have made, instead of giving way to such a deplorable temper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly it was deplorable, when the hon. gentleman was induced to utter the most miserable insinuation against a gentleman with whom he was always closely allied while that gentleman was a member of this House, and with whom he co-operated on every possible occasion. The hon. gentleman was surely in a temper when he was induced to villify by insinuation that absent man, and to resort to such an extraordinary exhibition of temper when he cited the case of my voting a salary to Sir Charles Tupper, my father. The present Government in England have to learn from this most potent, grave, and reverend seignor, who talks about childish ignorance, because, as I understand it, there are several relatives in that Government who have to vote salaries for each other. But, to come back to the point which disturbed the hon. gentleman. He did not think it was wrong to refer to Mr. Ewart as being influenced in giving his views to the committee of the Privy Council of Canada by the fact of his having been associated, professionally, for so long a time in this case. He deemed it an important point in his argument on that occasion to prove that that gentleman had been, for a long time, identified with the cause he was then advocating. What I have said with reference to the hon. gentleman's position, I am able to prove. He admits that he has acted in this matter as the paid advocate of the Manitoba Government, but he says this is a personal attack, and he becomes irate. The conscience of the hon. gentleman must have some effect. I say he cannot find that any leading

member of the British House of Commons ever took the part the hon. gentleman is taking in a discussion of his client's case, or brought the case of his client before the House of Commons. So that, instead of accepting the challenge, he resorted to what I consider a deplorable exhibition of temper. Let me, however, give him some authority for my statement. He referred to Sir Charles Russell, and Sir Richard Webster. So did I. He forgot that I told this House that the circumstances in their case were plain, so as to bring them outside of the rule which it is not considered decent to violate in the English Parliament. The hon. gentleman has evidently not studied very carefully this part of parliamentary life. For his benefit, I will refer him to the very case—the case of Sir Charles Russel and Sir Richard Webster. They had been connected with a parliamentary commission, professionally, and they made speeches. They did not move motions; they did not advocate action by the House in anything like the sense the hon. gentleman is moving now. They were discussing the report of the commission, or something incidental, and here is what was said:

Mr. McNEILL. The Lord Chancellor of the day was Lord Chelmsford, and in the debate to which I am referring, the mover said it was well known that it was the practice of Lord Chelmsford, while he was at the bar, to take no part in any proceedings in the House in which he was professionally concerned out of it; and, on the other hand, he would never act as advocate out of the House in any case in which he had been professionally concerned within its walls.

I hope the hon. gentleman is listening. Sir Richard Webster, instead of claiming that he was exercising his undoubted rights in making a few remarks on the matter, said it was an entirely different case from what the hon. gentleman has attepmted to declare in this House. He explained:

I believe, from my study of the question, that you, Mr. Speaker, have laid down the correct rule—that the Standing Orders of this House, and the rules which govern men apart from Standing Orders, forbid any member bringing forward or supporting in this House any measure for the purpose of obtaining a fee or reward.

I ask the hon. gentleman to read that, because he put a great deal of reliance on the standing order in Parliament differing from our standing order.

And further than that, I think no hon. member should, in his capacity as a member of this House, advocate afterwards any case in respect of which he has received fee or reward.

On two occasions the hon. gentleman tells us that he has received fees, and gave me what I considered a very impertinent answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I withdraw that if it is unparliamentary. But the hon. gentleman gave me, certainly, an answer not worthy of himself or this House. He referred to Sir Richard Webster's as an example for his course, and I am giving him Sir Richard Webster's language of 1893, in the incident of which the hon. gentleman referred. Sir Charles Russell was charged with making an observation in that debate, and the Attorney General deemed it a matter which was not to be dealt with flippantly. Sir Charles Russell dealt with it as its importance and his dignity required. I need not press home; I am sure now of my point in making the charge and the statement. My object was to minimize all that heat of argument and sham eloquence of the hon. gentleman, and to remove the impression from this House and the country that the hon. gentleman was acting solely from patriotic motives. The rule in England is that a man in the House of Commons must be above suspicion and when advising the House as to policy, it must be considered there is no outside influence of any kind at work. I did not say the hon. gentleman was doing anything dishonourable. My whole argument was that he was doing what the Parliament in England would not tolerate, and what would weaken his position in this House and country on the Manitoba school question. Sir Charles Russell, being charged with having taken part in the discussion, said:

I wish the House to be put in possession of the exact facts of the case. On the occasion referred to by the right hon. gentleman, a motion was brought before the House by my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in which he impugned, in certain respects to which I will not refer, the conduct of my hon. and learned friend, the member for the Isle of Wight (Sir Richard Webster). On that occasion I took no part whatever in the debate. I said I would take no part in the discussion, and I absented myself from the House. I found in the reports of the papers next day that a statement had been made by my hon. and learned friend which was considered a matter of moment on the point raised as to my hon. and learned friend's conduct, which was that he had handed to me and to my right hon. friend, the present Home Secretary, with whom I was associated, a particular letter on a particular day.

Now he goes on:

I find I used the language referred to by the leader of the Opposition, in which I said:

I regret to say I still think that the conduct of the case has been practically unfair to the defendants.

That was his observation, and Sir Richard Webster, pressing him with a violation of a particular rule, said: "The proceedings were pending," to which Sir Charles Russell answered:

Of course the proceedings were pending. The House will, therefore, see that what I was doing on that occasion was not initiating a discussion or taking part in a debate, but, after the debate was over, setting right a mistake which had been made, and showing that a statement which af-

fected me and my learned friend, the Home Secretary, was, in fact, incorrect.

Now, Sir Henry James—and I think he is a good authority on questions concerning the etiquette of the English Bar of the British House of Commons, said :

But I am disposed to take a somewhat generous view of this rule. The object of the rule, no doubt, was that a person should not advocate the same cause in this House for which he had received fee or reward out of it.

Whether that is pleasant to the hon. gentleman or not, I made the point fairly in debate, and will make it when I have the opportunity, for he cannot take people by the beard, he cannot ride rough-shod over the people of this country and declaim about the rights of either the minority or the majority, without having to admit that for a large portion of his eloquence and a larger portion of the study he has given to the question, he has been well paid by the client whose cause he is pleading. I make the point in fair debate with the best precedents, and I stand by the position I have taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be just as well, perhaps, that the House and the country should understand that whether the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was or was not the paid advocate in his professional capacity of the Manitoba Government, it is tolerably well known that the hon. gentleman is remaining here at a great sacrifice of remunerative professional engagement for the purpose of doing what he considers, rightly or wrongly, to be his duty That, I think, may be fairly set against the very ungenerous and uncalled-for attack that the Minister of Justice has made upon him

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to add some further remarks to the very case that the Minister of Justice brought up to prove that the hon. member for North Simcoe was wrong in the attitude he has assumed. If the hon. gentleman had read fully the debate from the "Hansard" with regard to that case, he would have been able to read the decision of the Speaker in direct opposition to what he has quoted, and he would have seen that the quotation from Sir Richard Webster means exactly the opposite of what he stated it to mean. What was the case? Mr. Conybeare, brought before the attention of the Attorney General, at that time Sir Charles Russell, the question of a member of the House having been engaged in a criminal prosecution, and whether that member was at liberty to engage in a discussion in the House with regard to that case. The Attorney General was inclined to think that the member was not entitled to engage in that discussion and so expressed himself. Mr. McNeill then inquired whether the proposed amendment was not in distinct contravention of the rule of the House :

He referred to the rule of 22nd June, 1888, which laid it down as derogatory to the dignity of the House for any of its members to bring forward, promote, or advocate in the House any proceeding or resolution in which he might have acted or been concerned for or in consideration of any pecuniary fee or reward.

And then he went on to make some further remarks. Then the Speaker being thus appealed to by Mr. McNeill gave his clear decision. I will read that decision, and the House will see that the rules referred to have no reference to a case of this kind, and they will see what they do refer to :

Mr. SPEAKER. As I have been appealed to, I am bound to express an opinion on the subject ; but the hon. gentleman has not given me much time to consider it. There are two resolutions of this House dealing with the question. One was passed in the year 1830, and the other in 1858. In the year 1830 it was alleged that members of this House promoted, for pecuniary reward, private Bills in which they were professionally interested, and a resolution was passed forbidding any member, by himself or by his partner, to promote in this House private Bills in which he was engaged. In the year 1858 another allegation was made, namely, that that rule had been evaded, and that members of this House, in taking up cases, were really paid for advocating those cases in the House, and a very stringent resolution was passed, which by the leave of the House, I will read : "It is contrary to the usage and derogatory to the dignity of this House that any of its members should bring forward, promote or advocate in this House any proceeding or measure in which he may have acted or been concerned for or in consideration of any pecuniary fee or reward."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARTIN. He quotes the rule ; he then goes on to apply the rule to the case in question.

Mr. WALLACE. Apply it to this case.

Mr. MARTIN. I will, presently.

The House will see that was strictly confined to the cases in which a member, in his public capacity, as a member of Parliament, advocated a particular personal cause, or promoted any case and received a pecuniary reward for so doing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has left out a part.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon gentleman will surely give me an opportunity to make my point.

That, I think, is the distinction. I cannot, therefore, say that it is contrary to the rules of this House for any member who has been engaged in a criminal case, to engage in this House on a subsequent occasion in a debate relating to the same case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will not object to my pointing out that strangely enough the "Hansard" does not read as the hon. gentleman has read. And the hon. gentleman reads what is not here in "Hansard" at all.

Mr. MARTIN. I have the London "Times." Then if I go on and read, just as the hon. gentleman did, what Sir Richard Webster said.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In fairness to me, as both the hon. member for North Simcoe and myself are being criticised, will the hon. gentleman allow me to read what is in the "Hansard," and is not in the "Times," in the Speaker's decision ?

Mr. MARTIN. I think it would be better for me to continue my remarks and let the hon. gentleman speak again if he desires to do so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that I have no right to speak again.

Mr. MARTIN. Sir Richard Webster goes on in these words, which are in "Hansard," and which the hon. Minister read :

I shall not, of course, introduce into this discussion the slightest element of personal consideration. But my recollection does not quite accord with that of my hon. and learned friend. * * * * If that applies to my hon. and learned friend, the Attorney General, it applies, unquestionably, to the hon. and learned member for York, to the hon. and learned member for a Scotch constituency, and to some others who made speeches in this House while the proceedings were pending, and with reference to matters which must have come, to a certain extent, to their knowledge as counsel in the case. If I may humbly say so, I believe, from my study of the question, that you, Mr. Speaker, have laid down the correct rule—that the Standing Orders of this House, and the rules which govern men apart from Standing Orders, forbid any member bringing forward or supporting in the House any measure for the purpose of obtaining a fee or reward.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And further——

Mr. MARTIN. And further——

That is the letter and the spirit of the understanding which should actuate members of my own profession and all other members.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There again "Hansard" differs.

Mr. MARTIN. What does Sir Henry James say ? The hon. Minister of Justice has no right to interrupt me in this way. Sir Henry James says :

I do not know whether there is any question before the House, and, therefore, whether I am in order in saying one word on a question which affects both persons and our profession. As regards the point of order, I would really suggest that there be no question raised on this matter. I will, if I may, show how little the rule that has been read, applies. Suppose I, as the counsel who had prosecuted James Egan, had stood by the side of the Home Secretary and said I thought there would be no impropriety in his bringing a fair discretion in that case, would I be shut out from expressing that opinion by virtue of this rule ? And, if it would be improper to discuss the prerogative of mercy from a hostile point of view, it would be equally out of order to say a word from a favourable point of view.

Now, what is the principle that lies at the back of all this ? What was the object of these rules passed by the House of Commons in England ? The object was to prevent a member of Parliament from using his position to promote a thing he had been paid to promote. Would the hon. Minister of Justice suggest for a moment that the hon. member for North Simcoe made the remarks he did to this House because he had been paid by the Manitoba Government to do so ? The hon. member for North Simcoe has a reputation in this country so far as these matters are concerned which will not be effected by any attacks of that kind by the hon. Minister of Justice. Suppose a case : Mr. Christopher Robinson has been counsel for the Manitoba Government in this matter. Suppose he should become Minister of Justice in the Government of the Dominion ; suppose afterwards a question on the same lines as this came before this Parliament ;—would Christopher Robinson a Minister of Justice, bound to defend his Government, bound to lay down the law on behalf of his Government, be precluded from doing so because at some time in the past he had received remuneration from the province of Manitoba in connection with this litigation? The whole attack is absurd, it is most ridiculous, it is appealing to a rule which was laid down for a purpose which the Minister of Justice would not dare to charge upon the hon. member for North Simcoe. I agree with the just indignation which has been shown by the hon. member for North Simcoe on account of this most uncalled-for attack, and I believe the best opinion on both sides of this House agrees in resenting the attack that was made upon him by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. DALY. I am sure the House has been very much edified by the warmth shown by the hon. member for Winnipeg. He stands upon the same platform with the hon. member for Simcoe as he stood in Portage la Prairie in 1889, when he started this unfortunate trouble.

Mr. MARTIN. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. DALY. It has a great deal to do with it, because the hon. gentleman has exhibited a considerable amount of warmth in the defence of his friend from North Simcoe. Now, to be fair to the Minister of Justice, it is only right that I should read from the English "Hansard" what the Speaker did say. Now, this is official :

To say that any man who has been engaged in a criminal case is not to engage in this House on a subsequent occasion in a debate relating to the same case, I cannot, because as far as the rules of this House are concerned I do not think it is contrary to them. I can quite understand that it would be highly improper for any member to take part in a discussion here on a case in which

he was concerned, and which was still undecided ; but after the case had been decided, then there might be information at his disposal which could be usefully supplied for the conduct of the debate. I am not about to set my opinion against that of the judges of the land, or to say that it is contrary to, or in accordance with, professional etiquette for any member of this House to make use of facts or information which have been gained by him either for or against a case. The House will therefore see, on the point of order, that I cannot stand in the way of the hon. gentleman to whom reference has been made, bringing on this matter ; but at the same time I shall leave it to the legal profession to decide whether it is contrary to legal etiquette for hon. and learned members to take part in a debate under the circumstances.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR. As you, Mr. Speaker, have ruled that it is a question of legal etiquette, may I again press the hon. and learned gentleman as to whether it is not the fact that, 'pendente lite,' and before the decision of the commission, he intervened in the debate, and used these words with regard to my hon. and learned friend who sits near me (Sir R. Webster) : "I did think that the conduct of the case had been unfair to the defendants." I must again press him for his views on that point in the light of the answer he gave to the question of the hon. member for Camborne.

Sir CHARLES RUSSELL. If the right hon. gentleman will tell me what was the occasion on which the language was used, I will answer his question. I have no reason to doubt the entire accuracy of what I have said. When the statement to which the right hon. gentleman refers was made, as he says, 'pendente lite,' there was no 'lis perders' ; and there is an entire absence of analogy between that case and this case. Although strongly provoked, I abstained from taking part in the debate on the occasion referred to.

Then Sir Richard Webster says :

I think no hon. member should in his capacity as a member of this House, advocate afterwards any case in respect of which he has received fee or reward.

Then Sir Charles Russell said :

I wish the House to be in possession of the exact facts of the case. I have now referred to "Hansard," and find that my recollection was strictly accurate.

Then Sir Henry James, whom the hon. gentleman was quoting, says :

The object of the rule no doubt was that a person should not advocate the same cause in this House for which he had received fee or reward out of it. Although my hon. and learned friend the Attorney General has said that there was no litigation in respect of the Parnell Commission, there certainly was a proceeding which comes within the terms of Lord Hotham's rule, and I am not disclosing any confidence when I say—for I have mentioned in this House before—that I felt that fact so strongly, that after the determination of the proceedings, and after the report had been made, and when the matter came up for discussion before this House, I appealed to the present Attorney General, and I offered him that if he and all the other counsel, the Home Secretary and the members for Dumfries and York would abstain from discussing that proceeding, in which they had been engaged, I and the late Attorney General would also abstain. My hon. and learned friend clung to his right, for reasons I do not complain of, and I am sorry to say the House on that occasion had to listen to six learned counsel who had been in the case. But I wish to say this is a question entirely for the consideration of the hon. and learned gentleman who brings forward this amendment. If he thinks, after taking advice from those who act with him, that he will not bring to bear upon the discussion any question which will have an influence cast into it by his being professionally retained in the case, then he is within his right in bringing forward this amendment.

But the report of the "Hansard" is entirely different to the one the hon. gentleman has read from the "Times," and bears out the contention that was made by the Minister of Justice in his reply. Now, here is the rule laid down by May, at page 82 :

A member is accordingly incapable of practising as counsel before the House or any committee. By resolution, 26th February, 1830, members of the House of Commons are prohibited from engaging, either by themselves or by a partner, in the management of private bills before this or the other House of Parliament, for pecuniary reward. Nor is it consistent with parliamentary or professional usage for a member to advise as counsel upon any private bill or other proceedings in Parliament.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has done great service for the cause of good government by reading that last quotation from May. He has put the whole case in a nutshell. This rule is intended to prevent members from practicing before the Private Bills Committees.

I would ask the Minister of Justice to turn his attention to the real meaning of the rule, which is to prevent members of this House from promoting Bills before committees of this House. Sir, I remember—the hon. gentleman does not, he was not here at the time, nor in politics at all—when the chairman of a Private Bills Committee, a gentleman on that side of the House, had to step down and out of the chair because he was concerned in the promotion of a Bill then before the committee. The older members of the House will remember the case to which I refer. The rule laid down in the quotation just made from May, is intended to prevent members profiting by their position as members of this House. Let me also point out that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was mistaken when he supposed that the English "Hansard" was official. The English "Hansard" is not an official publication.

Mr. DALY. It is as official as the "Times."

Mr. CASEY. Yes, and no more official than the "Times." The English "Hansard" is a private speculation, and is, I believe, chiefly condensed from the "Times." There is a lot of details in the "Times" that does not appear in the "Hansard" ; but to pretend that the "Hansard" is any better authority than the source from which

it is taken, is an absurdity that only a very young member of the House would have fallen into. I am not astonished at the Minister of Justice, or the Minister of the Interior falling into that mistake. My hon. friend from Winnipeg is even a younger member than they are, but with his four years' experience, he knows better than that, and was able to teach a lesson to the Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior on a question of parliamentary procedure.

Now, to pretend that in this country where questions of constitutional law are being argued all the time before the courts, no counsel who has had the good fortune to be employed on a case could ever speak in this House on that case afterwards, is an absurdity worthy of the source from which it comes. To pretend that counsel who are eminent enough to get charge of such cases, must never afterwards speak of them in the House of Commons, is a contention that may well befit a beginner, a gentleman as youthful in the legal profession as the hon. Minister of Justice. But when he applies that contention to a man of ten times his eminence in the profession, of twenty times his eminence in the House, he is doing himself all the injury that he can. Now, I am glad this point has been discussed, I am glad it has been settled out of the mouth of the friend of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daly), to whom he handed that rule in May to be read for reference. I am glad it is settled out of his own mouth, that the rule of the English House of Commons does not apply to this case at all. I am glad this question has been settled because it does not concern this particular debate but the principle of debate in this House, and I hope that attention having been called to it, a stop will be put to the practice of the promotion of private Bills by members and even by Ministers before committees of the House.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 17th July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the House to assent to the following motion:—

Mr. CASEY.

That for the remainder of the session two sittings be held, one each day commencing at 10 o'clock and continuing until 1.30, and the other commencing at 3 o'clock and continuing till the hour of adjournment.

The committees have finished their work, and I imagine all the members are anxious to close the House as speedily as possible. I hope there will be no objection to this motion.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not prepared to give my assent to this motion just now. There is a matter of which I have privately spoken to the leader of the House, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow the motion to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. I will let it stand for the time being.

ST. PETER'S CANAL.

Mr. CASEY (for Mr. Fraser) asked, Has the attention of the Government been directed to the following editorial in the North Sydney "Herald" of June 26th, 1895, headed "St. Peter's Canal," in which among other things it is stated: "It may be that before letting this latter contract the officers of the department having this work in charge have not been sufficiently careful in their examination of the conditions of the work. This may become a matter for the Government to deal with." If so, what do the Government propose doing in the matter? 2. When will the St. Peter's Canal be opened for traffic?

Mr. HAGGART. The attention of the Government was called to the article in the North Sydney "Herald," for the first time by this inquiry. The facts are that the superintending engineer took every care in the examination of the condition of the lock, before an appropriation for the repairs was asked for. Diver Sutherland thoroughly examined into the condition of the lock and gates in June 1892, and again in October, 1893, on which occasions he reported the wooden floor as destroyed, and the gates badly eaten by the teredo (a sea worm), but to be doubly sure, and to fully test the report, the superintending engineer subsequently employed Diver James Simpson to examine the lock and especially the gates, and he fully corroborated Sutherland's statement in every essential particular, so that it will be observed great care was taken to ascertain the condition of the lock and gates before the letting of the contract for the work of repairs. The contractor failed to carry the work through to completion, and it is being done by the Government by days' labour, at his expense. Owing to the contractor failing to complete the work, delay necessarily arose in prosecuting it, but it is hoped the canal will be open for traffic some time in August proximo.

ROAD AT FENELON FALLS.

Mr. CASEY (for Mr. Edgar) asked, Has the Government received any conveyance of, or any written authority to fill up the short street or road in the village of Fenleon Falls, which lead from Colborne Street to the steamboat landing at the entrance to the locks? If yes, by whom was the conveyance or written authority given or signed? What was its date, and what was the consideration paid by the Government?

Mr. HAGGART. The Government have not received any conveyance or written authority to fill up the old road in the village to Fenelon Falls, but as soon as the Government's attention was drawn to the fact of the contractors when building the lock, had left debris on the road, orders were given the superintending engineer to level and grade the road.

VACANCY IN THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. CASEY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the leader of the House and the House to a question I have put before in another form without obtaining any reply. The question is, how and when do the Government intend to fill the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture? I have before me a very prominent organ, which speaks more particularly for the farmers than any other paper in Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to conclude his remarks with a motion?

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps Mr. Speaker will permit me to continue.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may, with the indulgence of the House, ask why the place has not been filled, but he cannot make a speech.

Mr. CASEY. If you rule so now it is all right, but you have never ruled so before, under similar circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER. Oh, yes; I have always ruled that way.

Mr. CASEY. The farmers are very excited about this matter, as stated in the organ of theirs which I have here, but which I cannot quote from now. I think myself that this portfolio should be filled, especially at this season of the year, and that the department should no longer be left in the hands of irresponsible parties, such as the director of the dairy industry and the director of the Experimental Farm.

Mr. FOSTER. I can inform my hon. friend that the department is not left in irresponsible hands. It has been administered by a member of the Government,——

Mr. CASEY. Who?

Mr. FOSTER—and my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) will have to repose faith enough in the Government, and in their good-will towards the interests of the farmers, to allow them the time they consider necessary, in the use of their own judgment, to make this appointment.

Mr. CASEY. The statement is made in Conservative papers that it will not be filled until next session.

THE DROUTH IN ONTARIO.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have a letter from a valued correspondent in the county of Grey, telling me of the terrible effects of the dry weather on the pastures and on hay. He says that the pasture is entirely destroyed, and that it is almost impossible for the farmers to keep their cattle. They have been obliged to import hay, and they are forced to pay very high freight rates for it on the railroads. My correspondent has urged upon me to bring this matter to the attention of the Government, in order to see if it is possible to get the Government to use their influence with the railway companies, so that the commodities required to keep cattle from starving might be carried in at cheaper rates than they now pay. From Toronto to Durham, from which place the complaint is made, where the hay is required, they are now obliged to pay 17 cents per 100 pounds for freight, and other products are charged in like high proportion. I would urge upon the Government that they should do something with the railway companies so as to afford these people better facilities for getting in hay and other products to keep their cattle from starving. We have given seed grain and made other concessions to people, and I hope the Government will take this matter into their serious consideration, so as to, if possible, alleviate the distress which prevails. My correspondent further tells me that in some localities they have been obliged to cut down trees in order to allow the cattle some opportunity of feeding and sustaining themselves. I hope that Mr. Speaker, and the House, will pardon me for bringing up this matter, as it is, perhaps, the last opportunity I will have of calling the attention of the Ministers to it this session. The Government will have an opportunity in the meantime of making inquiries, and if they find the condition as my correspondent describes, and my correspondent is a very reliable and respectable man, I hope they will take some steps to relieve the difficulties, and the privations and the excessive railway charges which our farmers labour under.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government has heard with regret the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) that we are to be deprived of his presence in this Chamber, and that this is the last time he will have an opportunity of bringing such an important matter before the House. The Government also sympathizes with the farmers who suffer affliction from the drouth, and in so

far as the powers of the Government warrant, they feel inclined to give very respectable and considerate attention to the subject mentioned by my hon. friend.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I appreciate the kindness of the hon. Minister. I meant that it was the last time I might have an opportunity this session. I can inform him that I will not have to run away from my county, nor go over a bridge to another county.

SUPPLY—THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, and the motion of Mr. McCarthy in amendment thereto.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Speaker, after the exhaustive speeches that we have heard yesterday, there is very little left to say on the legal part of the question now before the House, as raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I will, however, try to give as brief a history as I can of the whole question, as it has occurred in the province which I have the honour and pleasure to represent in this House. The schools in Manitoba were established in the earliest days of the existence of that country as a colony. When Lord Selkirk attempted to colonize the Red River Valley, his first care was to procure missionaries and to provide education for the children of those who had become inhabitants of that country. The population then, besides the Indians, was composed of the employees of the two respective companies that had been trading in Western Canada, and of the descendants of those employees. But none of them were properly called settlers until the noble lord made an attempt to create a colony, which although not perhaps successful at the start, has been the nucleus of the population of the province of Manitoba to-day. As early as the year 1818, at the request of Lord Selkirk, the Bishop of Quebec. Mons. Plessis, sent missionaries to the Red River Valley, in order to establish missions there, and also to provide for the education of their children. The first missionaries were the Rev. Messrs. Provencher and Dumoulin, and part of their instructions were as follows :—

The missionaries will take particular care of Christian education among children, and for this they will establish schools and catechisms in all localities they have occasion to visit.

Further on in their instructions we read :

The missionaries will establish their home in Fort Douglas (now a part of the city of Winnipeg), on the Red River ; will build a church, a house, and a school.

Upon starting on their long journey, these reverend gentlemen were provided with a letter of recommendation from His Excellency Sir John Cope Sherbrooke, who was then Captain General, and Governor General in and over the province of Upper and Lower Canada, and commander of His Majesty's forces therein. That letter is as follows :—

To all whom these presents shall come :

Whereas the Reverend Joseph Norbert Provencher, Severe-Joseph Nicholas Dumoulin and Guillaume Etienne Edge have been appointed by the Most Reverend Bishop of Quebec to proceed as missionaries to the Red River and adjacent Indian territories, there to disseminate the Christian religion and to afford to the inhabitants the benefit of the rites thereof, now know ye that, being desirous of furthering so pious and useful a work, and of offering the fullest protection and support in my power to the persons engaged in it, I do hereby call on all His Majesty's subjects, civil and military, and do request all other persons whomsoever to whom these presents shall come, not only to permit the said missionaries to pass without hindrance or molestation, but render them all good offices, assistance and protection wherever they shall find it necessary to go in the exercise of their holy calling.

Given under my hand and seal-at-arms, at the Castle of St. Louis, in the city of Quebec, this twenty-ninth day of April, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighteen, and in the fifty-eighth year of His Majesty's reign.

(Signed) J. C. SHERBROOKE.

By His Excellency's command,
(Signed) ANDREW WM. COCHRAN,
Secretary.

Therefore the first settlement of missionaries in that district was under the auspices of the civil authority—under the auspices of the Governor General of the then provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. After the settlement of those missionaries and the starting of their schools, the other denominations came later on, and likewise established missions and schools. So that from the earliest period up to the time of the entry of the colony into the Dominion of Canada as the province of Manitoba there existed the schools of three different denominations—the Roman Catholic, which were the first, established in 1818, the Presbyterian, established in 1821, and after that the Anglican. Up to the time of confederation these schools worked admirably ; there was no friction, and they were recognized by the then existing civil authorities—by the Government of the colony of Assiniboia. Grants of money were made and the people were taxed for their support, each settlement and each denomination having its own school. At the time of the entry of the colony of Assiniboia into the confederation as the province of Manitoba, this question of schools was, of course, discussed ; and it was insisted upon, if not by the whole, at least by the largest portion of the population, that what had been won before should be maintained ; that is to say, that each denomination should have the free exercise of its privileges. No matter what may be the opinion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) about the respective bills of rights, it is a fact that

one of the conditions of the entry of that colony into the Dominion of Canada was that it should enjoy a system of separate schools. So much was that the case that the negotiations that then took place between the central Government here and the delegates from the colony of Assiniboia resulted in the adoption of the Manitoba Act, which is an almost verbatim copy of the bill of rights which is now recognized as the one that was used in those negotiations. With regard to the authenticity of that bill of rights, we have the affidavit of the only surviving delegate, and the only surviving person who had anything to do with those negotiations, in which he declares that the bill of rights used in those negotiations was the one that was produced in the Lépine case in the courts of Winnipeg in 1874. There is one thing sure: when that bill of rights was produced in the courts at that time, there was no intention at all that it should be used for any other purpose than the purpose of that trial; and that it was a genuine bill of rights has been proven by subsequent facts. Now, is it to be wondered at that the Manitoba Act should contain such provisions as those which exists with regard to schools? Not in the least, because the clause regarding education in the Manitoba Act is only a repetition, with very slight modifications, of the provisions on the same subject contained in the British North America Act. I say more: I say that the spirit of the constitution is in favour, if not of the establishment, at least of the maintenance of separate schools wherever such schools are created, or wherever they exist by law or by practice; because where such a system was in existence by law or by practice prior to the entry of a province into confederation, or where it is thereafter established, it becomes unchangeable. That is to say, it cannot be altered or abolished either by the local power or by the federal power. Therefore I say the spirit of the constitution is in favour of the maintenance of separate schools, and we must not be surprised that there should have been a difference between the first judgment rendered on this question by the Privy Council and the second judgment, because in the first case the contention was that we had a system of separate schools by practice, if not by law, prior to our entry into the confederation, and that the local legislature had no power to abolish or alter that system in such a way as to affect the principle. That was the only question that came before the Privy Council in the first case. In the second case, the question took a different form. We presented a petition to the federal authorities here, based on the rights which we were entitled to exercise under the British North America Act with regard to the schools that were established by the legislature of the province of Manitoba after our entrance into the confederation; and the Manitoba Act, as I have stated, protects the mainteance of such schools. Subsection 1 of the Act reads as follows:—

> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class or persons had by law in the province at the union.

That was our first contention, under the Manitoba Act, in the first case that went before the Privy Council. The subsection reads as follows:—

> Where, in any province, a system of separate or dissentient schools existed by law at the union, or was thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

It was under this section, and the one corresponding to it in the Manitoba Act, that, in the last case, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council found that our rights and privileges had been interfered with and removed by the Act passed by the Manitoba legislature in 1890. These rights we had acquired under the Provincial Act which was passed after our entry into confederation. So that the question is not whether this House should establish a system of separate schools or allow the so-called system of public schools to be perpetuated in Manitoba. The question is not whether we are in favour of separate schools or opposed to that system, and we are not called on to give a decision according to the feelings we may have in favour of the one system or the other. Our position to-day is the same as would be that of a judge in deciding a case, in which he may have a personal opinion, but in which he must decide according to the law and the facts. Here we have to decide according to the facts, according to the law, and according to the constitution. Whether we are in favour of the one or the other system is immaterial, we have to give justice unto whom justice is due. Now, although I have established these premises, although I have established that in the question before us we are not called on to decide whether we are opposed to or in favour of any special system of schools, still, I have to follow the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in some of the arguments he made and especially in some of the statements he made when presenting his motion. But, before doing so, I propose to show that from the entry of Manitoba into confederation up to the law of 1890, the system then in force was perfectly acceptable to the people, and that there were no reasons for abolishing it. There was neither legal nor any other grounds or reasons. The system was abolished simply and solely because those who abolished it were opposed to it, and they abolished it regardless of the sentiments and views of those who were

enjoying the system. If we go back to the time when this system was in force, we find several proofs that it was very acceptable to the people at the time, not only was it acceptable to them but they were opposed to any change, on account of the probable bad results and on account of the trouble that any change would cause in the community. But, coming back to my first point, I claim, in spite of what has been said to the contrary, that the system we had before was a good one; and I have to endorse my contention by the statements of men who certainly cannot be charged with being partial to separate schools, men even who have, perhaps, since altered their minds with regard to that system; but if they did so, the change could not have been disinterested on their parts. Dr. Bryce, who is a member of the present board of advisers in Winnipeg, and who is to-day defending the present school system, wrote, in 1887, when there was no question at all of any change, as follows:—

The separate school supporters are viewed in the light of being exempt from the general law which establishes a national system of education. In Manitoba, the Roman Catholic schools are as much national as the Protestant. No special rights are given to either Catholics or Protestants.

Dr. Bryce is a Presbyterian, and professor of Manitoba College. In the same year, the reverend professor wrote as follows:—

The Government grant is voted for one system of schools, and is divided according to the population of children. No special rights are given either Catholics or Protestants. All moneys are equitably distributed.

Now, this reverend professor who has written a good many books, wrote a book entitled "Manitoba, its infancy, growth, and present condition." He wrote this book in 1882, just a few years before the abolition of separate schools. In it he said:

Lord Selkirk's scheme of perfect religious equality and toleration is that still subsisting in Manitoba. * * * There is no bone of contention to disturb the prevailing harmony. No church is given any place of precedence.

Now, Sir, I have here an abstract from the report made by Mr. J. B. Somerset, at the time superintendent of schools:

In connection with its working (the law) during the last seventeen years, it may be pointed out that the schools of the province have been managed without a particle of the denominational friction that has caused disturbance and bitterness in other provinces of the Dominion. * * The past history of the province encourages the hope that perfect justice to each interest shall result in a continuance of the harmony that now exists.

This is another Protestant gentleman who speaks very freely, very openly, very frankly and very honestly. A certain Dr. Morrison, who is now living in the maritime provinces

was school inspector for the Protestant schools for a time. He wrote last year as follows—

Throughout all these years, from 1871 to 1888, no complaint was ever made with the workings of the separate school system. * * * The people, Protestant and Catholic alike, were perfectly contented with the school system as it then existed.

Now, Sir, it remains to ascertain why the change took place, why the system was modified. As shown by these proofs that I have given, the system was accepted by the people, all were thoroughly content and no change was asked. The answer is easy; it is that politics was introduced into the question; politics took hold of the question in order to use it for political purposes. That is the only reason why a change was made. And who was the first man to promote that change? He was no less than the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). At a time when nobody in Manitoba thought of making a change in the constitution of the province on this question of education, when nobody knew there was any dissatisfaction on that question, the hon. member for North Simcoe took into his head that he ought to start an agitation in that direction. And, not being satisfied, perhaps, that he would meet with sufficient success in his native province, he came and started this disturbance in the province of Manitoba. He made a speech at Portage la Prairie; and my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), who was present, will remember the circumstances. But, Sir, the hon. member for North Simcoe did not content himself with having started that agitation, but he came back here to the city of Ottawa and made a report of what he had done there; and attempted to make predictions as to what the future would bring forth in this movement of his. I have here the report of a speech that the hon. gentleman made in the city of Ottawa, before the Equal Rights Association of this city. He was at the head of that movement at the time. I do not know that he is at the head of it yet. There is no tail to that movement, so there can be no head. He said:

We have a record for eight months, Mr. Chairman—I mean the Equal Rights Association—which any political party could boast of in a decade of years; and if there are men among us now who want to go back to their old political alliances, I say, Shame on them. They ought to be satisfied with what we have accomplished in so short a time. (Loud cheers.) What have we accomplished? Go to the province of Manitoba, and what do we see there? Why, the government is going to deal, not only with the dual language question and the iniquitous Act which was fastened upon them, but with the separate schools. I had the honour of standing upon the same platform at Portage la Prairie with the Attorney General of the province——

My hon. friend from Winnipeg will remember it, as I have said before.

—when he announced his position, in anticipation of the action of his government, that he would cease to sign cheques for the publication of the statutes in the dual language, or he would cease to be Attorney General.

He has done both.

Do you tell me the Equal Rights Association had nothing to do with that question? Of course, the feeling was there; the grievance existed, the people's minds had only to be directed to it, and the moment attention was drawn to it, the province of Manitoba rose as one man and said: We want no dual language, and away with separate schools as well. (Applause.) Let me prove that what I say is correct. There ought to be no sympathy between Attorney General Martin and myself, according to political creed. He is a Liberal; I am a Conservative; therefore, we should be sworn foes.

In the course of his address he said, further:

He was glad to notice that at last the Protestant minority of Quebec had waked up, and at an early day he hoped to have the pleasure of addressing them in Montreal on the question. They all had their hands full. In Ontario they would have to deal with the question of French teaching in the schools; in Manitoba they had the dual language to deal with, and in the North-west they had the same question. As soon as the work had been accomplished, they would be in a position to master the same difficulties in the province of Quebec.

That is the origin of the abolition of the separate schools in Manitoba. When the contention is raised that the schools are abolished because they were ineffective, because they were not good schools, I say that that contention was never used or raised when the abolition of the schools took place. The only argument brought forward by the Attorney General at the time when he introduced that Act was not that he had anything to say about the management or the state of the schools at the time, but that the policy of the Government was to abolish the system and nothing else. Now, Sir, that is the fact; because I remember that in the debates that took place at the time it was never contended that the schools were ineffective or that there were any such things in existence as are reported to-day by those who want to justify their action of that time. Now, the hon. member for North Simcoe has repeated the charges against the old system that the Attorney General of the present day, Mr. Sifton, made upon a previous occasion. I have before me a speech delivered by Mr. Sifton, the Attorney General of Manitoba, as reported in the "Globe" on the 25th April last. Mr. Sifton, in the course of his speech explained the state of things prior to 1890, and is reported to have said:

Mr. Sifton then explained the state of things prior to 1890. There were, he said, what might be called two systems of public schools in existence, a Protestant system and a Catholic system, with a Board of Education having a Catholic section and a Protestant section. The Board of Education absolutely controlled the system, the Catholic section their schools, and the Protestant section the Protestant schools. Each section received its grant and the government was not seen at all in the system. This state of things lasted from 1871 to 1890, and the people, therefore, had had ample time to see how it worked out. The way that it did work out was that the teachers placed in charge of the schools were not fit to teach anywhere. The examination papers on which they got their certificates, were such as would be set for boys of nine years of age. Then, the attendance at school was not looked after at all. The schools were not opened regularly, and there was no inspection. The money grants were paid all the same, although schools might not have been opened more than three or four days a week, or for only two or three months in the year. Another objectionable thing about the old system of Catholic schools was that the accommodation was simply abominable, except in the case of about twelve or fifteen out of the whole number. Although this was the case, these Catholic schools were getting about twice as much under the government grant as the Protestant schools were. The result of all this was that, under this system, one generation of French Catholics grew up absolutely illiterate. Mr. Sifton here referred to petitions sent to the Government, in which six out of seven of the petitioners were unable to sign their names, and had to make their marks. Since he had come to Ontario on this present visit, he had received an urgent petition sent to the government, and signed by 27 French half-breeds. Of these 24 made their marks, and only 3 signed their names. This was not a pleasant thing to tell, but it was true, and was the result of the old system. One could go from one end of Manitoba to the other, and he would not find among the business or professional men a young man from any of those families. The children of such families remained on the farm where they were born. There was no idea of progress among them. If this system were imposed upon them permanently, it would simply make them hewers of wood and drawers of water.

Of course, this is a campaign speech, but I have never yet seen such a tissue of falsehoods as the one I have just read to this House. I say that the Catholic schools at that time were on an equal footing with the other schools. I say, moreover, that their programme of studies was more complete in fact, and contained more matter, than the programme of studies of the corresponding schools under the Protestant section of the Board of Education. I will not say they were better than the other schools, but I will say they were equal to the other schools. I have here the programme of studies that was adopted by the Board of Education and was in force in 1890, as compared with the programme of the Protestant schools:

By the Protestant Section.	By the Catholic Section.
1. Reading.	1. Reading.
2. Spelling.	2. Spelling.
3. Composition.	3. Composition.
4. Grammar.	4. Grammar.
5. Arithmetic.	5. Arithmetic.
6. Book-keeping.	6. Book-keeping.
7. Writing.	7. Writing.
8. Geography.	8. Geography.
9. History.	9. History.

10. Hygiene.
11. Morals and religious instruction.

10. Useful knowledge.
11. Morals and religious instruction.
12. Deportment or becomingness.
13. Vocal music.
14. Drawing.
15. Dual languages.

So that in the programme of the Roman Catholic schools, there were three branches that were not included in the programme of the Protestant schools. Moreover, I will say that there were not two schools, I think, out of the whole number, where the dual language was not taught. It has always been supposed that these schools were entirely French, that is to say, that only the French language was taught therein. Well, Sir, in many of those schools where the community was chiefly English-speaking, the schools, though Catholic, were entirely English schools; and in all the other localities, whether the population was mixed or not, both languages were taught, and are still taught in them. Now, with regard to the quality of those schools. In 1886, as the House is aware, there was a Colonial Exhibition held in London, and Sir Charles Tupper invited the Superintendent of the Roman Catholic schools, as well as the Superintendent of the Protestant schools, to send to that exhibition copy books and other work of the pupils. This letter reached the superintendent after the 29th July, when the schools were closed and the children were on their holidays. Within a few days after the receipt of this request, a person went around and picked up whatever copy books and other work done in the schools, he could procure, and he found that eight schools were able to send school work to compete in the Colonial Exhibition. Therefore eight of the Roman Catholic schools sent in exhibits to that exhibition, and the result was that eight diplomas came back, and eight medals were awarded. I have here, Sir, copy of a letter which was written by Sir Charles Tupper in reference to that exhibit:

Colonial and Indian Exhibition, 1886.
Canadian Section,
London, 29th July, 1886.

To T. A. Bernier, Esq.

My dear Sir,—I duly received your letter of the 3rd instant, and thank you for the memorandum which you have prepared on behalf of your section of the Manitoba educational exhibit. I shall be pleased to receive a thousand copies of the memorandum and to see that they are carefully distributed. The exhibit which you have taken such pains to collect has already attracted considerable attention, and I do not doubt it will add to the success of the Dominion at the exhibition.

I remain yours faithfully,
(Signed) CHARLES TUPPER.

William Clark, commonly known as Capt. Clark, who was in charge of the exhibit in London and who was a former resident of St. Boniface, the town where I reside, is not a Roman Catholic, but is, I believe, a Presbyterian. He wrote from London on 27th July, 1886, to Mr. Bernier as follows:—

I can speak with experience with reference to the excellence of your section, two of my daughters having been for a long time with the good sisters of St. Boniface, where their progress was as satisfactory to me as it was pleasant to them.

WILLIAM CLARK.

This was the result of the exhibit sent at the time to the Colonial Exhibition which was held in London in 1886. This was only three years prior to the passing of the Act complained of. It is contended in this House that those schools were not looked after, that the money was paid to them without any control being exercised. I say this, that every year the Superintendent of Education, who was at the same time treasurer of his section of the board, made a report to the Government as to what had been done with the money granted by the legislature to the respective sections of the board, and at no time was there any trouble and at no time was their attention called to the fact that the money was not properly distributed and not properly accounted for. I exercised the functions of Superintendent of Education for three years, and on no occasion was I ever called upon to make any further reports than those yearly made by myself, and this was the experience of my predecessor as well as my successor, to the Government as to what had been done with the moneys that had been granted. On the other hand, it is contended that there was no inspection made of those schools. Section 75 of the old Act provides as follows:—

75. It shall be the duty of every teacher:
(d). To keep a visitors' book, and make an entry therein of every visit; to offer the said book to all visitors, and to request them to note therein any remark which they may think proper.
(e). To allow at all times the trustees and visitors to inspect the registers and visitors' book.
(g). To hold, at the end of every year, at least one public examination.

Section 80 of the same Act is in the following words:—

80. The visitors in each school district may be:
(a). The priest or clergyman.
(b). The members of the provincial legislature.
(c). The judges of the Court of Queen's Bench and County Court.
(d). The members of the section of the board.
(e). The trustees of each school.

By the above provisions of the school law the Roman Catholic schools were open to inspection by 23 visitors being Roman Catholics and 38 Protestants, whilst for Protestant schools there were 55 Protestants and only 9 Roman Catholics. When I spoke about the change not being called for and it being only a move for political purposes, I should have brought to the attention of this House some debates that took place in the different religious bodies in the pro-

vince at the time. At a meeting of the Presbyterian Synod held in the city of Winnipeg on 22nd November, 1892—that is after the first decision of the Privy Council had been given,—Rev. Dr. Robertson read the following resolutions which were presented by the Committee on Education :

That this synod, in accordance with the position taken at previous meetings of the synod in favour of national schools, established in Manitoba in 1890. desires to express its continued anxiety for their complete establishment throughout the bounds of this synod. It declares its determined opposition to any measures looking towards interference with the provincial rights of Manitoba, which have, by the highest court of the realm, been ensured in the position taken in the School Act of 1890. It protests against any remedial legislation, aiming at the fastening of separate schools upon the province of Manitoba, or aiming at in any way making it possible for such to be maintained upon the public funds. The synod also reports the efforts of the friends of national schools in the Territories in seeking to have established a public school system suited for all classes of the people, and free from denominational bias. The synod further calls upon the people whom it represents to be vigilant and earnest in maintaining their rights in the premises, while at the same time cultivating a kind and patient spirit towards those who hold opposite views.

During the debate following this motion Rev. Dr. Bryce spoke as follows :—

He believed there was a great movement amongst the French people in favour of national schools. The resolution was not in favour of sectarian schools. He knew that the action of the Presbyterian Synod, as representing the strongest religious body in the North-west. in declaring for national schools two years ago, and which was sent to the Privy Council, had an important effect in the matter of the decision which was given.

Rev. Dr. King, a very highly educated and liberal-minded gentleman, who holds the position of President of Manitoba College and is head of the Presbyterian church in Manitoba, says :

Rev. Dr. King took strong objection to the resolution. First, he did not agree with Dr. Robertson, that religion should be relegated to the church and family.

He believed it would be bad for the state, if such were carried out.

One great difficulty he found was, that, he thought, in three of the resolutions they were transcending and entering the domain of party politics. These resolutions were far in excess of any previous ones passed by the body now in session. As individuals, they could have their opinions in this matter, but he did not think, as a Christian body, they should pass such resolutions. He did not think that it would deepen the church tone to have discussions on remedial legislation or provincial rights. He was surprised to see that those who framed the resolutions, favoured the North-west Territories School Act, which contained a clause debarring ministers from sitting as school trustees or holding any office in the education department. He could not see that the people needed any summons to stand by their rights. Some Presbyterians might take a different view of what were provincial rights from those held by Dr. Bryce and Dr. Robertson. They would then at once be disobeying the synod, and it was with one and another of their fellow Christians. It would place the Presbyterians of Winnipeg in the same relations as the Presbyterians of the Northern States were at the time of the great American rebellion, and the breach they made has never yet been healed. He believed it depreciated the tone of the church to make it the tool of a political party, which, by passing the resolutions, they would do. If they acted as the mover and seconder wished them to do, they might have very grave issues to encounter. He had no doubt that it would help on a particular party to pass these resolutions, so he would move, in amendment : That all the resolutions be omitted except the first one.

Rev. Mr. Farquharson (Pilot Mound) said he was sorry to part with his brethren in this matter, but he was strongly opposed to interference with Roman Catholic schools. The minority in Quebec were not receiving equal rights in school matters, and the Presbyterians of that province felt the injustice, and why should the Catholics in this province be treated unfairly ? While the state had the right to insist that every child should receive some education, it had no right to say how a child should be educated.

As he was proceeding to develop his idea, Rev. J. M. Douglas moved, seconded by Rev. C. W. Whyte : That the discussion be postponed until to-morrow. This was lost. Mr. Farquharson then moved an amendment to the effect, that, under the existing circumstances, the synod deprecated any attempt on the part of the province to collect taxes for public school purposes from such Roman Catholics as not only refused to take advantage of the public schools, but also supported their own schools.

A further clause proposed that such legislation be enacted as would put Catholic schools in the best form for carrying on their work.

Dr. King's motion, seconded by Professor Hart, that the resolution be amended by making the first one the deliverance of the house, was declared carried by a considerable majority.

Dr. King next moved, seconded by Rev. T. Wright : that the synod, in harmony with the decision of the general assembly of 1887 on the subject of religious instruction in the public schools, would earnestly deprecate any change in the existing school law of the province of Manitoba in the direction of the withdrawal or the abridgement of the right now enjoyed by the people to have, at the discretion of the duly elected school trustees of the province, being of the opinion that such withdrawal or abridgement is not required by any consideration of justice, and, besides being valueless as a measure of conciliation, would be both dishonouring to God and injurious to the interests of the state. In speaking of the motion, the mover held that the great aim of education and the interest of the state in education was to form character and good habits. He asked how such could be formed without religion and religious interests. He looked upon the making of the schools purely secular as an attempt simply to make things right by giving each a grievance. He said the Roman Catholics could have schools without the Bible, if they wished. The motion was carried.

Before this meeting was concluded, the Rev. James Farquharson handed in to be recorded on the minutes, his reasons for dissenting from the resolution, even as modified by Dr. King's motion. They were as follows :—

1. Although on parents, not on the state, devolves the duty of determining how the children are to be educated, yet the synod's resolution recommends the state to compel to support one system of schools.

2. At least some Roman Catholic parents are so thoroughly opposed to the education given in the public schools that, although compelled by law to support the said schools, they refuse to send their children to them, and voluntarily maintain parochial schools.

3. If the people in the province and of the Dominion are to become speedily one in sentiment, which all desire, the majority must deal, not only justly, but also generously, with the minority.

Mr. Farquharson added, after reading his reasons for dissent, that, if by any means, by compromise or otherwise, the present law should be found to be workable, no one would be more delighted than him.

I just wanted to show by this quotation that the unanimous sentiment in the province on this school question is not as represented by our opponents. On another occasion, even prior to the passing of the Act there was a meeting of the English Church Synod at Winnipeg, and the present primate of Canada, his Grace the Archbishop of Rupert's Land, spoke on the occasion. This meeting took place in December, 1889, prior to the passing of the Act. The Archbishop of Rupert's Land then said :

Criticisms that have been made on the addresses of Dr. King and myself suggest one or two remarks. I have seen it represented that we would prefer the present system of separate schools to any merely secular system. I do not hesitate to say that I would ; but at the same time I think this an unfair way of putting the matter. There is much in the present system that is objectionable that could be removed. Under proper restrictions, I see a measure of justice, and no injustice, in separate schools, and I do not think that it will be easy to do away with them. However the Roman Catholic authorities may approve of the subjects of religious teaching that Protestants would agree upon, they will accept no teachers but their own. The great majority of Roman Catholic children will, therefore, be sent to their own private schools rather than to state schools not under Roman Catholic instructors, whether there be religious teaching in them or not. If there is no religious teaching, there will be but the stronger expression of dislike. The day will come when one, if not both political parties will discover that it is undesirable for the state to have this inferior secular instruction, and unjust to the Roman Catholic section of the community, that, while getting no state aid for its private schools, it should have to contribute to the support of the state schools. And the separate schools will reappear—possibly, in an objectionable form. If Protestants allow the threatened secularization of the public schools, they may expect to see in a few years these two classes of state schools—Roman Catholic and secular. Will that be satisfactory ?

And further on :

The Roman Catholic Church might give its sympathy and aid in all that I propose, but we cannot look for this. In that case, I simply say that I should infinitely prefer that the Roman Catholic Church should continue to have separate schools under satisfactory conditions for the state, to our schools being without religious instruction.

Well, Sir, we have the admission of the promoter of this School Act of 1890 which we are complaining of that the schools which he intended to establish at the time were schools in which no religion should be taught, and that they were to be absolutely godless schools. I presume that the hon. gentleman has been very sincere on this question from the start, because he has never failed to express the same opinion whenever called upon to speak on the subject, and I will read some of his remarks. The Attorney General at the time, the present hon. member for Winnipeg, made this statement in the House when introducing his Bill :

The Government's position had not been determined because they were dissatisfied with the manner in which the affairs of the department are conducted under this system, but because they are dissatisfied with the system itself.

That does not accord with the contention of the hon. member for North Simcoe when he says that these schools were abolished because they were not properly conducted or administered or were not good schools. Now, what is the opinion of the promoter of the School Act ? The present member for Winnipeg, who was the promoter of the Act of 1890, is reported by the Winnipeg "Free Press" as having spoken on the 22nd of February, 1894, as follows :—

He was himself not satisfied with the School Act, and had never been so. He had made a strong effort to have the public schools, controlled by the government, really made national schools with religion obliterated. He was now more convinced than ever that that was the only school which would be justified as constitutional. It has been urged by satisfied supporters of the Act that none would complain of the devotional element introduced, as it was of the broadest nature, but they found that the Roman Catholics had the very greatest objection to this provision of the Act, and he was dissatisfied himself. * * It had been said that in the event of his opinions being adopted, our public schools would be godless schools, but by many staunch supporters of the School Act it had been privately admitted to him that the religious exercises practised in the schools at that time were without value. But as a matter of sentiment, they added,—oh, as a matter of sentiment, perhaps—but he could not understand such an argument. The Roman Catholics had honestly stated that in their belief the two forms of education should go together. The Protestants admitted, on the other hand, that it was impossible to have religious training in schools, and only asked that it be recognized, insisting, however, in imposing their views on others in that respect. Rather than that small amount of religious training should be done away with in the schools, the Protestants said they would prefer the old state of affairs. He would leave it to his audience to determine which was the more honest stand of the two.

We have a more recent production from the hon. gentleman, the letter which he

wrote on the 25th of June last, and which was published in the city papers here. In that letter I find the following :—

When I introduced the school Bill of 1890, I pointed out that in so far as it provided for religious exercises in the schools, it was in my opinion, defective. I am one of those who deny the right of the state to interfere in any respect of matters of religion. I said then, and I still think that the clause of the 1890 Act which provides for certain religious exercises is most unjust to the Roman Catholics. If the state is to recognize religion in its school legislation, such a recognition as is acceptable to Protestants only, and in fact only to a majority of Protestants, is to my mind rank tyranny.

The desire of those with whom I think in this matter is to eliminate every question of a religious nature from the school laws and to make the schools purely seculiar. This has not been done in Manitoba, and that course is apparently not supported by a majority of the people there. That being so, surely it will be admitted that the nature of religious exercises or religious teaching (I am unable to make any clear distinction between the two) should be such as is agreeable to the consciences of those whose money is taken to support the schools.

This is another proof that the schools as they exist in the province of Manitoba to-day are in reality a continuation of the Protestant schools that existed before the abolition of the separate schools system in 1890, and that they are still Protestant schools. Now, another charge made in the speech of Mr. Sifton is that some of the separate schools were not taught during the whole school year. Well, there might have been an exception ; but from my own experience—and I think I know something about them—those schools were kept open the whole school year round, that is to say, during the full 200 days, as required by law ; because no school that was not open and in operation during 200 days was entitled to receive the grant that was awarded by the section of the Board of Education to which it belonged. As to the qualifications of the teachers, I may say that they were up to the standard, and they compared very well with those of the Protestant schools. I know that at the time I was acting as Superintendent of Education most of the teachers came from the normal schools of Quebec and Montreal ; and in addition to the certificates which they brought from those schools, they had to pass the necessary examination provided by our own regulations. In those schools, as I have said, not only was the programme followed in its entirety, but the two languages, English and French, were taught, with very few exceptions. Now, it is contended again, that some of those schools were taught by priests. Well, there were, perhaps, in the distant districts, a few places where the people were too poor to support teachers who would require full salaries for their services, there were cases, very few, where the priests devoted themselves to teaching schools, but in so doing they never received money as priests, but as teachers, and in no case did they teach school or receive money unless they were properly engaged by the school trustees, who alone could entrust them with the teaching of those schools. I can give one instance of a place where the Catholic population is chiefly composed of half-breeds, and where a priest taught the school. This was Fort Ellice. The Hon. Senator Boulton, on one occasion, made the following statement with regard to the teaching there :—

In my immediate neighbourhood there is a separate school, named after the clergman, Father DeCorby, who founded it. He conducted a separate school there for years, to which the Protestant population in its neighbourhood went. They were all satisfied with the school ; they had no complaints to make of it.

Major Boulton is not a Roman Catholic, and he gave this statement of his own free will. It is said that most of these schools were not open half the time, that some of them were only open a day or two, and that they received the allowance. This I deny. That could not be the case, because no school could get an allowance unless the declaration be made under oath by the school teacher and certified to under oath by the two trustees, that the school had been running for at least 200 days in the year. Now, when I consider the percentage of attendance at the respective Protestant and Roman Catholic schools at different periods, I find that there was very little difference between the two. In 1881 the percentage of children enrolled in the total school population, was :

	Per cent.
Protestant schools	70
Catholic schools	66
Difference	4

In 1889—	Per cent.
Protestant schools	75
Catholic schools	69

Take the percentage of the average attendance of the total school population :

In 1881—	Per cent.
Protestant schools	34
Catholic schools	32

In 1889—	Per cent.
Protestant schools	52
Catholic schools	46

Not a great difference. Let us compare that with the average attendance in the schools since the inauguration of the new system of schools in 1890 :

In—	Per cent.
1891	43
1892	43
1893	41

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, these are the Protestant schools of to-day, the so-called public schools. Compare this with the per-

centage of the average attendance of the number of enrolled children in the schools previous to the Act:

PERCENTAGE OF THE AVERAGE ATTENDANCE TO THE NUMBER OF ENROLLED CHILDREN.

	Protestants.	Catholics.	
1881	40·8	50·2	
1889	65·7/10	66·4/10	
1891	56·3/10		Since the inauguration of the new system.
1892	55·8/10		
1893	48·7/10		

So that, under the new system, the attendance is less than it was under the old system when it reached as high as 65 per cent for the Protestants, and 66 per cent for the Roman Catholics, whereas, under the new system, the attendance in 1893 fell to 48 per cent. Take another table under the new system, the new school law, the new management, this improved school system as it is called. In 1891 out of 28,678, total population of pupils, 6,656 attended school less than fifty days in the year; 7,341 attended school less than fifty to one hundred days in the year; 13,996 attended from one hundred days and upwards, so that the majority of school children entered on the school register did not attend the school 100 days in the year. In 1892 the same proportion exists. In 1893 again the same proportion exists, as will be seen by the table:

	Attendance less than 50 days.	Attendance 51-100 days.	Attendance less than 100 days.	Total school population.
1891.....	6,656	7,340	13,996	28,678
1892.....	6,675	6,231	12,306	29,594
1893.....	7,539	8,414	15,953	34,417

So that under the present system the school children do not attend school on the average more than six months in the year, and some a great deal less. I shall not delay any more on this subject. We all know that soon after the passing of this Act, the Roman Catholic population of Manitoba took every possible constitutional step to have their grievances removed. Petitions after petitions were forwarded, and representations made, first to the local authorities, and later on to the federal authorities, and we all know the result. When I heard the hon. member for North Simcoe last night complaining that we gave very short notice to the Manitoba Government when we summoned them to come down to defend their cause before the Privy Council, it struck me that when the local legislature of Manitoba undertook to pass the Act abolishing our local schools in Manitoba, they gave us very short notice, indeed. In fact, after their minds had been made up to abolish those schools, they would not either heed any advice or retard the passing of the Act in order to ascertain whether their position was legal, under the constitution or not. Consulting the journals of the provincial

legislature, I find that several amendments were submitted before the passing of the Act asking that the question be delayed so that it might be considered by the proper courts of justice with a view to ascertaining whether the legislature in passing such a law was acting within its power or not. But it was of no avail, for the legislature had made up their minds to pass the law, and, whether right or wrong, whether they had the power or not, they were determined to keep their course. Now, one of the most reasonable amendments proposed was this:

Mr. Gelley moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Jerome: Whereas, grave doubts exist as to the constitutionality of the Bill, and the carrying out of the same would subvert all practices heretofore in use since the province entered confederation; and

Whereas, such radical changes, if put into force at once, would thereby cause great confusion, which will be greatly increased if said Bill be declared ultra vires';

Therefore, to avoid all such unnecessary changes and confusion, be it resolved, that the Bill (No. 13) respecting public schools be not now read a third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to strike out the last clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:—"This Act shall not come into force until the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada be obtained as to its constitutionality."

And the question being put on the amendment, the House divided, and names being called for, they were taken down as follows:—Gelley, Gillies, Jerome, Lagimodiere, Marion, Martin (Morris), Norquay, O'Malley, Prendergast, Roblin, Wood.

The nays numbered 25. Of the eleven who voted yea, six were Roman Catholics and five were Protestant Conservatives. Before I conclude, let me say a word about the rights of the parents, Protestants or Roman Catholics, to dictate what the education of their respective children shall be. I find that men of the highest standing have affirmed the rights of parents in this matter and have declared that any system that involves a denial of the parent's right of control, the right of parents to instruct their respective children according to their own creed and belief, is wrong. Mr. Gladstone, speaking on the subject of denominational schools, said:

As regards the existing denominational schools,——

In England, of course:

—it is a very grave and important question which we have to ask ourselves—whether we are frankly, ungrudgingly, willingly and systematically to make use of that powerful agency for the purpose of good secular instruction which is placed at our command in a great degree, if not exclusively, through the vigorous action of religious zeal and love? Let us not disguise from ourselves that this is a question of the greatest moment. The answer to it, I own, appears to me to be perfectly clear. The answer is, that nothing but folly could induce us to refuse to avail ourselves of an opportunity so valuable.

Now, this is the opinion of the great former leader of the great Liberal party in England. But here is the opinion of the leader of the Conservative party, Lord Salisbury, the present Premier, who has just come into power:

Numbers of persons have invented what I may call a patent compressible religion, which can be forced into all consciences with a very little squeezing; and they wish to insist that this should be the only religion taught throughout the schools of the nation. What I want to impress upon you is, that, if you admit this conception, you are entering upon a religious war of which you will not see the end. There is only one sound principle in religious education to which you should cling, which you should relentlessly enforce against all the conveniences and experiences of official men; and that is, that a parent, unless he has forfeited the right by criminal acts, has the inalienable right to determine the teaching which the child shall receive upon the holiest and most momentous of subjects. That is a right which no expediency can negative, which no state necessity ought to allow you to sweep away; and, therefore, I ask you to give your attention to this question of denominational education. It is full of danger and of difficulty; but you will only meet the danger by marching straight up to it, and declaring that the prerogative of the parent, unless he be convicted of criminality, must not be taken away by the state.

I might cite other authorities, but I will content myself with these two. I will, however, for the information of my hon. friend from North Simcoe, give him the report of a little gathering in my own beautiful province, in which he may find something for his edification. This extract is headed "An Indian on the School Question," and I would ask the hon. gentleman to give me his attention while I read it:

A number of religious, temperance, political and other bodies or organizations having offered expressions of sympathy and encouragement to the provincial government for the stand which has been taken on the Manitoba School question, a band of Indians who had encamped by the railway track and were having a picnic on the remains of an old horse that had been injured by a passing train, thought it their duty to offer expressions of sympathy and support to the government in their time of trial. The chief, who is known as The-man-who-catches-the-porcupine-with-his-hands, was appropriately attired for the occasion. His hat consisted chiefly of the skin and feathers of a he-owl; his coat was swallowtail, somewhat dilapidated, but still retaining traces of former magnificence; his trousers were made of a coffee sack, and when the violent gesticulations excited by eloquence caused the tails of the coat to part, the words Best Java, in black letters, could be noticed on his posterior. Chief Porcupine said that in the matter of the school question there was much need of sympathy. Catholics wanted devotion in schools, Protestants did not want devotion and were willing to turn religion out of their schools if Catholics would do the same. The government was sick on the matter, great chief Laurier was sick, great chief Greenway was sick, Chief Porcupine was sick, great newspaper man at Winnipeg was crazy and roars like a drunken Indian—everybody was sick, and Indians desire to express sympathy and to suggest that education like Indian education is best.

Now, Sir, I will close my remarks by stating that if we to-day are called upon to deal with this question, if to-day there is so much trouble and agitation throughout the Dominion, I may say that the primitive cause of all this is no less than the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment on the school question. He was the promoter of the legislation that we complain of, he was, I may say, the author of the movement that started at Portage la Prairie in 1889; and having pursued this course ever since, he now comes to this House and asks us to blame the Government for the promises they have made to remedy the grievance that we complain of. Sir, what have we done, a handful of Roman Catholics in Manitoba, that we should be treated in this way? When these rights and privileges are guaranteed to us by the constitution, why should this Parliament be called upon to deny us the enjoyment of those rights and privileges? When the Imperial Privy Council has decided in our favour, is this House to set up its judgment above theirs, and is this House to deprive a few Roman Catholics in the province of Manitoba of those privileges which, I repeat, they are entitled to? The hon. gentleman who spoke last night, said there were only 20,000 Roman Catholics in Manitoba, and why, he asked, should they enjoy those privileges when the total population of the province is 152,000? Well, Sir, we are more numerous in Manitoba, in proportion to the total population, than are the Protestants in Quebec in proportion to the total population. We want the same privileges in Manitoba that the Protestants are enjoying in the province of Quebec, we want them because we are entitled to them by right, because the constitution guarantees them to us, and we ask nothing but what is due to us, nothing but what is fair. Now, Sir, while I say that I am opposed to the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman blaming the Government for having made the promise or remedial legislation, I must say that for my own part I regret that the Government, instead of postponing the settlement of this question for another six months, has not thought it wise and proper to bring in remedial legislation at once, and do away with the grievance that we have been complaining of for the past five years. I regret that the Catholic minority in Manitoba should be put off for another six months, and perhaps longer. I regret that we should be compelled to pay taxes for schools which, according to the hon. member for Winnipeg, are in effect Protestant schools, and at the same time, that we should be compelled either to close the doors of our schools, or to beg from our friends the money that we require to maintain them. It must be remembered that we are living in a new province, our popula-

tion is composed of natives and of new settlers who have not the means sufficient to meet the requirements of their position. They are comparatively poor, and while they are compelled by the existing law to pay for the support of schools which they cannot accept, at the same time they are compelled to pay for the maintenance of their own schools, or else shut them up altogether. Now, Sir, shall this House be a party to the perpetration of such an injustice? No, Sir; I cannot believe it. No matter what the views of hon. members may be on the school question in the abstract, the claim we now put forward in the House is that we are by law and by equity entitled to our separate schools in the province of Manitoba. Has not the Privy Council declared that we have been deprived of a privilege and of a right that we had been enjoying for nineteen years prior to the passing of this Act of 1890? And, Sir, when the duty rests upon this Parliament of restoring those rights, or those privileges, if you choose to call them so, when this Parliament is called upon, under the provisions of the constitution, to restore those rights that have been stolen from us, are we going to prove recreant to our duty? Are we, as statesmen—because I suppose we all consider ourselves to be statesmen—going to refuse to perform our plain duty as statesmen in remedying the injustice that has been shown to exist? We are judges in this matter, we must not decide this question according to our individual opinions, but according to the law and the constitution, and the law and the constitution ought to be obeyed. This is not a political question upon which we should divide upon party lines. I hope when the time comes to settle the question both parties will join hands and settle it in a fair, liberal, just and equitable way.

Mr. DICKEY. I desire to make a personal explanation, not to offer any remarks on the subject before the House. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) referred to the publishing of some affidavits which were put in evidence at the hearing before the Privy Council of Canada, and subsequently withdrawn as the case proceeded. The hon. gentleman seemed to feel that that was a great injustice not only to himself but to others, and the present Government as an organization has quite enough faults to answer for without answering for my personal faults, and I therefore desire to take the personal responsibility of publishing those affidavits. They were put in and read, and subsequently, as the proceedings show, were withdrawn. Mr. Ewart claimed they should be printed, and there was no contest over it, in fact, the question was never raised. I was then Secretary of State, and the Printing Bureau sent and asked me whether they were to be printed, the message being received by me just as I was going into the room on the second or third morning, and without consulting my colleagues and without giving the matter serious attention, I said, "Certainly, they are part of the proceedings, print them, and print that they were withdrawn." I may have been entirely wrong, perhaps I was; I must say, on considering the matter when the printed book was placed in my hands, I thought I had made a mistake. What I want to say is that any observation founded on want of good faith or on the idea that there was any intention on the part of the Government in so acting is entirely mistaken. We are still subject, and I personally and particularly am subject to any remarks as to any practical injustice that has been done, but I do not want the House to suppose that there was any intention in placing the affidavits there, of taking any unfair advantage, and that there was anything more than a mistake made. That mistake occurred inadvertently, and hon. members may refer to it as they think proper, but they should consider it not an intentional and wrong act.

Mr. McNEILL. I hope, in the few observations which I shall offer to the House, I shall endeavour to say nothing which may wound the feelings of any one who differs from me on this very important and, I am afraid, in some quarters, very exciting question. Before making those observations I wish to offer to the House, I desire to state why it is I feel it impossible to support the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I will read my reasons, with the permission of the House. Had this been a plain resolution condemning any attempt to force separate schools on Manitoba, I should, as a matter of course, have voted for it. The resolution, however, appears to me to be framed not so much to obtain the sense of the House on that question as with a view to embarrassing the Government at the very time when they have been fighting the battle of the province to this extent at least, that they have been resisting a strong effort that has been made to induce them to proceed with remedial legislation at once, and they have insisted upon time being given to arrive at an amicable adjustment of the difficulty, if possible. It seems to me that, under these circumstances, and at this time, it would be an especially ungracious act on the part of any one who, like myself, desires at all hazards to uphold the rights of the province, to vote to defeat the Government. It also seems to me that if I defeat the Government, and bring in hon. gentlemen opposite, I run the risk of bringing in a party who may go much further in the direction I disapprove than the present Government are prepared to go. For they may force separate schools on the province at once without making any attempt at compromise. So that, to use a homely saying,

I should simply find myself out of the frying pan into the fire. Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution because, apparently in order to secure support from a certain section of hon. gentlemen opposite, the scope of it is reduced to such narrow limits that it is quite inadequate to express my views. The condemnation it contains is confined to remedial legislation on the lines of the remedial order. It ought, in my view, to go much further, and condemn any attempt to force separate schools on Manitoba, whether on the lines of the remedial order or not. Sir, had this been a simple straightforward resolution condemning any attempt to force separate schools on Manitoba, I would have voted for it. But I refuse to risk the defeat of a Government whose general policy I approve, with the result of bringing in a Government whose general policy I would disapprove, and whose policy on this question the leader of the party carefully conceals. I say I refuse to do this merely to support a transparently tricky, half-hearted resolution of this kind. I do not wish to use the word "tricky" in any invidious sense, and if the time ever comes when an attempt is made to force, not merely remedial legislation on the lines of the order, but separate schools of any kind, on the people of Manitoba, I shall be prepared to oppose the attempt with my voice and vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When does the hon. gentleman expect to get into the fire?

Mr. McNEILL. I am satisfied it will be a very long time. Having taken the liberty of reading that statement to the House, I wish to be allowed to make one other observation before I proceed to deal with the question that is really before the House. I wish to say this, that I heard with the very greatest pain some remarks that in the heat of debate fell from the Minister of Justice last night. My hon. friend the member for North Simcoe is now, I suppose I may say so, my political enemy. At all events, he has not acted exactly the part of a political friend towards me, because he selected my constituency, I think, as the first constituency in which he had a candidate placed to support his own particular views. But be that as it may, the time was when the hon. gentleman was my close political friend, and my very warm personal friend, and I am under obligations of personal friendship to that hon. gentleman that I never can forget; the marks of that which once has been are not very easily obliterated in my mind in this regard, and I cannot in silence allow an imputation to be cast on the hon. gentleman without saying that I think that imputation was altogether unfounded. The imputation, as I understood it, was that the hon. gentleman was actuated to some extent at all events, by pecuniary considerations in the course he was taking in regard to this matter, and I think it is only due to the hon. gentleman to say, from what I know of him and from what the people of Ontario know of him, that there is not any man within the four corners of this Dominion who is less likely to be actuated by such motives than the hon. member for North Simcoe. This, I think, it is only due to say, and I would be very sorry to take any political advantage in this contest upon grounds such as those to which I refer. Having said so much, and having taken up some time already, I must say that I think short speeches at this time of the session are very much in order. I shall endeavour to make the observations that I have got to make as brief and as simple as possible. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say, so that there may be no misunderstanding upon that point at all, that I bring no charge of intolerance against those who desire to force separate schools upon the majority of the people of Manitoba; no charge of intolerance at all. I think I may say that I fully sympathize with many of the views that they have at heart. I am quite sure that they are actuated by the belief that in what they are doing, they are doing justice and are doing right. And I will go further, and say, that I can sympathize largely with them in the desire to see secular teaching interfused with religious instruction. I will say, further still, that I can sympathize with the chivalrous feeling and sentiment which actuates our friends from Quebec when they rally to the support of the minority of their own blood and their own religion in Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, I hold that the majority of the people in Manitoba; that the province of Manitoba has, subject to the provisions of the constitution, a right to decide for herself what system of education shall obtain there, and ought to hold that right although free from attempted coercion at the hands of any other province of this Dominion, or of this Parliament, or of any extraneous power whatever. As I have said, I sympathise with my French Canadian friends in their desire to relieve their co-religionists and their compatriots from that injustice that they think they labour under by reason of the passing of the Act of 1890 which took away from them suddenly— and I think in some respects, harshly—rights which they had acquired and which they had enjoyed for some nineteen or twenty years. But, I must say to my friends, and I must say it with all kindness and in all friendship, that I do not admit there should be one rule for the province of Quebec, and another rule for the province of Manitoba. I say that this question of education is a strictly local question, and I say that it is a question that has been handed over to the provinces absolutely, except in so far as that absolute control has been cut down by the first and second subsections of the Act. I say that this is in its nature a matter much more essentially local—this Act of 1890 that we are now discussing—than the Jesuits' Estate

Act, we discussed some years ago. It is a more local matter if for no other reason, for this reason; That the Jesuit body is not a body confined to the province of Quebec, but a body which has its ramifications over all parts of the Dominion. And I say further—and I am sure my friends will allow me to make these statements, and to express my views in a friendly and quiet way in reference to this matter—I say that the Jesuit Estates Act was as distasteful, was as absolutely opposed to the rooted conscientious convictions of the minority in Quebec, as this Act of 1890 is opposed to the conscientious convictions of the minority in Manitoba. I say still further, that the Jesuits' Estates Act was not only opposed to the religious convictions of the minority in Quebec, but it was opposed to the religious and conscientious convictions of the majority of the people of every province in the Dominion of Canada outside of Quebec; a statement which cannot be made as to the Manitoba School Act of 1890. Therefore, I say, that when this House decided that the majority in Quebec had the right to control legislation there in reference to this Jesuits' Estates matter, and that this House should not interfere, this House cannot now consistently order that the conscientious convictions of the majority in Manitoba are to give way to the conscientious convictions of the minority. But, Mr. Speaker, I shall be told that the constitution says that we are obliged to establish separate schools in the province of Manitoba over the heads of the overwhelming majority of the people there, and contrary to the desire and wish of the legislature of that province. Had it not been for this statement, I should not have ventured to intrude any words of mine on the attention of this House; but I do not feel inclined to sit down silently under the imputation that I am not willing to be guided and to be ruled by the constitution of the country in which I live. Therefore, it is, Mr. Speaker, that I wish with all humbleness to point out my reasons, at all events; a reason for the faith that is in me, that we are not called upon by the constitution to perpetrate any such Act as it is foreshadowed we shall be invited to perpetrate. Mr. Speaker, what is the constitution? Fortunately, the recent decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has simplified this matter for us very much indeed, for that decision has made the question clear, and has defined this as the law: That it is only one section of one Act that we shall have to consider, namely, the 22nd section of the Manitoba Act, and that we may leave out of consideration altogether the British North America Act, so far as the discussion in this House is concerned. What are the sections of this Act which we are told, compel us to force separate schools on the province of Manitoba against the will of that province? They are very short. They are only two, and with the permission of the House I will read the subsections, as I need not trouble with the opening part of the clause. The first subsection says:

> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice at the union.

We will take this first section in the first place. Well, Mr. Speaker, we need take up but a very short time in discussing that subsection, because it has been decided in Barrett's case that this Act of 1890 interfered with no right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons had by law or practice at the time of the union. Therefore this section, so far as this discussion is concerned, may be left out of consideration altogether; it is outside of our discussion at present; but, before passing away from this section, I wish to call the attention of the House to its particular phraseology:

> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

We see, in the first place, that this section has reference only to rights and privileges which existed at the union. But what is the meaning of the words: "Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect"? The meaning is that if any Act of the provincial legislature be passed which contemplates an interference with any such right or privilege, then this greater power, this Act which is a Dominion Act, and which has the sanction of Imperial authority, steps in as a bar to the going into force of the local Act; and the local Act, at least that part of it to which we are referring, becomes null and void, and is of non effect whatsoever. This is how the framers of the constitution framed their provisions when they sought to declare that a right or privilege could not be interfered with. The framers of the constitution made it impossible to interefere with it. I call attention to that, because it is very important in connection with what follows. Now, we come to the second subsection which is the one that really controls this matter, and you will observe the difference in the wording. The one says nothing in any law shall prejudicially affect; the other is:

> An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or decision of the legislature of the province or of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

We see at once that the words of this subsection are much wider than the words of the other; because, while the first subsection is confined exclusively to rights and privileges which existed by law or practice at the union, the second refers to any right or privilege. Now, when the minority and those who represented them found that they

had been defeated in the Barrett case, and that they could not succeed under the first section of the Act, they thought that under the words of the second subsection they would succeed. They thought that the rights which were guarded by that subsection were such rights as they had been deprived of. They went to the Supreme Court, and three out of the five judges there decided against them. But, nothing daunted, they carried their case to the highest court in the Empire, and that court decided unanimously that the separate schools which had been conferred upon the minority in Manitoba by the Act of 1871 did fall within the protection of this second subsection. Therefore, if we find that this clause declares that those separate schools are not to be interfered with, or that if they are interfered with they shall be restored, then most assuredly the contention is well founded that under the constitution we are obliged to restore them. But is there any such provision to be found in this clause? "An appeal shall lie"—does that mean that the separate schools shall be restored? Remember the words of the first section, which prevents interference. If the framers of the constitution meant that the rights referred to in the second subsection should be restored, that was equivalent to saying that they could not be interfered with. Why, then, change the wording of the statute? Why not include those rights in the first subsection? Why should the framers of the constitution provide an elaborate and expensive machinery of this kind to do what would have been done by one additional word in the first subsection? But, Sir, it was not the intention of the framers of the constitution that those rights and privileges which might come into existence subsequent to the union should receive the same protection as the rights and privileges which existed prior to the union; and why? A very little consideration will show us why. Because the rights and privileges which existed at the union were rights and privileges which were known and understood, and the danger, if there was any danger, in connection with them was fully appreciated. But the rights and privileges which might come into existence after the union were unknown; they were in the womb of the future; no one knew what they might be; no one could tell whether they might be fair and beneficent rights, or monstrous and mischievous rights. Acts of Parliament are not always just, we know very well. Unfortunately, they are often very unjust; and the framers of the constitution had no intention of enacting that, by a mere snap vote in the legislature, some provisions which might be monstrously unjust should be maintained and perpetuated for all time. Therefore it was that they left to the future the things of the future—left to the men of the future to deal with the things that might in the future be established. This is the reason, the plain and obvious reason, for the difference we find in these two sections. No, Mr. Speaker, the men who framed this constitution were not so fatuous as to put a clause into it which would perpetuate for ever rights which were unborn, and the particular nature of which no man living at that time could imagine. But that is the contention we have to meet here to-day. We are told that the constitution requires that these separate schools shall be restored. The assertion is made stoutly enough. But I have heard no proof whatever adduced that the constitution does anything of the kind. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, in the very able remarks he made last night, referred to certain statements made by the judges in the course of the argument and in the judgment. But the quotations which my hon. friend made in no degree prove the contention which he sought to establish. Those quotations were made in reply to the counsel who was endeavouring to show that the appeal which was then being argued before the Privy Council did not fall within the second subsection at all. Mr. Cozens Hardy and Mr. Haldane were arguing that there could not be a case. They were endeavouring to prove that it was absurd to say that there was a case under the 22nd subsection, and the statements made by the Lord Chancellor were in reference to that argument. I wish now to recall to the House again for one moment, the statement of Mr. Blake which was referred to by the hon. member for North Simcoe last night. Mr. Blake stated what it was he was asking decision upon; he laid down what the case was that he was arguing. Is there any gentleman in this House who will assume that Mr. Blake, whom we all know so well, did not understand what the question was which he wanted to bring before the court? What did Mr. Blake say? At page 26, I find:

The LORD CHANCELLOR. It is not before us what should be declared, is it?

Mr. BLAKE. No, what is before your Lordship is, whether there is a case for appeal.

The LORD CHANCELLOR. What is before us is the functions of the Governor General.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, and not the methods in which he shall exercise them—not the discretion which he shall use, but whether a case has arisen on these facts on which he has jurisdiction to intervene. That is all that is before your Lordships.

Again, at page 38:

Mr. BLAKE. The question, whether, on the whole, acting in their political capacity, the Privy Council believe that they ought not to act, or to act in what we may consider a lame and half-hearted way, or to go the whole length of our demand, is no part of the question I have to submit to your Lordships.

Again, at page 266, just before the final judgment:

Mr. BLAKE. I do not ask your Lordship to make any suggestion as to his action, which I conceived from the beginning is political. He is to be instructed as to the law; and then his ac-

tion and the action of the Parliament will carry the thing out.

It is rather interesting, at this moment, to call attention to a remark which Lord Shand made :

Lord SHAND. Do you think it is necessary for us to go much deeper : That there was established a system of denominational education which was regarded as a privilege by all the parties who were in the minority ?

Then he goes on to say :

Lord SHAND. It would be a very different thing to go to the Governor General and ask him to establish a denominational system, or get him to ask the legislature to do it. I do not think you would ask that.

That is the very thing, we are told, that the constitution says we have to do, and that the Privy Council, by its decision, says we have to do—to establish a system of denominational schools in the province of Manitoba.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose the hon. member will admit that the court went further than Mr. Blake said it was necessary to go.

Mr. McNEILL. I am coming to that. I admit that to avoid, as I believe, a misconception, the court went a great deal further than Mr. Blake said they required to go, or than they said themselves they had a right to go.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. McNEILL. It is not an opinion at all. I give the hon. gentleman the proof. Far be it from me to offer an opinion on any such question :

Lord WATSON. I apprehend that an appeal to the Governor is an appeal to his discretion. It is a political, administrative appeal, and not a judicial appeal, in any sense of the term, and in the same way, after he has decided, the same latitude of discretion is given the Dominion Parliament to legislate or not, as they think fit.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, you all admit that, but if you are bound by the constitution to legislate in a certain way, you cannot have that discretion.

Lord WATSON. The power given of appeal to the Government, and, upon request by the Governor, to the legislature of Canada, seems to be wholly discretionary in both.

Mr. EWART. No doubt.

Lord WATSON. Both in the Governor and in the legislature.

Mr. EWART. Yes.

Lord Watson says, further on :

He has to take into consideration many things, which we have not to. He cannot do anything himself. At the last resort, the only person or body which can do anything more is the Parliament of Canada, who are certainly in no legal compunction, and certainly would not act unless they felt there was some substantial grounds for doing it.

I think that those quotations sufficiently show what the opinion of the judges was with regard to what they were to decide. I will quote from the judgment of the Lord Chancellor at page 284, and if the hon. Minister of Justice will be kind enough, for one moment, to hear this, he will find it a direct answer to the question he put :

The sole question to be determined is, whether a right or privilege that the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed, has been affected by the legislation of 1890.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was not the question I put to the hon. gentleman. It was whether the court had not gone further than merely to answer the question, and whether they had not given their opinion as to what course should be followed in order to remove the grievance.

Mr. McNEILL. I thought I had answered that question already. I thought the hon. gentleman said something with regard to my opinion, as to whether the court had gone further or not than the question before them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I said that was a matter of opinion, and, consequently, a matter of argument.

Mr. McNEILL. The argument is settled by the Lord Chancellor. He says the sole question yet to be determined is whether the rights or privileges of the minority which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed, has been affected by the legislation of 1890.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And my point is they have gone further than that.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. Minister of Justice points out that the court has gone further.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They gave the benefit of their views whether it was necessary or not.

Mr. McNEILL. This is a question which is somewhat out of the line of my argument, but I may deal with that point at present. I am now arguing the question whether we are by the constitution called upon to do a certain thing. I will go into the merits of the question afterwards. I am dealing with the constitutional point now. We are in no way called upon, under the constitution, to pay any regard to the advice which these four most able men, most impartial men, and most ignorant men, so far as the conditions of Manitoba and their relations to the Dominion are concerned, may give as to what is best for Manitoba and the Dominion. Their impartiality is beyond any cavil or doubt, and so is their ability, but these gentlemen were not

informed of the special matters connected with this subject in the North-west Territories, and, for my part, I decline to hand over the political adjudication of the question by this House to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This is now simply a matter of politics that we are discussing; it is not a question of the constitution at all. My hon. friend has apparently abandoned the contention as to the constitution, and is referring now to an obiter of the judges that is in no way binding upon us, which is not in reference to a question of law at all; which, even if it were in connection with the matter of law would not be binding upon any court. When the hon. gentleman comes here with the suggestion that this obiter is binding upon the Parliament of Canada in this matter of grave political consequence affecting the interests of this great Dominion, I say that, however able these gentlemen may be, we the Parliament of Canada are better informed on the matters of that kind than they can possibly be, and we are the tribunal to decide these questions. The question was not referred to the Judical Committee of the Privy Council as to what action we should take. I do not blame or suggest any blame to them for making that remark; I say that they made it, in my opinion, probably in order to prevent a misconception. They arrived at a conclusion which we all knew before they arrived at it, that certain rights and privileges had been granted, and certain rights and privileges had been taken away; and, in order to guard themselves against misconception, against the idea that they had suggested that it was necessary to put these rights and privileges back exactly where they were, they say that it is not necessary. They say:

> It is certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted, or that the precise provisions of these statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Act of 1890 no doubt commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the province. All legitimate ground of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions.

Does any one suggest that this Parliament is bound in any degree, is bound to the weight of one poor scruple, by a remark of that kind on the part of these gentlemen? With all respect for their great erudition and ability and unquestioned impartiality, I repeat again that, so far as the matters we are discussing here are concerned, so far as the local affairs of Canada are concerned, they are in point of fact ignorant, and whether they are ignorant or not, we are not bound by remarks of that kind. If the Minister of Justice has no better argument than that upon which to found his opinion that this judgment of the Judicial Committee binds us to re-establish these schools in Manitoba, I think his case is a weak one indeed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is rather against imperialism, is it not?

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will have his little joke. I have been drawn away a good deal from what I had intended to say——

Mr. McCARTHY. It has done a great deal of good.

Mr. McNEILL—but before I pass away from the constitutional question, I wish to make one further remark. It is said that there was an agreement that the minority in Manitoba should have their separate schools. If there was such an agreement—and I am not in a position to decide whether there was or not, for I candidly admit that I have not waded through all the documents in connection with this matter—we find it in the first clause of this section of the constitution. But the second clause of this 22nd section distinctly negatives the idea that these separate schools, if they were to be had at all, were to be preserved in perpetuity. The second subsection of this 22nd section shows that whatever rights and privileges it may have been understood they were to have, these were not necessarily to be preserved in perpetuity, but were subject to revision from time to time by the local legislature, but always with the right on the part of the minority to come to this House for redress of grievances if this House thought it desirable that those grievances should be redressed.

Mr. AMYOT. Will the hon. gentleman say what he understands by the word "practice" in the second subsection?

Mr. McNEILL. I do not think that that is germane to the point I am at present dealing with. But as I understand it, no rights existed by law at the time of the union. Therefore, in order to make it quite clear that the minority should be protected in all the rights they had enjoyed in reference to the denominational schools, the word "practice" was put in as well as the word "law." I was about to say, so far as the merits of the case are concerned——

Mr. AMYOT. Are we not bound to keep the practice in this matter?

Mr. McNEILL. That has been decided in Barrett's case, and is out of the discussion, as my hon. friend will understand. We are now upon the second subsection of the Act. Now, there has been—I do not say that it has been purposely done—a wonderful confusion of two distinctly separate thoughts in connection with this discussion. One idea is that we are bound by the constitution to do a certain thing, and the other

is that we are under moral obligation to do it. And, as soon as we prove that we are not compelled by the constitution, the two questions are mixed up, and it is made to appear that some statement in the course of the argument or judgment casts a moral obligation upon us. Now, I am ready to deal with the question of moral obligation.

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

After Recess.

SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY, N.S.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 88) respecting the South Shore Railway Company.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FORBES. I was in hopes that we could end this difficulty by coming to an agreement upon an amendment, which was practically understood to be the result of negotiations. Amendments have been submitted to the promoters of the Bill, but, so far as I can learn, they are not yet accepted. I do not know whether they propose to accept them or not.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). The hon. member knows that the proposal he has made cannot be accepted.

Mr. McISAAC. Before this motion is carried, I desire to make some remarks. I wish to direct attention particularly to a phase of this question which has been adverted to by several hon. gentlemen during the last debate. An impression has been sought to be created in this House that the Government of Nova Scotia was hostile to the South Shore Railway Company, and was unduly partial to the Coast Road Company. These are the two rival railway companies in the western part of Nova Scotia. I may say that during all the time these negotiations were going on with the Government of Nova Scotia, I happened to be a member of that Government, and I think I am in as good a position as any other hon. member in this House to state what the attitude of the Government in Nova Scotia was during all this time towards the South Shore Company. It has been asserted over and over again that the Premier and the Government of Nova Scotia were hostile throughout to the South Shore Company, and unduly partial to the Coast Line Company. It has been asserted that the charter which was granted to the Coast Line Company was granted by the Government, and argument is made in this House on the assertion that it was the Government which did this, and refused to do that. Now, let me tell this committee that this charter first obtained by the South Shore Company, was granted by the legislature in 1892, and not by the government as such; and the charter which was afterwards given to the Coast Line Company was granted by the legislature of that province in 1893, one year later. The ground taken by the promoters of this Bill is that the South Shore Company obtained their charter one year before the Coast Line Company, and that consequently they have the best rights; and that afterwards, the Government interfered to injure their rights by negotiating with the Coast Line Company. Now, as I say, the charter was first obtained by the South Shore Company in April, 1892, to build a line of railway from Yarmouth to Shelburne. In that charter it was provided that the company should begin operations within two years, and that they should have until 1896 to build the road. In about one year after the charter was obtained, the Coast Line Company came to the legislature to seek a charter. Now, here let me remind the committee that the Government of Nova Scotia at this stage had nothing whatever to do with this charter. The charter for this Coast Line Railway was introduced in the House of Assembly by Mr. Johnston, who was then a colleague of mine in the Government, and one of the representatives of the county of Shelburne in the House of Assembly. His colleague in the representation of that county was Mr. Cahan, who was the leader of the Conservative Opposition in that province. This is a point of importance, and I would like the Minister of Railways to pay particular attention to this phase of the question. When this charter was introduced by Mr. Johnston, it will be conceded that if there was anything wrong in it the leader of the Opposition would have brought it to the notice of the House on that occasion. Not only was he one of the representatives of Shelburne, but he was the leader of the Conservative party in the House, and if the object of this charter was to do any injustice to the South Shore Company, if the object was to give some advantage from a party standpoint, to the Liberal party in the province, and to work any disadvantage to the Conservative party, surely the man, above all others, who would raise his voice against that charter, would be the leader of the Opposition himself. Did he oppose it? Did any Conservative member in the House of Assembly oppose the passage of the charter for the Coast Line Company? Not one of them, and yet the South Shore Company had obtained their charter from the same legislature one year previously, and if any injustice was going to be done to the South Shore people, and if the Liberals were likely to gain any party advantage over the Conservatives, surely that was the occasion, above all others, when the leader of the Opposition should raise his voice in remonstrance and opposition. But it is left to

hon. members in this House, years afterwards, to come forward and tell this House that this charter was instigated by the Government of Nova Scotia, by the Liberal party, for the purpose of invading the rights of a company which had obtained a charter one year previously. Sir, the records of the debates that took place are the best proof of what I said. Can the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) who is promoting this Bill, tell me that he was opposed to the passage of this charter to the Coast Line Railway Company in 1893? On that occasion, I believe he represented the sentiments of the Conservative party in the county of Shelburne. I remember well the first time I had the pleasure of meeting the hon. gentleman in Nova Scotia. He was in company with my friend, and his friend, the Hon. Mr. Johnston, who was the local representative of the county of Shelburne. I was introduced to the hon. member for Shelburne by Mr. Johnston, and the occasion, I believe, was when the hon. member was in Halifax with a draft Bill of this charter, or if not a draft Bill, at least with some papers in connection with that company.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want to state anything that is not true. I may say that I had nothing whatever to do with promoting this charter for the Coast Line Company in Halifax. I wrote the charter, but nothing more. But I was in Halifax at that time with regard to another road, Mr. Hervey's. I think that is what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. McISAAC. Perhaps the hon .gentleman had not the charter with him on that occasion, but, as he says himself, he wrote the charter, and he knows, and will not deny, that on the occasion when this charter was submitted to the legislature, he was heart and soul in unison with Mr. Johnston, and all the Liberals and Conservatives in the county of Shelburne, in urging that this charter would receive the support of both parties in the House. My hon. friend cannot deny that. It is a matter of public record, and I hold in my hand, and intend to read from, the debates of the House of Assembly on that occasion, to show that both Liberals and Conservatives in the county of Shelburne and Yarmouth, and, indeed, throughout the province, were united on this question. There was not one Conservative member in the House who was opposed to granting a charter to the Coast Line Railway Company. The only objection urged against it now is that this company got a charter one year before. Under certain circumstances that would be a valid objection, but no valid objection existed then, because although the company had obtained a charter it did nothing during the year, the company made not the slightest move to organize or to show any bona fides, or to demonstrate that they had a dollar of capital and had any intention to build the road in that part of the province. For years before either companies obtained a charter from the legislature, as the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) well knows, there was an agitation in the western part of the province for railway extension from Yarmouth to Shelburne and along the south shore to Halifax. Effort after effort had been put forth by Conservatives and Liberals, by the friends of railway extension in that part of the province. All those efforts were futile, including the effort of the South Shore Company, which obtained a charter one year before a charter was granted to the Coast Line Company. When the Coast Railway Company came before the legislature there was not a Conservative in the House of Assembly who opposed it, and there were no people in the province who objected to it. Speaking now as regards the position in which I felt myself in 1893 as a member of the Government coming from the east, I may mention it was represented that every effort to obtain railway extension from Yarmouth along the shore had failed. It was represented to the legislature that the South Shore Company had done nothing, although it had received a charter about a year before. The leader of the Opposition did not oppose the granting of a charter to the Coast Line Company. The Bill was introduced by a private member in 1893. It passed its various stages in the legislature without a dissenting voice. There was some discussion when the Bill went through the House, and in order that there may not be any misunderstanding, I desire and intend to read to the House all the discussion that took place in the legislature in regard to the granting of a charter to the Coast Railway Company. When I make this promise I do not propose to take up very much time. The discussion consists of the speech of one member. No hon. member felt he should oppose it, no one was so unpatriotic as to consider he should oppose even a narrow gauge railway in the counties of Yarmouth and Shelburne, especially when every effort in the past to secure a broad gauge road had failed. The county of Queen's which lies alongside the county of Shelburne was very much interested in railway extension from Yarmouth to Shelburne, as well as those two counties themselves. I will read to the House the only speech delivered on that occasion. It was the speech of Mr. Hemeon, who represented Queen's. That gentleman took a keen interest in railway extension in the western part of the province. When he heard there was a proposal made to build a narrow gauge line from Yarmouth to Shelburne and extend it further, he, with many others, felt that a narrow gauge road was not desirable in those counties or in any other part of the

province. That opinion was largely shared by members of the legislature; it was shared also by members of the government, and they looked on the project with a good deal of disfavour. The hon. member for Queen's, on the motion for the second reading of the Bill, made the following speech:

Mr. Hemeon said that, in looking over this Bill, it would be seen to be rather a new departure from measures hitherto introduced relating to the construction of lines of railway in this province. The line contemplated by this Bill was what was known as a "narrow-gauge" line of railway. As this was a mode of constructing railroads which had not hitherto been pursued in this province, it was one with which, probably, few in this House had any practical acquaintance. Instead of, as in the standard gauge, 4 feet 8½ inches, the distance at which the rails were placed apart was only 2 feet. Some people might imagine that a railway of this kind was only a toy affair, and that it was not capable of doing substantial service. But the fact was that narrow-gauge railways were not new by any means in other countries. In the state of Maine such roads had been in successful operation for some time. One such road was opened in 1879, from Farmington to Philips. This road last year carried over 25,000 passengers and 28,000 tons of freight, and was capable of carrying ten times as much, if that many passengers and that much freight had offered. The road to which he referred had been extended from Philips to the Rangeley Lakes in 1891, a distance of 30 miles; also, one connecting Strong with Kingfield; distance, 16 miles. Another road, 16 miles long, had been constructed in the southern part of the state from Hiram to Bridgton. These roads had several towns and villages along their length, some of them of considerable size. The town of Farmington, which he had mentioned, had a population of between 3,000 and 4,000 people. The great advantage of railroads of this character was, that they admitted of grades and curvatures which were unknown on the standard-gauge roads. He had personally travelled over a road which had grades of 250 feet to the mile, and curvatures of 22 degrees. The difference would be seen when it was remembred that in Nova Scotia we allowed no grade of over 80 feet to the mile or a curve of over 6 degrees. This made a manifest difference in the cost. Such a road could be carried around hills in order to avoid fillings, and over grades to avoid cuttings, and consequently through a country that would be impossible or very expensive to an ordinary road. In the state of Maine the road to which he referred was carried through a country that was wild, hilly, even mountainous, and the grades were steeper and the curves sharper than on many carriage roads in this province at the present time. He was in a position to say that the roads did their work efficiently and well. He was in the United States at a time when the winter was at its height and snowstorms were frequent, but the roads did their work as regularly as wide-gauge roads. He saw one train, drawn by a 38-ton engine, which hauled 90,000 feet of lumber. This was as large a freight of that material as was to be found on any road in Nova Scotia. One engine on such a road could haul cars enough to carry between 300 and 400 passengers. Therefore, it would be perceived that such roads were in every way desirable. Another important fact was, that they could be built at a much lower cost than wide-gauge roads. The first cost of construction would not exceed 50 to 60 per cent of the cost of a wide-gauge road, while the cost of the subsequent operation of the road would not exceed 60 to 70 per cent. Some time ago the $50 stock of the road from Farmington to Philips was sold at $75. At the present time the stock could not be purchased for anything approaching $75. The section of country between Yarmouth and Lockeport, through which the road contemplated by this Bill would pass, was such that a road of this description would fully answer all the requirements for many years to come. The construction of this road would enable the people of that part of the country to obtain railway accommodation, for which they had long waited, and for which they might have to wait many years if a more expensive road was undertaken. It was quite reasonable that the people should seek the construction of this road, and he trusted that the government would entertain the project favourably. He trusted also that his remarks would enable the members of the House who were not familiar with narrow-gauge roads, to gain a better idea of their value.

This is all the discussion that took place in the Nova Scotia legislature when the charter of the Coast Line Railway Company went through the House. Is that speech in opposition to the charter, or is there a word in it to say that it was an invasion of the charter of the South Shore Railway Company which had been granted by the same legislature a year before? Does that speech show that the South Shore Company had invested a dollar of honest money in the enterprise, or that they had the slightest intention of ever constructing the road? Was there a Conservative on the floor of the Assembly who could say a word in its behalf? Was there any Conservative in the Assembly so low as to do reverence to that company, which this Parliament, I am sorry to say, has for the last month been endeavouring to resuscitate? When other people have sought another charter from the legislature, that was the time for the friends of the South Shore Company to oppose any interference with its rights. Where were the ten or thirteen Conservatives in the legislature on that occasion? Where was Mr. Charles H. Cahan, the leader of the Conservative Opposition, who represented the county of Shelburne, now represented in this House by my hon. friend (Mr. White)? Mr. Cahan is a man who could upon this or any other question make a bitter and able fight, but when this charter was moved by his own colleague, Mr. Johnston, and during all the stages of that charter, the leader of the Conservative Opposition never said a word to oppose it. We were told here that the Government did all in its power on that occasion and ever since to obstruct the South Shore Railway, and to aid in every way, fair and unfair, for paltry political reasons, the Coast Line Company. I have been a member of the Nova Scotia Government during all these years, and I deny that, and I challenge any member of this House to truthfully assert it. The Government of the province had nothing whatever to do with the charter of the Coast Railway

Company. The members of the local government sat in their places as the members of this Government should do now, and listened to the arguments in its favour. They knew that a charter had been given one year previously to the South Shore Company, and they saw that another charter was introduced by one of their colleagues from the county of Shelburne. They saw also that the other member from the county of Shelburne, who was the leader of the Opposition, never opposed this charter while it passed through its various stages in the House. I cannot repeat that too often because it is the crux of the whole discussion. That charter became law by the unanimous consent of every Conservative and every Liberal in the legislature. That was in the spring of 1893, and at this stage the Government had done nothing whatever in connection with it, nor had the company approached them. Having obtained a charter from the legislature, they took steps to organize the company, and having satisfied the Government that they became legally organized under the charter, they appealed to the Government, representing that their charter gave them power to build a narrow gauge railway from Yarmouth to Shelburne and along the southern coast. In the beginning the Government did not look with favour upon the construction of a narrow gauge road in the province, but when it was represented that every honest effort had failed to secure a standard gauge road, they consented. In no part of this Dominion are party lines more strictly drawn than in the province of Nova Scotia. When two rival companies undertake to build roads in any part of the province, we usually expect to see party rivalries creep in. But in this case, when this company went to the Government and asked for a subsidy to build a narrow gauge railway from Yarmouth to Shelburne, both the Liberals and the Conservative party in those counties supported the application. We are told that the Government of Nova Scotia bonussed this company for petty party purposes; but there was not an opponent of the scheme at all. All parties in those two counties joined in urging the Government to aid this railway; and the municipalities granted the right of way in those two counties.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). In the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. McISAAC. I know that there is one hon. member who is not very much known in the province of Nova Scotia, the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills). Very few counties in Nova Scotia know anything about him, except that he has lately acquired some notoriety in connection with the military property in this county. I say the counties of Yarmouth and Shelburne granted a free right of way to the Coast Line Company. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if this is not proof positive to the members of this committee who do not come from Nova Scotia, that at that time these two counties irrespective of party wished to aid the narrow-gauge road? This being the case, I again ask this committee if there is any proof that the Liberal Government took any sides at all against the South Shore Company or in favour of the Coast Line Company? After the company was duly organized, an application was made to the government, in which it was represented that a smaller subsidy than was usually granted for a standard gauge road would be sufficient. The government of Nova Scotia, after duly considering the question, came to the conclusion that aid should be granted, for the reason that all the people in that part of the province urged it very strongly, and that there was no difference of opinion on the subject between the two political parties The government first promised $1,500 per mile. Afterwards, when it was agreed to widen the railway, the subsidy was increased to $2,200 a mile. After all these negotiations had taken place, and after the company had commenced the construction of the road, the company entered into a contract with the government, and I am going to read the essential features of that contract. I read from a speech delivered by the Provincial Secretary last session, as reported at page 25 of the debates of the House of Assembly for 1895:

> The third contract was that between the government and the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, which related to a narrow gauge road from the town of Yarmouth, in the county of Yarmouth, to the town of Lockeport, in the county of Shelburne, the distance not to exceed ninety miles. This contract was entered into on the 18th September, 1894, and the condition was that the work was to be commenced forthwith and be completed before the 1st October, 1896. The ordinary subsidy given to railways was $3,200 per mile, but in this case, as the road was to be a narrow gauge road, the subsidy was placed at a lower figure. The company would receive $2,200 per mile instead of the $3,200 per mile usually given to broad gauge roads. As to the terms of this contract, he asked the attention of the House while he read the clauses relating to the manner in which the company was entitled to obtain payment of the subsidy.
>
> (a) "They shall be entitled to receive the sum of twenty-two thousand dollars, being the subsidy for ten miles, when they shall have fully completed, equipped and put into effective operation, to the satisfaction of the provincial engineer, a section of ten miles of the said railway from Yarmouth eastward, provided that when such subsidy is claimed the work of constructing the remainder of the railway is being vigorously and effectively carried on, and that, in addition to the completion of said ten miles, they have expended on such construction on the adjacent sections a sum of not less than $50,000. Such expenditure shall be established by the report of the provincial engineer, who in making such report shall take into account only useful and effective work actually done and paid for, and materials for construction actually delivered on the line of railway and paid for."

As to the further payments it was provided :

(b)" They shall be entitled to receive further payments of subsidy from time to time on successive ten-mile sections fully completed, equipped and put into effective operation, to the satisfaction of the provincial engineer, provided that (in every case prior to the completion of the whole line) when such subsidy is claimed the work of constructing the remainder of the railway is being vigorously and effectively carried on, and that, in addition to the work actually completed, they shall have expended on such construction on the adjacent sections a sum of not less than $25,000. Such expenditure to be established by the report of the provincial engineer in the same way as that specified in the foregoing paragraph (a), provided also, that in no case shall the company be entitled to claim subsidy until they shall have paid or caused to be paid all wages due to the workmen employed and all charges for materials supplied for the construction of said railway."

It would be seen, as respects the first ten miles, that the company must complete it and have expended $50,000 on work ahead before they could get the subsidy for the first ten miles, and that in the case of subsequent sections they must have completed each section and have expended $25,000 on work ahead before they were entitled to claim the subsidy for such section. There was in this contract a condition of an exceptional character to which he wished to call attention. The government were aware that there was more or less of a railway war down the shore, and that there was perhaps more than the usual amount of doubt as to the success of the company undertaking the enterprise, in view of the rivalries and struggles that were going on. For this reason they thought it necessary to take extra precautions to secure the completion and equipment of the road. The supporters of the enterprise, the gentlemen who might be called the financial backers of the road, were John A. Brill, manfacturer, of Philadelphia ; George Martin Brill, manufacturer, of Philadelphia, and George A. Fletcher, merchant, of Philadelphia. These three gentlemen were men of high financial standing and business record. They came to the government in support of the narrow gauge scheme, and agreed to enter into a personal obligation for all the debts that the company might contract in connection with the work. They agreed, further, that if the company should let the work of construction as was the custom, to another company, they should become responsible, so far as the government could make them so, for all the debts which the sub-company might incur in connection with the work. They had signed a bond of that nature, and, so far as it was possible to make them so, they had rendered themselves personally liable not only for all the debts incurred in the province of Nova Scotia by the company, but also for the debts of the construction company to which the work might be let. Lest this should occasion any misconception, he felt it necessary to add a word of warning as regards claims which might be made of a more remote character. The gentlemen named agreed to become personally responsible for the debts of the Coast Railway Company, and for those of the sub-contractors in the first instance, but as regards sub-contractors in a more remote degree, they assumed no liability. Those who dealt with persons not being the company or the construction company, to which the work might be let, should not be misled by the nature of the bond. Whatever value there was in the bond, and he thought it was a valuable one, it only applied to the debts of the two companies, first, the Coast Railway Company, and, second, the construction company, so-called. For other contractors or sub-contractors, the gentlemen who entered into the bond were not liable.

Usually in submitting contracts of this nature the government did not submit specifications, because they were voluminous, and it was hardly necessary that they should be laid upon the Table of the House. But as this was the first narrow gauge contract entered into, the government brought down a copy of the specifications, so that they might be printed in the journals of the legislature.

I think that I have given ample proof that the Government of Nova Scotia were not in any way biased but acted in an impartial manner throughout, so far as these two companies are concerned.

Mr. LISTER. The questions involved in this discussion are of such importance that I think the discussion should not be confined entirely to members from the province of Nova Scotia. We, in the province of Ontario as well as in the other sister provinces, are interested in the legislation now before the House. We are interested because there are principles involved in this legislation that affect all the rest of the Dominion, principles upon which this House and the Railway Committee of this House have over and over again pronounced ; and to me it is amazing that the Government should permit the discussion of the Bill now before us. It is incredible that in view of the action of the Railway Committee in years past, in view of the action of this House upon similar legislation, the Government—for what motive it is impossible for me to conceive—should permit the promoter of this Bill to go on with it. What do we find here ? We find it proposed to resuscitate a defunct railway company for the purpose of constructing a railway parallel to a line of railway which is now in the course of construction through a country which is utterly inadequate to support two rival lines of railway. The only inference which can be drawn is that the legislation now before the House is destined to compel the bona fide company now constructing the road to buy the other company out and repay that other company for the losses they have made in the undertaking which they initiated some years ago. What are the facts ? To revive this railway charter means, in the first place, that the Coast Railway Company will be hampered in the sale of its bonds. It means that the Coast Railway, which has undertaken its work in good faith, which has spent a large sum of money in the work, may be obliged to abandon the undertaking entirely for the reason that it is confronted with another railway having a subsidy from the Dominion. And this Government is aiding and abetting this monstrous conspiracy against the rights of the people, it is aiding and abetting a parcel of adventurers from the United States without credit or capital to destroy a legitimate

undertaking which is honestly prosecuting its work. The Government are backing up the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) who, in this matter, does not occupy a position which a professional man should like to occupy. What do we find? The hon. member for Shelburne was a solicitor for the South Shore Road. He was paid by that undertaking, as I understand it.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I never received a cent of money from it.

Mr. LISTER. They never paid anybody, but probably they promised to pay.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I never was their solicitor.

Mr. LISTER. Very well, if the hon. gentleman was not the solicitor for that road, he is the promoter of it now. The hon. gentleman, according to his own statement in the House, drew up the charter for the Coast Line Railway. He was the solicitor for that road to the extent that he was employed to draw its charter, and according to the Minister of Justice last night, he should not be here taking any part in any debate or measure affecting that company.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think the hon. gentleman wants to do an injustice to the hon. member for Shelburne. That hon. gentleman said distinctly that he never received a cent from the company.

Mr. LISTER. There are two companies.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I never received a cent or even sent in a bill.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. Secretary of State does me the justice of saying that I do not want to put the hon. member for Shelburne in a wrong light. He has stated that he was not the solicitor for the South Shore Road, and I have accepted his statement. But I was going on to say that the Act of Parliament to incorporate the Coast Line Company was drawn by the hon. gentleman from Shelburne. If the lawyers down in Nova Scotia draw bills for nothing, they are somewhat different from the lawyers in my province. We would charge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does my hon. friend say that he would not draw for nothing the charter for a company to run a line through his own constituency—to open out and develop his own constituency?

Mr. LISTER. Not for a rich corporation; oh, no. They could afford to pay the little fee for that service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You would be delighted to do it.

Mr. LISTER. Would the hon. gentleman give his medicine for nothing?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I sometimes do.

Mr. CAMERON. He gives many a dose in this House that gentlemen opposite do not like.

Mr. LISTER. At all events, my hon. friend drew the charter. According to the statement of my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) appeared in the legislature of Nova Scotia for the purpose, no doubt, of helping on the Coast Line Railway. Now, the South Shore Railway Company had been incorporated, they had done a little work on the road, and they had allowed their Act of incorporation to run out; it had expired.

Mr. CAMERON. Time's up.

Mr. LISTER. Does the chairman say that time is up?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Five minutes more.

Mr. LISTER. I would like an hour.

An hon. MEMBER. Sit down.

Mr. LISTER. Oh, no. This is too important a matter. The South Shore Railway, as I was saying, was incorporated by the provincial Parliament of Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia is in the eastern part of the country, and has more than a local reputation from the fact that the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) claims it as his home. There could only be one member like the hon. gentleman. Now, let us get to business; these interruptions necessarily lengthen the few remarks I have to make. The South Shore Railway did a little work——

Mr. CAMERON. When?

Mr. LISTER. In 1894. Then it allowed its charter to run out, and ceased to be a corporate body. The Coast Line Railway Company then applied for incorporation. Now, Sir, that was the time for the gentlemen who are promoting this legislation to appear before the legislature and say: You have no right to incorporate this company, because we have an Act of incorporation, and we intend to apply to the Dominion Parliament to have the powers in that Act revived. But neither my hon. friend from Shelburne, nor any other gentleman so far as we know, appeared before the legislature to raise any objection. The people of that country wanted a road, and the Nova Scotia Government decided to incorporate this company and to subsidize it. The company went on honestly; they entered into a bond with the Nova Scotia Government to have so many miles of the road completed by the month of October next. They have nearly twenty miles graded; they have the stonework of their bridges up, and have made contracts with the iron manufacturers for the superstructure, which is to be up within the course

of two or three months. But now that all this work is done, the member for Shelburne again appears as the evil genius of this road. He comes to Parliament, after his company is in bankruptcy, after it has been declared absolutely insolvent, and after proceedings have been taken to close it up and sell it out, and applies to have the Act of incorporation revived. What does he do it for? I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, if you are curious.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hour for Private Bills has expired.

SUPPLY—THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was endeavouring to show, and I hope with some degree of success, that no obligation is cast upon this Parliament by the constitution to re-establish a system of separate schools in the province of Manitoba. I stated that on the discussion of this question, there seemed to have been a remarkable blending together, if not confusion of two distinct considerations—the one being whether we were bound by the constitution to do this, and the other whether we were bound by moral obligation to do it. So far as the constitutional obligation is concerned, I do not propose to add anything to what I have already said. But, with your permission, I will say a word upon the other aspect of the case, and what I have to say will be brief, for I very much fear that I have already trespassed too long upon the patience of this Chamber. And in what I am about to say I would most especially ask for the kind consideration and forbearance of my French-Canadian friends in this House; for what I am about to say must, from its very nature, be something that they will not like to hear. I mean to say that I must contend for something of which they entirely disapprove. But I hope I shall let fall no word that can, in any degree, wound the susceptibilities of any one in this Chamber, or out of it. Now, the question that is presented to us to consider at the present moment is this: It having been decided that we are not bound by the constitution to restore these separate schools, are we bound by moral obligations; is it right and just and necessary that these schools should be re-established? That a grievance exists, I admit. No one can gainsay the fact, the patent fact, that certain rights and privileges were conferred upon the Catholic minority in Manitoba, and that those rights and privileges, after they had been enjoyed for 19 or 20 years, were taken away suddenly, and, as I have already said, I believe harshly, in certain respects. But now the question is whether this Parliament is obliged, from moral considerations, from consideration in reference to the best interests of the people of this country—for those are the considerations which we have to deal with here—to remedy the grievances which are complained of. The nature of the grievances was described by the hon. member for Simcoe last night, and I will not enter minutely into that matter. But I wish to say that it does not follow, nor is it granted by any legislative assembly in the world, that the existence of grievances in the sense in which this term is used here, is a reason why these grievances should necessarily be redressed. I wish to make my meaning clear on this point. In one sense, of course, it is not a grievance, but in the sense in which my hon. friend used the expression, it is a grievance. In the wider, and broader, and larger sense, nothing can be a grievance if the general good requires that that so-called grievance should exist. But I speak now of the restricted sense, and I say that in the restricted sense, it is a grievance. But have legislative assemblies, have parliaments, been in the habit of considering that because a grievance of that kind exists, it must be redressed, irrespective altogether of larger considerations? What was the case with regard to the Land Act of 1870 in the United Kingdom? Were there not grievances, and great grievances, arising from the operation of that Act? Are there not dozens and scores of people who were without reproach, so far as character is concerned, from every point of view, who have been reduced from a condition of luxury, which for generations had belonged to their families, to a condition of absolute penury at the present moment? Was not that a grievance? But did the Parliament of the United Kingdom consider that because such a grievance as that existed, the larger considerations were not to prevail? Did they ever say that that was a reason why these grievances should be redressed in the sense of doing away with the larger legislation? Surely not, we all know that it was not so. Take the case of the disestablishment of the Irish Church. Were there not grievances—great, undoubted, undeniable grievances? But was it considered necessary that these grievances should be redressed? Take the case of the operations of the Charity Commissioners in England. Were there not great grievances, were there not notorious grievances? But was it considered necessary that they should all be redressed? Take the case of the endowed school commissioners in England. Do we not know that grievances of the most pronounced character arise from the putting into effect of the legislation which gave rise to the Endowed Schools Commission? I have in my mind at this moment one case, that of Dulwich College, the great educational establishment for the South London district. And what was done in reference to that by the Endowed School Commissioners? Rights and privileges were conferred upon several parishes, among

others, the parish of Camberwell, the inhabitants of which had for all time the right to send their children to that school at rates lower than the rates which the children of other parishes were obliged to pay. That right was taken away from them by the endowed school commission, and it is notorious that all over England the Endowed Schools Commissioners acted in this way, and that grievance after grievance was the result of putting into force the provisions of the statute by which they were created. But was it considered necessary to repeal that statute because these grievances were brought into existence under it? Surely not. If my hon. friend the Minister of Justice were present, I would refer him to an instance nearer home, and I would ask him whether, when fishermen were allowed to fish with a mesh of a certain size, and when the Department of Marine and Fisheries, acting upon considerations for the general weal, changed those regulations, deprived those fishermen of the rights and privileges that they possessed to fish with nets of that particular mesh, and forced them to use another, and a larger, and a less efficient means of obtaining their livelihood—I would ask whether he considered that the fact of that grievance existing, was a reason why this Parliament should intervene and repeal the Act which had been put on the statute-book in the general interests, and for the general good? I say we have to deal with a question of this kind on large and broad principles, and we have to ask ourselves here, not whether a grievance in this sense exists, but whether, that grievance existing, it is in the general interest of this country that the legislation which gave rise to that grievance should be virtually repealed. We have to ask ourselves the broad question: Whether it is better to allow this grievance to exist, or to compel the majority of the people of Manitoba to legislate in a way contrary to the wishes of the majority of that province—whether we in this Parliament should interfere with the free province of Manitoba in the exercise of its undoubted right in respect to education? We have to look, in order to arrive at a conclusion on this question, a little afield, and see what the results have been in other provinces of this system of separate schools which it is sought once more to establish in Manitoba. I cannot help looking at my own province of Ontario, and I cannot help contrasting the condition of things I find there, where this system of separate schools exists, with the condition of things which exists in New Brunswick, where separate schools do not exist, with the condition of things which exists in Nova Scotia, where separate schools do not exist, with the condition of things in Prince Edward Island, where separate schools do not exist, and I find in those provinces where separate schools do not exist a condition of things is coming about which I believe will naturally follow where separate schools do not exist and where the children are brought up together under one national system of education. I find, if my information be correct, that in those provinces that bitterness of feeling which unhappily to a certain extent exists between the people of different religious persuasions in Ontario, and which unhappily did exist in those provinces at one time, is rapidly dying away. I understand that there now Protestant and Roman Catholic are becoming more and more reconciled to one another, that the children being educated in the common schools are forming attachments and friendships from childhood which will continue to manhood, and such troubles as we know in Ontario are happily almost unknown by those provinces by the sea. Under these circumstances, I ask, in the general interests of this country is it for us to deliberately determine in this House that we will trust on the majority of the people of Manitoba this system of separate schools, which certainly in the province of Ontario has not contributed to that feeling of good-will that we should like to see obtain in the minds of the people of this country? We are asked, as I have said before, in consideration of the conscientious scruples of the minority to override the conscientious scruples of the majority in that province and impose on them a system of education which they utterly disappove of. I ask whether, on broad principles, we are called upon to do this thing? It is called redressing a grievance. I ask whether we assembled here in this House have a right to redress a grievance of this kind, whether in the general interests of the people of this country it is well we should do this thing? That is the point we have to consider, and that is the point we have to determine. And if I may say one word to my French-Canadian friends on this subject, it is this: that if there is one thing more than another I hope to see it is an amicable, friendly and satisfactory arrangement of this burning question, and I would say to them, if I might venture to do so, that if they approach the people of Manitoba in a reasonable spirit, in a kindly and friendly spirit, as I am sure they wish to do, and if they ask of them not those things which they cannot grant conscientiously, but things which they may grant and which my French Canadian friends may all be able to agree to, we may hope that a satisfactory solution of the question may be arrived at. But at the same time I wish to say this, that if it comes to be a question of struggle between the Dominion authority and the authority of the province no man can tell where that will end.

Mr. AMYOT. We have been led into a trap by confederation.

Mr. McNEILL. But one thing I am sure of, and I hope my hon. friend will allow me to bring that consideration to his mind, and it is this : that it would be almost impossible to frame enactments to give effect to any legislation we may desire to pass in this House which the people of Manitoba, if the people make up their minds to do so, will not be able to evade and escape. For years this struggle may go on, for years this struggle may continue in this Dominion, for years this House may be called upon time after time to endeavour to give effect to legislation we may pass, and the result will be that we will just be pursuing the province of Manitoba from one legal thicket into another ; and, therefore, I say in all kindliness and friendliness to my French-Canadian friends that I strongly advise them to endeavour to arrive at an amicable and friendly arrangement of this matter, because I am quite sure that if it be atempted to coerce the legislature of Manitoba it will be an exceedingly difficult and very dangerous undertaking.

Mr. WALLACE. I will not trespass very long on the time of the House. I heard the statements made by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) with respect to the schools of the province of Manitoba. It is clear to me that the proposal that those schools should be restored virtually as they had existed previous to 1890 is a proposition that will not meet with acceptance in this House, nor with acceptance at the hands of the people of this country. The facts are undeniable. We have the evidence of Mr. Sifton, Attorney General of Manitoba, who, I understand, is also Minister of Education in that province, as to the state of the schools, and those statements were read by the hon. member, and not contradicted, or at least no proof was given that they were incorrect, and if after nine year's experience of the schools of Manitoba under that plan, it is found out that out of 26 of the population 24 are unable to sign their own names, but have to make their marks—and that is the statement of Mr. Sifton—and that only two can sign their names, it appears to me that a radical change is necessary if the people of Manitoba are to do their duty to the rising generation of the province. It is quite clear that the schools in a sparsely-settled country, such as Manitoba is and must be for many years to come, will be inefficient if two or three different schools are to be established in one district, because not only the Protestants and Roman Catholics, but the various branches of the Protestant Church will each demand separate schools, and I do not see how the demand can be refused. It has been stated by the hon. member for Provencher that Archbishop McLean, of the English Church, is an advocate of the separate school system. I believe that he is correct, and also that there are very many clergy of the Church of England who are strong advocates of the separate school system. Belonging to that church myself I have had an opportunity of ascertaining the opinions of the laity, and I believe the desire for separate schools as regards the Church of England is confined almost entirely to the clergy of that church, and that such a proposal does not meet with any favour among the laity of that church. If separate schools are to be given to Roman Catholics, you cannot refuse them to each of the other churches. What a deplorable state of affairs must then necessarily exist. In some districts it is as much as the whole population can bear to pay a general tax to support one school, and they will be utterly unable to support three or four schools. The result would be that there would be no schools, or that the schools would be so inefficient as to be altogether worthless and the children would grow up without the advantage of any education. That would be the effect of an attempt to restore the system that formerly prevailed in Manitoba, a system of which they had experience of for nineteen years, and no doubt for a number of years before. It is clear that efforts of that kind will not be successful, and that we should proceed very slowly indeed in that direction. Another point worthy of consideration is this : If it should be decided by a majority of the Parliament of Canada that remedial legislation should be imposed upon the province of Manitoba, there is no use shutting our eyes to the fact that that would create endless trouble and difficulties in that country. We should not shut our eyes to the difficulties that would immediately ensue. The Manitoba Government has the control of education there. They have the control of the purse-strings. They have control of the educational machinery, and if they were hostile to any proposal made by the Government of Canada, they could impose obstacles innumerable. The proposal that is made by the Government to-day, to see if some way can be devised, through the co-operation of the Dominion Government and the Government of Manitoba, that would meet with the approbation of the people of the province, is, therefore, wise. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) did me the honour of reading some remarks I made on Friday last in the city of Ottawa. Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to read some further remarks I made on that occasion, and to ask the hon. leader of the Opposition what his opinions are about them. I was referring then, and I shall refer now, to the interference of the clergy, and the interference of the clergy of another province in this matter. I referred to the interference that had taken place with reference to the decision of the Imperial Privy Council of Great Britain, and I then said :

We will now turn to another phase of this remarkable question, and we find ourselves face to face with a declaration made by no less a personage than the Bishop of Nicolet, and throws a flood of light upon the means employed to influence the decision of the Imperial Privy Council. Understand me clearly: I do not in the least wish to asperse the character of the noble lords who rendered the decision, or impute any motive save those which are honourable and just. Yet we have before us the declaration of the Bishop of Nicolet, that the church dignitaries of the province of Quebec,—mark you, not of Manitoba, but of Quebec—two thousand miles away from the province affected by the legislation of 1890, were not content to abide by the legal and constitutional methods devised and provided for settling such questions, but that they had to resort to ways and means contrary to and inimical to the principles lying at the very foundation of British jurisprudence. Are we to understand that we are returning to the practices which in the past have been provocative of evils untold and struggles written on every page of medieval history? Are we to accept without protest this new system, or rather the old and obsolete practices which we, as British freemen, have struggled so long to banish from our legal tribunals and expunge from the constitution? For my part, I answer, No! Most emphatically, No! And the great majority of the citizens of Canada will answer, No! when called upon to render their verdict. The Bishop of Nicolet informs us that, to use his own words: "I am asked if the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda can usefully intervene to assist in the settlement of this important question. It is certain that the Sacred Congregation can contribute assistance of great value to the bishops by giving them their support. But in what way can this Sacred Congregation accomplish this intervention? It might, perhaps, through the intervention of His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan represent, among other things, to the Colonial Minister, that his predecessor, Lord Carnarvon, had given, in his own name and in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, the assurance to the Catholics of Manitoba, that they should have their separate schools, and that, consequently, the Crown is bound in honour to fulfil these solemn promises, if it does not wish to alienate the hearts of the Catholics of Manitoba. An intimation of this nature might have a good effect in reference to the judgment which the Privy Council will render within a few months upon the question which the Canadian Government has submitted to it."

I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition if he also approves of that proposition?

Mr. LAURIER. Ask your colleagues.

Mr. WALLACE. My colleagues have been speaking pretty freely on this question, but the leader of the Opposition has been very reticent, and I think it is high time he should now give his opinion. I listened with a very great deal of attention this afternoon to the speech made by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). I cordially agree with his views as to the amendment now before this House. I agree with a very large portion of his arguments with reference to this question, but I am sorry, Sir, that I cannot agree with that very high opinion he entertains of the hon. mover of the amendment (Mr. McCarthy). The hon. member (Mr. McNeill) said: "There is no one less open to mercenary considerations than the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Well, I have looked into that a little, and I am forced to come to a different conclusion from the conclusion of the member for North Bruce in regard to that matter. There was a question brought up in the House last night as to the propriety of any member of the House of Commons, acting as a paid agent for anybody, either government or individual, and then coming to the House of Commons to force these opinions, whether right or wrong, upon the House, and, in my opinion, such is a gross abuse of the privileges of a member of Parliament. That is the opinion given by the constitutional authorities in England, and repeated by our own authories in Canada. The rule in England is this:

> That it is contrary to the usage, and derogatory to the dignity of this House that any of its members should bring forward, promote or advocate in this House any proceeding or measure with which he may have acted or been concerned for or in consideration of any pecuniary fee or reward.

I am told the hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) has admitted to this House that he has received a pecuniary reward or a fee for advocating the case of the Government of Manitoba before the Privy Council of Canada. He repeated in the House of Commons the arguments of which he was the paid advocate. The hon. member referred last night to the practice in England. The practice in England is so clear that it only requires to be stated. Sir Charles Russell, Sir Richard Webster and Sir Henry James, all high authorities, take the same position. Sir Charles Russell said:

> The object of the rule, no doubt, was, that a person should not advocate the same thing in this House for which he had received fee or reward out of it.

Sir Richard Webster said:

> I think no hon. member should, in his capacity as a member of this House, advocate afterwards any case in respect of which he has received fee or reward.

Sir Henry James says the same thing. The rule is so clear and obvious that for a member of Parliament to come into the House of Commons as the paid advocate of a government or an individual, with the fee in his pocket, and to force his opinions, whatever they may be, upon the House of Commons, is derogatory to the dignity of this Assembly. I will point out in this particular case how badly it works. In 1888, when the government of Mr. Greenway was formed, and the conflict between the two political parties was pretty hot and pretty close, and Mr. Greenway found that he required to make the greatest efforts in order to secure a majority in the House, we have evidence that he went to the Archbishop

of Winnipeg and made a corrupt bargain with him.

Mr. DEVLIN. Who did ?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Greenway made a corrupt bargains with the Archbishop of Winnipeg. He was to appoint a man acceptable to the Archbishop as a member of his government, and in return he was of course to have the support of the Archbishop so as to keep the Conservative party out of power. That compact so entered into was carried out by both the contracting parties. Mr. Greenway on the one side, and the Archbishop and the Vicar-Generral on the other. I have the affidavit of the Vicar-General, and also the affidavit of Mr. Alloway, a banker, who was present during the course of those negotiations. I will not trouble the House with reading these affidavits.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. WALLACE. I said I will not read them, and I will use my discretion. I presume they are familiar to most members of this House. The hon. member for North Simcoe had read these affidavits and knew of that bargain ; and yet, because he was the paid agent of one of those parties, he was not equal to rising in this House and condemning such a corrupt and improper transaction. In view of that, we can understand the conduct of the hon. member in coming into this House with the fee in his pocket, and advocating the case of the Manitoba Government. Of course, he advocated the same thing before, because I am told he received a fee from them before, in the initial stages of this question. That being the case, I think it was most improper for the hon. member not to advocate in this House what he thought was right—because I honour a man for doing that ; but he found it necessary, in order to strengthen his backbone, to keep him straight in line, to accept a fee from the Manitoba Government. But, Sir, such things are not new to the hon. member. This is not the first time that he has handled public money. In other cases, I have been told, he got moneys belonging to the Dominion of Canada. I remember many years ago reading a speech of the then leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Edward Blake ; and when I heard the very touching references made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) last night to the great sacrifices made by the hon. member for North Simoce in being present at his post to-day, they recalled to my mind the remarks made by Mr. Blake to which I am about to refer. And Mr. Blake made these remarks, not in Parliament where he was protected by the rules and could make any charges as he pleased, but in an open public meeting, so that if they were wrong the hon. member for North Simcoe had his redress in the courts of the country. In a speech delivered in Muskoka, referring to a certain railway there, Mr. Blake said :

> I congratulate you, not with reference to the colonization railway, but with reference to the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, that, as I pointed out at Huntsville, even if the bonded debt has been increased, if the tolls are heavy, if you have no larger amount to pay, you have some compensation. You have the satisfaction of knowing that a prominent member of Parliament, and a supporter of the Government, has got an easy berth, with a salary of $3,000 or $3,500 a year, as president of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, practically due to the subsidy——

A subsidy received from the Government, promoted by himself and his co-directors——

> —and has made, in common with a few of the original promoters, a very handsome sale of the original stock which they took up, at enormous profits, also practically paid out of the subsidy, and that a few others have made great profits out of the contract. So that, if you don't get all the good out of it that you might, you know that some estimable citizens, not resident here, it is true, and in whose fortunes, perhaps, you do not take a very deep interest, but still some prominent members of the body politic, have got their full share of the good things of this life through the agency of the railway.

That is the statement made by the Hon. Edward Blake with reference to the hon. member for North Simcoe, and, so far as I know or have heard, never contradicted—that this hon. gentleman received a salary —for I do not suppose that anybody would say he ever earned it—of $3,000 or $3,500 a year for less than a week's work, perhaps less than a day's work, in the duties of that office ; and that he made large sums of money out of the sales of stock which he was enabled to make by being president of the company. And I am told that the other directors who accepted an even share with him were very sadly and greviously disappointed. This hon. gentleman is depicted as a disinterested patriot by the hon. member for North Bruce, but other members have not the same compassionate or considerate opinion of his disinterested patriotism. But is that the only case where he has used his position as a member of Parliament, where he has, at any rate, while in Parliament, taken to himself and drawn in moneys that were voted by Parliament for the construction of a railway. No, Sir. If we will look up the records, we will find that the whole career of the hon. member for North Simcoe is filled up with transactions, not of this kind exactly, but a great variety of transactions, all of them pointing in the one direction, to feather the nest of D'Alton McCarthy. Why, we had a few years ago the history of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Co., and I was much struck by the fact that an hon. member on the other side started in to make an investigation with regard to that matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is wandering from the question before the House.

Mr. WALLACE. The statement was made by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) that he believed the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was in this matter a disinterested patriot, that he was not open to any mercenary considerations, and I have been endeavouring to prove that during his whole career, as member of Parliament, he has been open to mercenary considerations.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member did prove that, he would not prove that the hon. member for Simcoe has been actuated by mercenary considerations in this matter.

Mr. WALLACE. I was just stating that the hon. member during his career, not only on this school question but in other questions which have come up before Parliament and for the consideration of the courts, has been able to feather his own nest. I remember on one occasion he made the statement at a public meeting, when charged with having received money through his law firm:

> In regard to the charge, that he had been made wealthy by the fees secured by his firm, amounting to $61,958, he desired to say that he did not receive from the country one solitary cent, directly or indirectly. There was not a word of truth in the charge; it was absolutely false.

I do not know any form of words that could be used more explicit, more positive, than this statement as reported in a newspaper exceedingly friendly to the hon. gentleman. He stated also, with reference to the Northern Railway, referring, of course, to the North Pacific Junction:

> With reference to the Northern Railway charge, he most emphatically denied receiving a cent of the $12,000. The railway got the money and expended it in improving the road.

The improvement of the road consisted in paying $3,000 of a salary to the president for doing nothing and dividing an enormous sum among the directors for their supposed stock in the road. I was going to call attention to the fact that he denied having received $61,000 from the company, and said he had not received one cent directly or indirectly. Now, Sir, I have in my hands a cheque. It is a very interesting cheque. It was given by the Government to the St. Catharines Mills Lumbering Co.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must again ask the hon. member to confine himself to the question before the House.

Mr. WALLACE. This is to prove the contention that I made, that the hon. gentleman has yielded to mercenary considerations, that he has not always been guided by those patriotic motives which the hon. member for North Bruce ascribed to him, and that a cheque of the Government amounting to $9,623 went directly into the hands of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I have already said, even supposing everything the hon. member alleges be susceptible of proof, that does not prove that in this particular case the hon. member for North Simcoe was actuated by mercenary motives.

Mr. WALLACE. I, of course, bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker, as I always do. As you have decided I cannot proceed any further with this interesting subject, I shall have to take the first opportunity, when I will be in order, to continue the discussion of it. You have decided, Sir, that I am not to make any further reference to the cheque of $9,623 which went directly into the coffers of the firm, not through any intermediaries but in a straight line. Now, there is another matter to which I wish to refer and this, I think, has direct reference to the question. We have had this question of separate schools in another place besides Manitoba. In Ontario, during past years, we have discussed the principle whether it was better for the province to have a public school system or to have a continuation of the separate school system. In Ontario, the Confederation Act provides for separate schools. That bargain could not be changed unless by the Imperial Parliament, and they would not change it certainly without being requested to do so by the Parliament or the people of Canada in some way. The Hon. George Brown, who had been fighting the battle against separate schools for fifteen years, when he accepted separate schools at the time of confederation said that he did so for two reasons. In the first place, we had to make great sacrifices in order to obtain this splendid measure of confederation, which promised to be of such great benefit to the people of Canada. In the second place, he said that we who had been fighting against the separate school system being grafted upon the public school system, who had been the watchmen on the walls for fifteen years, need be watchmen no longer, because the Roman Catholic hierarchy agreed to accept this measure, which was a mild form of separate schools, as a finality, and would ask no further legislation with regard to separate schools. For those two reasons he agreed to the system of separate schools being incorporated, in that moderate way, in the public school system of Ontario. But we have found in Ontario that they were not satisfied with the schools given them at confederation, but from year to year, Mr. Mowat, the head of the Ontario Government, has made amendments and changes in that Act in order to satisfy the Roman Catholic Church and make it more workable and effective.

An hon. MEMBER. Do you object to that?

Mr. WALLACE. I object to this, that when a bargain is made as a finality, when both parties solemnly agree to ask no further changes, that solemn bargain should be adhered to.

Mr. AMYOT. Apply that to Manitoba.

Mr. WALLACE. I am willing to apply the same principle exactly to Manitoba. I have never said anything different. But while this battle was going on in the province of Ontario, while objection was made to the increased power given the separate school system in Ontario, where was the hon. member for North Simcoe, who is so solicitous to-day for the welfare of the province, which I believe he has only visited once or twice during his whole career. Where was he when the battle was being fought on this question in the province of Ontario? Was he found fighting against the extension of the separate school system? Not at all. I do not know where the hon. member was during the last campaign and the campaign before. Yes, I do remember where he was in the campaign before the last—he was trying to break up the Conservative party. But where was he in the last campaign?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where is Marter now?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think that is an answer to the question. I ask, where was the hon. member for North Simcoe?

Mr. LANDERKIN. He was in Washington.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for North Simcoe had announced before that, he was an adherent of Sir Oliver Mowat; he had declared that if Oliver Mowat had lost the support of Elgin Myers, he had gained the support of Dalton McCarthy. I believe Sir Oliver Mowat did lose the support of Elgin Myers; so, the hon. member as an honourable man was bound to give him his support. Still, I believe, the hon. gentleman never went home to vote for Sir Oliver Mowat. The Parliament of Canada was sitting at that time, and the hon. member could not record his vote at Ottawa, as he did not live here, and I think he did not go home to record his vote. But if he did so, he was in duty bound to support the man who was extending the separate school system in the province of Ontario, and abusing the men who were fighting the extension of that system. So I say the hon. member has not been consistent, he has not been politically honest in the advocacy of a measure in one province where he does not live, and in the advocacy of the opposite in the province where he does live. Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall not occupy the attention of the House any longer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Go on.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not take orders from the Opposition, nor are there many people in the country who do. I shall not vote for the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Simcoe. I do not believe it comes out squarely on the lines of the speech the hon. gentleman made; the speech is one thing, and the resolution he closed with is another. In my opinion, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) might also vote for the resolutionn the hon. member for North Simcoe has proposed.

Mr. TARTE. Does the hon. gentleman think I will?

Mr. WALLACE. I think the hon. gentleman could. I would like to ask if the hon. member for L'Islet did not have a hand in preparing it?

Mr. TARTE. That is a fine question.

Mr. WALLACE. For the reasons I have given, I shall not vote for the amendment.

Mr. WELDON. I differ from several members who have spoken on this question yesterday and to-day as to the gravity of this question. We all feel that the question is one of gravity, but, for my part, I cannot agree with any hon. member who says that it is the most important question that has come before Parliament since confederation. The question very much resembles one which came before this Parliament twenty years ago, when the school law of another province was attacked in this Chamber, and in the course of my remarks, I shall point out the likeness between the two cases. To my thinking, the question that agitated this country five or six or seven years ago, when a great party had forced upon it by the dominant will of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) a policy which would land this whole Dominion of ours in the arms of the United States, was a question of far greater magnitude than this. I take for granted, Mr. Speaker, that in this country we are a law-abiding people. I think this discussion and the discussion that is going on in the country is a very useful one. I congratulate all the members who have spoken to this motion, and whom I have heard, almost without exception, on the moderation, on the courtesy, on the excellent temper, with which they have spoken. I am not here to take any part in the discussion that arose last night at the end of the debate; but I think it fair to say—I always sympathize with the under dog in a fight—that the tone of courtesy and fairness, the logic and good temper of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) last night were deserving of high praise. And as a very good test, I would point out that when the hon. member sat down, the House itself was in good temper and was not impatient or irritated or angry. So, while I speak of the gravity of the question, which we must all feel, it seems

to me we have had two or three or even more graver questions than this. As I say, we are a law-abiding people. There will be a contest of strength, there will be a tug of war. And what I hope for in this discussion is that, carried on in the same excellent temper with which it has been so far carried on, the public mind will be enlightened by the discussion. I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that the discussion is one almost entirely upon a phase of the question that need not arouse acrimony, namely, the interpretation of the constitution. There is much want of light in the public mind; there is much want of light in the journals of the day; there is much want of light of guidance and leadership in the unravelling——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentlemen opposite cheer prematurely. If they will hear me out, I think they will not take much comfort from my remarks. That reminds me to say that in this discussion that began yesterday, shortly after three, and has now continued until ten o'clock to-night, while this constitution was being expounded and interpreted by a large number of members, lawyers and others, not one single member on the opposite side of the House has taken so serious a view of his duty that he has contributed one single idea to the discussion. Where is the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)? Angels and ministers of grace, defend us? The hon. member for Bothwell silent on a constitutional question? One of his colleagues my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) has sat here this many Parliaments. And the hon. member for South Oxford has been a member of this House almost without a break, since confederation. Did these hon. gentlemen ever before see the two hundred and odd men in this House threading their way through the tangled forest of an involved constitutional argument without seeing the hon. member for Bothwell standing by with his lantern? Sir, as the lover said to Kathleen Mavourneen. "Why art thou silent, thou pride of my heart?" My hon. friends will not contradict me, we never witnessed such a spectacle before. I cannot say, the rules of the House will not allow me to say, that there is a conspiracy of silence, but there is a policy of silence, there is a policy of inaction, which is part and parcel of their whole policy, and I think the Canadian people, who like men of action and men of decision, would prefer to sustain the Government which takes what I think is a wrong course on a vital question, rather than these timid gentlemen.

We are accustomed to compliment the Fathers of Confederation. For my part, looking at their work as embodied in the constitution, I think they are not entitled to unstinted praise. Into the general constitution, they threw that fatal clause with reference to education, which we call clause 93, undoing with the left hand that which they had striven to do with the right, when they made this federal compact. It is well known that Sir John A. Macdonald was in favour of a legislative union. All over the Queen's Empire where both Catholic and Protestant people are found in large numbers, the question of separate schools excites controversy and disunion, and creates the deepest political difficulty. I am blaming neither Catholic nor Protestant. They are both in dead earnest, they are both sincere; but every statesman in every colony of the Queen's Empire, not here in Canada alone, and every statesman in all the counties of northern Europe where the state takes strong grounds for the control and subsidizing of education, has to deal with the same difficulty. My regret is that the fathers of confederation, when they incurred the great expense of adopting a federal union instead of a legislative union, threw this section 93 into the constitution. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—if I may refer to an earlier debate—stated the fact that it was the Protestants of Lower Canada who were responsible for that. So far as I know his statement is strictly correct, and I think the Protestants of Lower Canada did very little credit to themselves, and very little credit to the liberality, and tolerance, and fairness of the French-Canadian people when they pressed so strongly for this clause in the constitution. I think he was right in saying that it was we Protestants who put that deadly clause into the cradle of this young nation. I speak in this complimentary way of the French Canadians, for I was reminded to-night by a well informed gentleman who lived long in the eastern townships, in conversation upon this question not half an hour ago, that at the present time in the eastern townships of Quebec, there were 22 members in the provincial assembly and in this Parliament, representing a group of counties in which the Catholic electors outnumber the Protestant electors by something like 30,000; and that out of these 22 members there are only 7 French-Canadian members, and one Irish Catholic. Now, if, as matter of fact, the French-Canadian Catholics have dealt with that measure of fairness to English Protestants, I do not think that Sir Alexander Galt and the other Protestants of the eastern townships, knew the people as well as we do. It may be that the people in that day were less tolerant than the people of this day, otherwise there would be no need for that clause. My hon. friend reminded me with reference to Upper Canada, that it was a Catholic statesman, Sanfield Macdonald, who in Parliament moved that this clause 93 taking education out of the exclusive control of the

provinces and putting it into the federal constitution, should be struck out; and that he, a Catholic in Upper Canada, was willing that his people should take their chances for fair-play from the Protestants. Those I think were wiser views, and I say again that I deeply deplore that this mischief-making clause, not a beneficent clause, invoked for the second time in the history of this country, once 21 years ago, now for the second time, has called into existence an agitation of so grave a character. It will not shake confederation to its foundations—I believe nothing of the kind. If those who think with me that this Parliament has full power to redress grievances and has full power to restore separate schools, and who think, also, that in coercing a proud province, a people of stubborn will, more harm than good will be done, and that we will not in the long run contribute to a peaceful and permanent settlement of this question; if we are more in number in this country than those who are in favour of remedial legislation, our views must prevail. If they who differ from us are more in numbers, then they will pass that Bill, and they will be consistent in doing so. I say here that I cannot anticipate civil war, I cannot anticipate a breach of the law, I cannot anticipate those disasters that many seem to fear. I think they underestimate the law-abiding spirit of the Catholic people, both French and English, as well as of the Protestant people. There will be a fair tug of war, there will be an open and manly contest, but in the light of day: both sides will try conclusions at the polls, and they who are the most numerous, must prevail in this country, as in all self-governing countries, and they who are the fewer in number must yield. I think the final issue of the controversy will turn, not so much upon the question of the meaning of the constitution, as upon the larger question of the merits of separate schools. In any country where 40 per cent or more of the people are Roman Catholics, and most of those of the French race, where so large a body of people are most solidly of one opinion and desire a certain thing, and where a considerable number of Protestants share that opinion, on grounds of policy alone, under these circumstances, I think, we must settle this question. I say this, although I feel strongly as I expressed myself in the House the other day. For one my voice will be raised to abide by the constitutional decision of the country which, within 12 months at the latest must be given at the polls; and if there should be resistance, though I am not a soldier, and though not entitled to serve in the ranks of the army, if necessary, I would enlist and help those who will endeavour to enforce the constitution and laws of the country. But now let us come directly to the question at issue. I shall make my argument much shorter than I would like to do, having regard to the great number of gentlemen who wish to follow me in speaking in this debate. I wish to argue that in my view, the constitution of this country empowers this House to restore separate schools in Manitoba, but it does not compel this House to do so. That there is no legal compulsion, is admitted by the Minister of Justice, and by every lawyer in this House. My view is that there is no moral compulsion, and that the true way to deal with this question is to deal with it on the merits. Therefore those who believe that religion is a vital part of the education and should be taught in the public schools, those who believe that that idea cannot be carried out unless Protestants are free to conduct religious exercises but also to teach some dogmatic religion, should favour separate schools. Others think that it would be better to let the state concern itself alone with secular teaching, and that the duty of furnishing religious instruction rests primarily upon the parents of the children, and secondarily upon the churches and ecclesiastical institutions of the country. First, let me restate the question that was argued with great skill, I think, and from my point of view, with almost absolute conclusiveness, by the hon. member for North Simcoe last night, and argued with conclusive logic in the magnificent speech made by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) to-night. That is on the question, does the constitution compel us to restore separate schools to Manitoba? The constitution, as was said by an hon. member to-day, consists of two parts, the written and the unwritten. The written part consists of three short sentences of English or French, and the unwritten part of three judgments of the Privy Council. Let me read those sections again, even at the risk of tiring the House. The written constitution of Manitoba, touching schools, is contained in these sentences, which collectively are called the Manitoba Act, an Act with Imperial authority:

> 1. The province of Manitoba may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject to the following provisions:—
>
> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons may have by law or practice in the province at the union.

Upon that first clause, which I call the written law of the constitution, there have been two cases decided, which I call the unwritten law of the constitution, decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and which to the mind of every lawyer and every layman who studies such questions is as much part of the law as the written text. One case was carried from New Brunswick, and is called ex parte Renaud. That was a decision on what is called the King School Act, this Bill having been carried through

the New Brunswick legislature by then Attorney General King, who is now a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, and it was laid down that the Act of 1871 did not deprive the Catholics of the school rights they had before confederation. The next case was decided nineteen years later, and it has been much discussed in this House to-day. The case of Barrett and the city of Winnipeg was decided in 1893, and it was held that the Greenway Act of 1890 did not deprive the Catholics of school rights possessed before Manitoba came into the confederation. The two cases are practically identical, the one affirmed the other. If one is good the other is good, if one is badly decided the other is; but it does not lie with any Canadian to question the decision of the Privy Council as being a bad decision. It is the law of the land, whether we like it or dislike it, whether we consider the judges are familiar with Canadian history or not, and whether the judges appear to have interpreted the statutes as we would interpret them or not, these decisions are part of the law of the land, part of the constitution. If we say, as did the late Sir John Thompson, that we sail the ship of state by the pole star of the constitution, we have no course open but to accept these decisions. The Catholics of New Brunswick had a stronger ground for complaint, a far stronger ground, than had the Catholics of Manitoba.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELDON. I say they had stronger grounds for complaint for this reason. While the Catholics of Manitoba under the decision of the court were burdened with the duty of supporting public schools, they being allowed in addition to bearing that burden to support their own schools, the Catholics of New Brunswick before 1871 were placed in a worse position. They too under the decision given could carry on after the union their religious schools, and they were burdened with heavy expenditures for supporting the public schools, but in New Brunswick before 1870 they had been deprived of important legislative grants, and in that respect their case of hardship was greater than that of the Roman Catholics of the Selkirk settlement, which had no legislature and enjoyed no public grant. In 1872, 1873 and 1875 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries brought up in this House the grievances of the Catholics of New Brunswick. Impelled by his warm feelings of sympathy and of love for his people and desiring to protect them, he fought the issue with a courage, steadfastness and persistency that did him infinite honour. In those years he sought by many ways to secure the help of the federal power. First, the power of disallowance, then the intervention of the Queen, now this device and now that device, this method and that method were resorted to in order to get the help of the federal power to better the position of those of kindred faith with him in the province of New Brunswick. Those efforts were unsuccessful I am thankful to say. In the twenty happy years that have rolled over the province since that struggle, the good sense of the people and the spirit of conciliation that prevails in all British provinces, if you give the people time to come down to their sober second thought, the spirit of fair-play, the spirit of neighbourly kindness made itself felt. Important changes were effected in all the large cities, in St. John and the other cities, which reconciled Catholics very much to the law and removed many of the Catholic objections to the operation of that law, which was found harsh in its first form as passed in 1871. I now turn to the second clause of the constitution.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Did not the Catholics accept the situation?

Mr. WELDON. I am glad to make a statement suggested to me by my hon. friend (Mr. Costigan) that the minority of the people accepted the decision of the Privy Council and the conclusion of this Parliament, and there was no talk of riot, bloodshed or separation. Section 2 of the constitution reads as follows:—

> An appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of the legislature of the province, or of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

That is the written law. We have to explain that section—a case decided in the Judicial Committee. We have on that case the unwritten law, the opinion of the Law Lords of the Privy Council. They have said clearly that in the case of Manitoba the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction within the meaning of that section to hear the appeal of the minority who are complaining in Manitoba. There has been much discussion in the House as to the nature of the last judgment of the Privy Council. I call it a decision, that certainly is not the proper word, without being too fine and nice in verbal matters. The last was not a decision of the Privy Council; the last was the opinion of the Privy Council, given by them not under any Imperial instructions, but given by them at the request of the Parliament. We made a suggestion in 1890 on the motion of Mr. Blake. It was put in the statute of 1891. Mr. Blake put on record his view of that statute. Sir John Macdonald put on record his view of that statute, and I wish to speak, although the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has gone over this ground in a very careful manner, to refresh the memory of the House, and as there are some hon. members here to-night who were not

here last night, and it may be that my words may go to some parts of my own province where the hon. gentleman's words may not go, I will proceed very briefly to restate this matter and give my own views, which are entirely in accordance with the views of the hon. member for Simcoe on this point. Mr. Blake's motion we all remember. He evidently had in his mind an English practice, with which every lawyer in England and every Canadian student of English law is familiar, and that is that the great tribunal in England, the House of Lords, when dealing with questions of exceptional magnitude and difficulty are glad to strengthen themselves before giving decision by obtaining the opinions of the Superior Court Judges. In a number of cases which will be in the memory of every lawyer this practice was resorted to. It was formerly a moot point in England as to whether when the House of Lords asked the help of the twelve judges of the Superior Court, they were bound by the answers received. It is now clearly settled that while the House of Lords has the right to put questions to the twelve judges, they have also the right to make what use they like of the answers they receive. I will read one or two authorities on the point, MacQueen, Appellate Jurisdiction, p. 49 :

> It has been sometimes asked, whether the opinion of the judges ought not to govern the decision of the House? They have never had that effect, even when unanimous. * * *
>
> The opinion of the judges, however, even though not adopted by the House must always be expected to throw valuable light on the subject of its deliberation, Entick v. Carrington 19 Howell, 1071, Lord Camden.
>
> These are the opinions of all the 12 judges of England, a great and reverend authority.
>
> Can the 12 judges of England extra-judicially make a thing law to bind the Kingdom by a declaration that such is their opinion ?

His Lordship goes on to say, no. Cox p. 333 "Institution of English Government" says :

> Their opinions are generally given upon abstract questions propounded by the House for their consideration, but those opinions, even when unanimous, do not govern the decisions of the House.

Mr. Blake's resolution, I have taken from "Hansard," and it says :

> It is expedient to provide means whereby, on solemn occasions touching the exercise of the power of disallowance, or of the appellate power as to educational legislation, important questions of law or fact may be referred by the Executive to a high judicial tribunal for hearing and consideration, in such mode that the authorities and parties interested may be represented and that a reasoned opinion may be obtained for the information of the Executive.

It will be noticed that the word "opinion" is used, and not decision. In the Act of Reference of 1891, chapter 25, section 4, subsection 2, these words are used :

> The court——

That is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council sending back its answer to our Governor General in Council.

> —The court shall certify its opinion.

And under subsection 6 :

> The opinion of the court is advisory only.

In the "Hansard" of 1890, page 4095, Mr. Blake says :

> I by no means propose to withdraw from the Executive its duty. My object is to aid it in the efficient execution of its duty.

Sir John Macdonald, in the "Hansard" of 1890, page 4094, says :

> Such a decision is only for the information of the Government. * * * The Government may dissent from that decision, and it may be their duty to do so. The answer of the tribunal will be simply for the information of the Government.

I need not labour with that further, though the point is interesting. I would not deal with it at so great length were it not that this is the first case in which we have put in practice Mr. Blake's resolution, and the subsequent statute, and it is important, I think, that there should go on our records, the views of those lawyers of the House who speak on the question, as to what they understand to be the real scope and meaning of the Act. I so heartily concur in the opinion of the Privy Council ; I so heartily endorse every statement they have made ; I so heartily approve of their answers to the questions put, that I in no way desire to discredit that opinion. I fully accept the judgment. But it is not an authoritative judgment like the decision on the New Brunswick school case, or like the decision of Barrett against the city of Winnipeg. These judgments were part of the law of the land, as binding as an Imperial statute, and they had all the fleets and armies of England behind them to enforce them, if need be. This is an opinion of no authority. Those gentlemen can make little or make much of it, as—according to the view of Sir John Macdonald—it commends itself or does not commend itself to their reason. And if that opinion is not binding upon the Governor in Council, how can it be binding upon this Parliament ? Great stress was laid upon one paragraph, the last paragraph in the judgment of Lord Herschell, which stated that the Manitoba Catholics had grievances and which suggested the way in which they could be remedied. There is no doubt that if Lord Herschell were a member of this House of Commons, he would be in favour of a remedial law, judging from the views he has expressed. But I heartily endorse what my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said with so much power and force today, and what my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said last night, so clearly and so strongly, namely, that no

tribunal on this earth can guide this Parliament, nor dictate to this Parliament in the exercise of its discretion. All that courts of justice can do with the Canadian Parliament is to stake out the limits of their legislative power, and that is because of the fact that we have a federal system. In the Australian colonies or in Newfoundland, the courts can do nothing in the way of affecting statutes. In this country, under our federal system, they can stake out the limits of our power, but within the limits of our power, this Parliament of Canada is as sovereign as the great Parliament at Westminster itself; that mother of Parliaments. And if I may use the word, it is an impertinence that the English Parliament would not tolerate, that any tribunal in the Empire should dictate that it should do this or do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELDON. I am glad to find the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) agrees with me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I do, emphatically.

Mr. WELDON. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) gave a reason. They cannot know as we know, they do not know as we know. Able as they are, impartial as they are, they have not the knowledge we have. They do not know the history of this country, they do not know the political history of this country; and it is folly for them to say, and it is folly for us to contend that we must be guided by the perfectly obiter utterances of these gentlemen who sit at Westminster. I am reminded of a story told by Sir Fitzjames Stephen, of an old and devout Hindoo who had a case before the Privy Council, and who had a great reverence for the lords of the Privy Council. And, in order to propitiate those demigods, as he thought them, he picked up in the streets of Bombay, an old idiot, and he carried him to the top of a hill, and burned him that this sacrifice might propitiate the gods in Downing Street. No member of the House could be a stronger Imperialist than I am. I do not know of a member of this House who has a stronger wish that the bond that binds Canada to Britain shall be made stronger and firmer, but I cannot look with eyes of idolatory on any casual remark made by their Lordships of the Privy Council, and which is not law. I cannot look upon their remarks as a holy Brahmin would upon the writings in his sacred books. I differ from my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I differ from the Minister of Justice that they spent so much time, and laid so much stress upon what Mr. Blake and Mr. Ewart said, and upon what Lord Macnaghten said, and what Lord Watson said, and upon what Lord Herschell said during the argument. If you take a law report, or take the report of any case to be found in the hands of any lawyer, or any reports that lawyers take into court, you will not find a word in them of this by-play which takes place between judge and counsel. Who, that has ever sat in a court, and has heard a judge groping his way between counsel in argument, has not heard the judge say on Monday what he will take back on Tuesday, and decide on Wednesday, when he delivers his judgment, differently from both. But people are conjuring with these words which have fallen from the lips of counsel and judges in the Privy Council argument as if they were sacred writings. My remark is perfectly germane to the subject under discussion, when I say, that I was not overborne by those citations which the Minister of Justice read so frequently in his speech last night. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was a great offender in that matter, because he read from Mr. Blake and Mr. Ewart and Lord Watson, to attack the position some of us had taken as to the character of the proceedings before the Privy Council.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me for one moment. I cited Mr. Blake and Mr. Ewart because I thought that what the counsel presenting the case said, certainly indicated the jurisdiction and the limit of that jurisdiction. I cited them, not because their word carried any weight per se, but simply because they defined very clearly what the Lords of the Privy Council were called upon to adjudicate.

Mr. WELDON. I heard the hon. gentleman's explanation. I followed him carefully, and I thought he was fighting the old fight he had fought in the East Block three or four months ago. That issue, though not quite so removed as the war between Carthage and Rome, was not an issue in this discussion. I thought he was fighting the fight which he and I took part in in the session of 1893, in which the same question was fought. I am content to stand by the argument I then made, and I do not wish to waste the time of the House by reopening a discussion which to-night seems to me to be perfectly academic. We are past that now. The Government, in whatever capacity, made an order that the people of Manitoba dealt with that order. That is past. Let us deal with the issue before the House. This is my argument: That the answers which the Privy Council gave us, on our invitation (they are not bound to give us any answer as Judge Taschereau pointed out) are very valuable and very interesting, but that is about as much as you can say in reference to them. The opinions of the Supreme Court of Canada and afterwards of the Privy Council, given to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, are very much like the opinions which the twelve judges of England give to the House of Lords in rare

cases. I come now to the last section, and hon. members, I know, will heave a sigh of relief to hear me say that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. WELDON. It is the third section, and when it is read, the whole constitution, written and unwritten, is read, and stated, so far as I am able to state it:

In case any such provincial law as from time to time seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of the section, is not made.

If there is any member of this Parliament who can explain what these words mean, which are as enigmatical and as impossible of explanation as the convention of Ulster, I would like to hear him. The restrictive words in clause 3 seem to me a pure mechanical blunder of the draughtsman, and they show with what carelessness and lack of interest this matter was disposed of when the Bill went through committee. This clause is a transcript of the clause in the British North America Act, the words of which have an easily explainable meaning. They look to the laws which the new province of Quebec had to make under the constitution to put the Protestants of the eastern townships and Montreal, in as good a position as the Catholics of Upper Canada; and the constitution says that if this new legislature of Quebec does not do what it is charged to do, we in the Federal Parliament will do it. It contemplates a provincial law being made in the future, and provides that if the provincial legislature does not make such a law, the Federal Parliament will do so. But it was nonsense to put these words in the Manitoba Act, and I am satisfied that their insertion in that document is a simple case of blundering on the part of the draughtsman, the mechanical transcription of five lines with no possible meaning. Nothing is contemplated in the earlier sections of the Manitoba Act of the nature of a compulsory school law in Manitoba; there is no Act to which the words I object to could refer; and neither grammar nor logic allow their insertion. I pass over this section and go on. The pith of the section seems to me to begin with the preposition "in," and it goes on as follows:—

In case any decision of the Governor General in Council, on any appeal under this section, is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then, and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case may require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section, and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section.

I need not argue that. It has been argued so often in this House that we are familiar with it. The statute says that when a certain event happens, which has happened, Parliament may make a remedial law. It is clear that we have the power. But the statute does not use any word that indicates compulsion. It does not say we must or shall make remedial laws; and I base a great deal on this clear word "may" of the Act, seeing that we have no case to guide us. We have a dictum of Lord Herschell on this point which has been referred to by the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. member for North Simcoe, so that it is not necessary for me to read it. Lord Herschell says that there is no legal compulsion on Parliament, and the hon. Minister of Justice has expressed the same view. That view, however, has not been prevalent in the country. In the papers, in the Protestant papers which I have read, it is often argued that there is a compulsion upon Parliament under section 2 to grant remedial legislation. But that question was argued with so much strength and candour and conclusiveness by my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) that I do not propose to add anything to his striking and persuasive argument. He drew a strong contrast between section 1, which dealt with the rights which the Catholics had in the old settlement of Selkirk, and section 2, which dealt with rights which should arise under new provincial legislation. As to the first, he pointed out that this Parliament had no power to touch them—that the courts would determine whether they had been violated; and as to the second, he pointed out that the clause could not be a formal declaration that separate schools once given would be given for ever. Such a guarantee would be a most reckless provision. If, as he said, the legislature, by any snap or hasty judgment, made an absurd law, and the sober second thought of the people led them to repent, there would be no way of repealing that preposterous law; and to suppose that any Parliament, looking into the future, would give any local legislature the dangerous power of making perpetual laws as to rights which he said were in the womb of the future, as to franchises not yet known, was to assume that Parliament in passing such legislation was acting without proper discretion. Now, I leave the argument here, and I ask the House again, does the constitution bind this Parliament to give remedial law. If so, what clause of the constitution? The first? No, because it does not speak of parliamentary action at all. The second? No, because it does not speak of parliamentary action either. Does the third? It speaks of parliamentary action; it says that Parliament may act; but it does not say that Parliament is under any compulsion to act.

My argument on the main point is now ended. I wish to say a word or two before I sit down with reference to a statement which has been several times made in this House that while the position we are taking may be a perfectly good position in a court of law—that while we may fairly entrench ourselves behind the

written text of the constitution and the views of the Lords of the Privy Council; yet it devolves upon this Parliament to grant redress which the courts of law cannot grant—that this Parliament should not be bound by the letter of the constitution, but that if we are satisfied that the Catholics in the Selkirk settlement or their spokesman at the time thought they were getting separate schools, and this Parliament thought it was giving them separate schols, though the courts said it was not, we should implement the constitution, and carry out that understanding in good faith. Tennyson says:

Truth-teller was our English Alfred called.

If there is any quality which a man of the English race takes more pride in than another it is keeping faith; if there is any word that wounds an Englishman more than another it is the word perfidy. I was touched by the statement of my hon. friend from North Bruce when he said that he would not, under any fear of his constituency or under any desire to please the mob, consciously break a treaty. Was there a treaty or an understanding? I submit that is a vital part of the case. I have followed the discussion on this question; I heard the elaborate argument of the hon. member for North Simcoe; I heard the answer of the hon. Minister of Justice; I have heard the detailed statement of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRiviere), whom I do not see in his seat to-night; and having heard these hon. gentlemen and having read the history of the case so far as I have been able to master it; having also read Begg's History of the North-west, the fairness of which I think is admitted by all parties; having gone through the debates on the Manitoba Act—debates which were very long and in which almost all the leading members of Parliament took part—I frankly say that my mind has swung round upon this question. When I came to Ottawa, not having had access in Halifax to these records, I thought the position taken by the Minister of Justice was probably historically true; but after my study of these documents, my mind swung round to the belief that the Manitoba question, while to-day filling the whole sky was out at that time half the size of a man's hand. The only record of any demand by the Manitoba settlers for separate schools was in the bill of rights which the hon. member for North Simcoe calls spurious, and which I think was spurious; and I will refer to that in a moment. The discussion that took place in this House when the Manitoba Act was going through was reported at great length. While it was in committee, Mr. Oliver, a member of the House, moved to strike out clause 22, which deals with education. The first speaker, on such motion, seemed to misunderstand the law, and supposed that he was doing away with constitutional limitations upon Manitoba altogether. The Hon. William Macdougall explained that this was not the effect of the motion, but that it was simply to put the Manitoba people under section 93 of the British North America Act. Among those who spoke were Cartier, McDonald, Hincks, Howe, Mills, Bowell, Mackenzie, Macdougall.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a very inadequate report.

Mr. WELDON. I am sure it is a very inadequate report; it is all the report we have. From that report it would seem to me it was, if I may use the expression, an ordinary liberal amendment to a Government Bill. It was one of some fifteen or twenty amendments made on almost every section of the Bill, and the House divided. Passing by the Oliver amendment, omitting now from view the so-called fourth bill of rights, whose history was stated so ably by the hon. member for North Simcoe, I cannot find anything to support the view that there was a treaty or bargain. Let me go more into detail before I sit down, because I think this is a vital point in the case. I have the fourth bill of rights here, it is in Mr. Ewart's book, beginning at page 364. There is bill No. 3 and alongside in parallel columns is bill No. 4. What hon. members will be struck with is the remarkable likeness between the two. In both bills there are twenty clauses. Clause first is almost the same in both bills; clause second is exactly the same; clause three is changed a little. The internal evidence and the historical evidence seem to show that the fourth bill of rights was not the basis of negotiations at Ottawa, which was carried to Ottawa by the delegates, Father Ritchot, Judge Black and Mr. Scott, commissioned by Louis Riel and his council. The evidence seems conclusive in this matter. I will not weary the House by reciting it. It was stated by the hon. member for North Simcoe last night with great fairness, and he gave the dates. He pointed out that beyond doubt the first bill was genuine. On a certain day in March it was signed, the next day the delegates left, and it would have been very difficult in the time to put in a second one. He pointed out that the first, and second and third bills of rights were all sent to England by the Governor General of the day, but nothing appears in the English blue-book of this 4th bill of rights. Is it not therefore evident that the basis of negotiations here had nothing to do with the fourth bill, but that it was the third bill which played a part in the negotiations. The Governor General would naturally send home the instrument on which the bargain was founded, and the fact that he did not send home this 4th bill of rights is conclusive proof that it was not considered in the negotiations. Here is a piece of evidence, which, I think, will convince us that the 4th bill of rights is a spurious instrument. Bills No. 3 and 4 run along pretty much alike until they come to

the seventh clause, and there the genuine bill reads as follows :—

That a sum equal to 80 cents per head of the population of this province be paid annually by this Government to the local legislature of the said province until such time as the said population shall have increased to 600,000.

There was the demand that they were pressing for steadily in the different bills of rights—the financial term, which was a vital matter, concerning which the delegates were in dead earnest. In the spurious bill of rights, as I call it, this clause is omitted, and in its place is substituted the clause regarding separate schools. It is extraordinary that this important matter of finance which the delegates strongly urged and ultimately secured should be displaced from the bill and there should be put in its place this irrevelant declaration, taking it in connection with what precedes and what follows. That seems to confirm the conclusion reached by my hon. friend from North Simcoe. I do not think that the question of separate schools can be taken as a live one at that period at all. The school question was not then a vital one. It is easy now, when that question has become of such enormous importance, to assume that it was also then a live and burning question, but I do not think that is a fair reading of history, and I cannot accept it as such. The English blue-book gives the third bill of rights certified to by the secretary of Louis Riel, Thomas Bunn, as a genuine bill. All the internal evidence support the theory that it is a genuine bill ; and I cannot accept the theory that the Catholics of Manitoba asked for separate schools in this particular document. Therefore, that part of their argument with reference to the treaty breaks down. One point more. To show how little attention was paid to the Manitoba school question in 1870, contrast the debates on the Manitoba Act in 1870 with the debates on the formation of the constitution of the other provinces. The discussion of the school question takes up hundreds of pages in debates on the British North America Act. But take the discussion on the Manitoba Act, either on the first reading or on the second reading, when there was a long discussion, participated in by Sir John Macdonald, Sir George Cartier, Sir Francis Hincks, Mr. Mackenzie, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), Mr. Bowell, now Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the Hon. William Macdougall and a great many more distinguished and leading members of Parliament, and you will find that not one word was said about the school question. I have gone through the debates very carefully, and cannot find a word on that subject, although the debates were reported at very great length. Everything else was discussed, but this school question was not, so that it could not have been in the foreground as a live and burning question. But take the other constitution, the British North America Act, and you will find that in the debates on that constitution, the school question was discussed at greater length than any other question. In the passing of the Manitoba Act, the school question was an obscure and petty one which excited little or no interest. I think that the Catholic people of that day were not anxious or concerned to protect their schools in Manitoba. I think they expected, as most Canadians expected, that the new province born along the Red River would be a French Catholic province, and they may have fairly said that the minority would not be of their faith, and do not seem to have taken any interest in the matter. I may be asked why the Protestants did not raise the question, but no doubt the Protestants considered that practically they had the same protection which was given them in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The hon. member for Bellechasse asked a question as to why the word "practice" was put in, and he got his answer. I would like to give him the answer again. It is given most clearly in the judgment of Chief Justice Taylor. At that time in Manitoba there was no legislature or statutes, and the draughtsman in simply reproducing the terms of the British North America Act :

Nothing in this Act shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in any province at the union——

would give no protection, would not put the Catholics or Protestants in Manitoba in as good a position as these classes of persons were in New Brunswick, because New Brunswick had an older legislature and had statutes. Manitoba had not, and no doubt they said, to give the religious bodies in Manitoba the same real protection they enjoyed in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, the word "practice" must be inserted and therefore it was put in. If it were not for the fact, that the Selkirk settlers had no school laws, I do not think the word "practice" would have been put in section 22 of the Manitoba Act, and furthermore the draughtsman, when draughting the Manitoba Act, said : No doubt we will take the original constitution, we will take the British North America Act, and apply it as far as possible. Section 91 of that Act is all right ; section 92 is all right, but when he came to section 93, some one may have said : The original clause will give no protection at all, because there are no laws ; and the draughtsman struck out the old section and substituted the new. There was no doubt great carelessness in the draughting of that Act. The language of the first section was very carelessly drawn. No good draughtsman would approve of the language of the first subsection. It is evidently a piece of careless draughting. What does it say :

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in any province at the union.

That is not a phrase to describe the birth of Manitoba. Canada had acquired the whole territory as far west as British Columbia, cancelling the Hudson Bay claims. Her Majesty, of her own motion, granted to Canada that territory. Canada created the new province. "At the time of the union," is a most infelicitous expression to describe the birth of the province. It is a piece of careless draughting. Not very inaccurate, perhaps, but careless. The third subsection, as I say, seems to be a piece of very careless draughting; and the whole goes to show how little interest was taken in the matter by the House or the committee of the House or by the people at that time.

As to the merits of the question, I do not think that this is the time to speak. I have great sympathy for the members of the Government. They have had to deal with a question of great delicacy and difficulty. That question was thrust upon them, it was not of their own seeking. And I think that from 1891, when the first call came to disallow the Act passed by the legislature under Mr. Greenway, the administration has dealt with the question with patience, with skill, with legal insight. I voted that way in 1893, I spoke that way in 1893. I do not wish to recall one word I then said. The Government were not precipitate; and I think they have read the constitution with fidelity and care. I break with the Administration because of the unfortunate—as it seems to me—declaration they made last Monday week, and confirmed last Thursday. The reasons I gave in my remarks of last Thursday, I re-echo to-night. I have spoken purely on the legal question, and with a view of helping to clear the air. I had hoped, and I do hope, that the lawyers on the other side of the House will assist the lawyers on this side of the House to clear the air. If we are wrong, our words will be of little value. If we are not speaking the truth, our words will fall short. If our logic is good, if our investigation of history is fair, if we have adequate knowledge—then the people who wish the re-establishment of separate schools in Manitoba should take fair ground also. If they believe that separate schools should be re-established; if they believe that necessary in a country like this, with a view to peace and order and reconciliation; if they believe we should give to the Roman Catholics what they want on the ground that a majority can always afford to be solicitous and careful of the feelings and opinions of the minority, let them so declare. A minority is apt to be sensitive, irritable, suspicious. How true it is. But if that is our ground, let us stand upon that ground. Let us say frankly: I am in favour of separate schools, because I believe that they will give the country permanent peace. If I believed that, then, strong as are my sympathies, and unconsciously strong as, no doubt, are my Protestant feelings, I have so great a desire to live on terms of good-will with my Catholic fellow-countrymen, whether they be of Irish, English, Scotch, or French blood, that I would be willing to abandon my own convictions and submit to the judgment of others. If, for me, the horoscope could be cast so that I might know what settlement of this question would give peace to my country, and turn her tired mind away from these wrangles, I would accept that settlement. These wretched quarrels weaken the energies and retard the development of our resources. We need all our energies to extend our industries, to give a stronger policy for the North-west, and fill that country with people, better our connections with England and improve our trade with any people that would trade with us. I may be asked, as one hon. gentleman has asked me: What meaning do you give to section 93? Is that section not a constitutional guarantee? Yes. And would you abridge it in this way. I frankly say, I will. If I can elect between two constructions, I will take the one that gives it the narrowest reading. I frankly say that because I think the policy of a federal union was, as it were, to plough a fire belt around these questions wherever they might break out; I say that that fire belt was to be coterminous with the lines of the provinces, so that these burning questions might not spread into the federal territory, so that the strong winds of passion that blow on this Parliament hill might not bear these burning brands west and east, to light new fires in all the many provinces. In closing, I would only say, may we be inspired with patience, with kindness, with good-will, and with a spirit of obedience to the law, whatever happens.

Mr. MASSON. At this late hour of the night, and at this stage of the debate, I will not trespass upon the patience of the House——

Mr. WELDON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a moment. I meant to say that I will vote against the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe, for the reason that I am anxious to see the Government do the best they can to reach a provincial solution of this difficulty.

Mr. MASSON. I am very glad the hon. gentleman rose to make that addendum to his speech. I had judged from his remarks that he was going to vote the other way, and am delighted to hear his last statement. I am glad that all who have spoken upon this subject have approached it with calm and thoughtful consideration, and, in discussing

the matter from their different standpoints, have endeavoured to present it in a practical, statesmanlike and judicial manner. We have heard a great deal, indeed, as to the power of the Governor in Council, and of Parliament. I think these opinions differ more in language than in meaning, and I might even say more, in the meaning of the words used than in the words themselves. We are told by one hon. member that it is claimed the Governor General in Council was bound by the Privy Council's decision, or the Privy Council's opinion, as the last speaker put it. Bound in what way ? No person has argued in this House, no person that I know of has argued seriously in the country that the Governor in Council here was bound to follow the opinion of the Privy Council. The Privy Council was asked, as the hon. member who has just taken his seat stated, for that opinion for the guidance of the Governor in Council, and of Parliament. And, that opinion being given, we are bound to respect it, we are bound to be guided by it so far as we consider it correct. Now, has the hon. gentleman from North Simcoe, has the hon. gentleman from North Bruce, has the hon. gentleman from Albert, the three gentlemen who have spoken most strongly upon that point, suggested such a thing as that any one of the several answers was incorrect ? Has any one of them taken the slightest exception to any of the decisions of the Privy Council ? No one has taken objection, and that being the case, we are bound to have respect to them. If they are correct, we are bound to consider them carefully. Although we may differ from them, we should not cast them aside as useless without giving them great consideration. I think the House will agree with me when I say that whether the order of the Governor in Council is bound or not is only a matter of language, and of the meaning of words. No person for a moment will dispute that the order of the Privy Council here followed exactly the opinion of the Privy Council in England, and that Parliament is free to act, that Parliament is politically omnipotent. It would be absurd, I use the word advisedly, to say that the Governor in Council, to whom reference was made to hear the application of the minority, to hear arguments pro and con with reference to that petition, a matter that had not been presented before the Privy Council in England—that the Governor in Council would be bound to come to the same conclusion on matters of fact, or even as to the remedies proposed. Then on the other hand, we, as a Parliament, are in no way bound by the decision of the Government here. They take the responsibility, as they take the responsibility in every other administrative Act. There has been no shirking of that responsibility. From the time the late Premier stated what the Government's responsibility would be, until the present time, no member of the Government ever shirked responsibility as a matter of Administration. But the hon. member for North Simcoe says that all the steps taken in this matter, except the first one of refusing to veto the Bill, have been wrong. I did not hear anything n his argument to show wherein the Government had been wrong in waiting for the decision of the courts in the pending suits of Barrett and Logan. These actions formed one reason, at least, for not vetoing the Bill, because, before the time for vetoing had arrived, the matter had gone into the courts, private litigants had entered suits, and that was one reason for not vetoing. While these suits were pending, was there any reason why the Government should not wait for a decision of the tribunals upon one of the strong points urged by the minority ? They waited for that decision. The Manitoba Court, the Supreme Court of Canada, and the Privy Council of England, each give their decision. That was a finality as far as a claim under the first section of the Act extended, but that did not debar them from further action. These suitors were claiming that the Act was ultra vires, and that it should be entirely set aside. That is very similar to a procedure we have in our division courts in Ontario. There we have a court of inferior jurisdiction, of jurisdiction to $200 in cases on promissory notes, bills of exchange, &c., of $100 on general actions and contracts, and of $60 on all personal actions, including torts to persons and property. Now, in the first class mentioned, there is a right of appeal on the merits ; in all the classes of action, in all the other limits of jurisdiction there is no right of appeal upon the merits. In all the cases, in all the lines of jurisdiction, there is an application to the court for prohibition on the ground that the action is not within the jurisdiction of the Division Court. Now, supposing a person is sued in the first mentioned class, the class in which there is the right of appeal, and he objected to the jurisdiction, as well as fought the matter on its merits, he would have a right to move first for prohibition to test the question of jurisdiction, failing on the question of jurisdiction, he would then have the right of appeal upon the merits. That is precisely a parallel case to the one in question. These suitors sought first, on the question of jurisdiction, the judgment of the highest court. That judgment went against them, they were out of court. But they had the right of appeal to the Privy Council of Canada on the merits. That appeal they made, and when that appeal came up for argument here, Manitoba refused to attend, grave questions arose, and under authority of an Act of Parliament, reference was made to the Supreme Court. Was it not right to wait until these questions were decided ? These questions have all been decided, and no person cavilled at any one of these decisions of the Privy Council ; no person speaking

in this House has dared to get up and say that any one of these opinions was incorrect. I think we must all come to the opinion expressed so firmly by the last speaker, that the course of the Government throughout has been wise, moderate and statesmanlike. They have tried to do nothing rashly, they have endeavoured to get at the very bottom of these intricate matters, they have sought the best advice, and now they have come before Parliament, or will shortly come before Parliament, asking for a ratification of their Act in following that advice. Now, the question has been raised, what is meant by this right of appeal ? It has been alleged that because the minority have the right of appeal, they must win in the appeal, that there is no such thing as failure, in whole or in part, that they must succeed in their claim. I think that as a question of law, that position is untenable. If there is a right of appeal, there must be a question to decide, and that question may be decided one way or the other. It may be a partial success, and it may be a partial failure. It is for those who hear the appeal upon the eivdence produced, and the opinions they have received from the Privy Council as to matters of law, to decide what is right and proper under the circumstances. But it is said that the minority demand that they must have an entire restoration of the schools as they existed, incompetent, improperly managed, improperly taught, improperly equipped, presided over by incompetent and unqualified teachers, as it is alleged ; they must have those schools back exactly in the shape they were, whether good, bad or indifferent. I do not understand such to be the claim of the minority, and I have read with great care the arguments before the Privy Council in England and the arguments made before the Privy Council here by counsel representing the minority in order to ascertain the extent of the claims made. I gather that they make no such claims as have been suggested, but that the minority would be perfectly satisfied if they had power to build and maintain their schools, and to control those schools, subject to Government inspection ; that on building, maintaining and controlling their schools they should be relieved from taxes for other public schools ; that they should receive their share pro rata of the government money, and I have no hesitation in saying, on the merits, that they are entitled to those claims. It cannot be argued that this means the restoration of separate schools with incompetent teachers. I understand and I gather that the minority, or a large portion of the minority, would be satisfied to allow teachers to be examined by the ordinary inspector. I understand, if there is more than one inspector, and they consider there should be more than one, one inspector should be a Catholic. Of course, I cannot gather the details fully, but on these points I think we may reasonably come to the conclusion that with these concessions granted to them, the minority will be satisfied. What has been taken away from them ? A right established by statute in 1871, the right that they had to govern their own schools to the fullest extent. The Manitoba Act gives them the right to appeal in the event of these matters being interfered with. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) says, would you have one law for Manitoba and another for Quebec ? Certainly not. Let them agree as far as practicable. I will read, what has not been read already, the corresponding section in the British North America Act, which the last speaker was frank enough to say was almost verbatim in the Manitoba Act. It refers to the whole of the provinces. It says :

> Where, in any province, a system of separate or dissentient schools exist by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the legislature of a province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

That is almost word for word, as regards the operative portion, the same as is found in the Manitoba Act. Therefore, there is not one law for Manitoba and another for Quebec, but there is the same law for both. I am glad the Protestant minority of Quebec has the same rights that are now being sought, the same protection that is now being claimed by the minority of Manitoba. On that consideration, I call the attention of the hon. member for North Bruce to the fact that the Protestants of Quebec are in just as bad a plight, if the power of the majority there was exercised, as is the Catholic minority in Manitoba, the power of the majority there being exercised. At the time of the union they had no separate schools as they have now. There were negotiations during the time of the Confederation Debates in respect to these schools, and from time to time we had all our Protestant church papers in Ontario, with those in Quebec, agitating in favour of improving the Protestant schools of Quebec before union took place, as they were expected to be permanently established. We had those papers fighting for their Protestant friends, anxious and earnest in their solicitation on behalf of the Protestants of Quebec. We had them publishing article after article, there was petition after petition, meeting after meeting, and if the hour was not late I would read some of the articles from the church papers, in which the difference in the schools of Lower Canada and the schools of Upper Canada as to the minority is distinctly set forth. It was shown by those papers that in the province of Quebec they did not get their fair share of public money, that they had not a fair share of taxation, that all the absentee landlords were taxed

for the Catholics, that all the corporate bodies were taxed for the Catholic or majority schools, that they were therefore cut down largely in taxation, that they could not form a union section, part being in one parish and part in another, that if a Protestant school was to be established it had to be established in one parish and that when the parish was divided into two sections, the people were unable to support two schools. All these matters admitted as a matter of right to the minority in Upper Canada were not so fully conceded in Lower Canada. Up to the time of confederation no decisive step was taken. I am now referring to an article published in 1864. In 1865 we had a Presbyterian church paper saying as follows :—

Parliament will soon meet again to discuss the question of confederation. What has been done since the last session was called ? Has there been placed before the public the true aspect of our law on common school of education ?

Then the question is answered, and the article proceeds :

Two or three meetings, a number of circulars, an application to Parliament, and then a total cessation of everything like effort. Are we prepared, this having been the course adopted, to have this question settled in the present Parliament ? If so, what are the terms we may expect ?

Nothing was done. Confederation was completed, and it was not until two years afterwards, in 1869, the present Education Act of Quebec was passed, granting the Protestants of Quebec the most complete system of separate schools I have discovered, far superior to the separate schools of Ontario, the system being far more extensive in its operation, and the privilege given to the Protestant minority far greater. Was it in reference to this that the hon. gentleman from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said: Is there one law for Quebec and another for Ontario ? No. He referred to the action and debate which took place on the Jesuits' Estates Act. Could anything be more unfair than the inference which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) inadvertently sought to draw. He mistook his position, he mistook his premises. I do not charge him with wilful unfairness, but I say that the inference he inadvertently sought to draw was practically unfair. Admitting for the sake of his argument that the Jusuits' Estate question was a matter relating to education—very remotely relating to education every one will say—how far are the two questions parallel ? The Jesuits' Estate Act was passed, but until the time had lapsed there was no application to veto it. Even admitting that the application to veto had come in time, it was not vetoed, and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) yesterday declared that the Government were right in not vetoing the Manitoba Act, because it was within the jurisdiction of the province of Manitoba. So was the Jesuits' Estates Act within the jurisdiction of Quebec, and if the Government were right in not vetoing one, they were right in not vetoing the other. What was the motion of the hon. gentleman in reference to the Jesuits' Estates Act ? It was that the Government should be turned out as derelict in their duty, because, all unasked for, they neglected to veto it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) forgot his premises when he said there was one law for Quebec and another for Manitoba. The application for veto was made and refused. Petitions were filed, and a start made on the line of appealing the matter of the Jesuits' Estates Act, as the Manitoba school question has been fought out on the right of appeal, assuming that it came within the reference to education. But when the time was named to hear the parties in the Jesuits' Estates matter, they did not appear, a settlement was made between the parties and there the matter stopped. There is still another point in which the parallel is broken right at the start. Whereas, the Manitoba School Act was passed by the majority, in spite of the solemn and vigorous protest of the minority, and on the vote every Catholic representative in the Assembly voted against it, and eight Protestant representatives joined hands in opposing the measure ; the Jesuits' Estates Act in Quebec was passed unanimously and without a dissenting voice. True, two members did say "passed on division," but when pressed to have the yeas and nays, they withdrew their opposition, and on the record it shows that the Act was passed without a dissenting vote. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) was therefore drawing a comparison that will not bear investigation, when he said, there was "one law for Quebec and another law for Manitoba." To be very brief, Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my reasons why I have made the statement that I favour the Manitoba people having separate schools to the extent I have alluded to. My first and principal reason is : That I believe in religious education in schools. I believe that so long as this is a Christian country, we must have Christian schools, be they Protestant or Catholic. If it were possible in the ingenuity of man, to discover some way in which they both could unite and obtain a reasonable and proper amount of religious education together, then I would heartily endorse that. But under the strained conditions between the two creeds in this country that is impossible at present, and while it so remains impossible I am in favour of separate schools. I am in favour of separate schools on the ground that every man is entitled to civil and religious liberty. Civil and religious liberty must embrace, and does embrace, that the parent has the right to teach his children his own religion and to have them so taught in the schools. Where the parent bears the expense himself, no one will question that right of his, but

the state has a right to assist in the education, and the state has just as much right to assist in religious education as in any other class of education. It is the duty of the state to make the man as he grows up the best possible citizen, and the better he is educated the better citizen he will be, and the more religion he has instilled into him in his youth and the more he retains through riper age, the better citizen is he. Another reason why I favour the granting of separate schools in Manitoba to the extent I have alluded to is, that were I living in the province of Quebec I should demand the same rights there, and what I feel disposed to demand for myself in Quebec, I am willing to grant to those of the opposite creed in any other province in this Dominion. Now, with the exception of the last speaker (Mr. Weldon), every member who took his line of argument from the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) dwelt largely upon what they called provincial rights. A province, be it Manitoba or any other province, has no right except what the statute gives it, and in one particular that right is limited by the statute, then that right is limited to all intents and purposes and must be treated in its limited condition. This right of appeal in questions of education is the only class of cases where the right of appeal exists; but it exists by the constitution, and it is futile to argue as the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) argued, that it was a mistake to put it there. If it was a mistake to put it there then there is a constitutional means to have it remedied, but while it does exist in the law, the administrators of this Government must respect it, and this Parliament should respect it. As I said, Parliament is politically omnipotent and Parliament may override it, but the Ministers dare not. Their oaths of office are to administer the laws as they are, and not as they think they ought to be. They might have different opinions and they might think that laws should be amended, but their duty is to administer the laws as they find them. On the other hand, Parliament is politically supreme and may override laws. Now the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said that he would stand to the bitter end against forcing separate schools on Manitoba. "Forcing separate schools on Manitoba" is a very favourite expression nowadays by orators throughout the country. It is not a question of forcing separate schools upon Manitoba; it is a question of granting to the minority a privilege which the law of the land gave them, and which is hedged round with this protective right of appeal; and I am surprised to hear any man who professes to guide his life on the motto of civil and religious liberty refusing to grant to the minority of any section the religious liberty of teaching their children the religion of their fathers. Now, it is said that separate schools are an evil. What evils have been pointed out? I will admit them all—that they add to the expense; that in sparsely settled districts they are practically impossible in many cases; that in towns and villages, where the schools are near together, they establish a line of demarcation between different races and creeds; that the children do not grow up with as friendly feelings towards each other as if they all attended one school. I admit the force of all these objections; but the only other course which I have heard suggested is that advocated by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) the secular school; and I agree with the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in saying, as he did last session, that if he were forced to make an election between separate schools and secular schools, he would accept separate schools. I arrive at that conclusion for the same reasons, I have no doubt, that he has. Any person who takes the time and pains to search through the records of any country that has adopted the merely secular school, must come to the conclusion, I think, that it is a very dangerous experiment. It was tried in Germany, and what has been the result. The Germans were a religious people, mixed as to religion, much as we are in Canada. They tried the purely secular school, and what followed—I will not say what is the result? That the nation has gone largely over to infidelity. That is a greater evil than could possibly flow from separate schools. Then, in France, where it is known that a different education is given to the male from that given to the female, you will find that the line of infidelity is just as marked, predominating in one sex, and almost entirely absent in the other. I will not say that that is entirely the result of the teaching; but it has followed the adoption of the national school, the secular school, and the banishment of the priests, which was claimed at the time as a great Protestant victory. Then, let us take Italy, the very centre of Romanism. In 1848 Italy adopted the national school; and from the correspondence of the agents of the British and Foreign Bible Society, we find that for the first twelve years of those schools, down to 1860, the people of Italy were loud in their praises of their success—the great good being done by them, the great benefit which the few Protestants in the country were enjoying by being freed from the control of the priests, and the great advantages enjoyed by the missionaries and the sellers of the Bible. But a few years later, in 1865, a different tone was heard; and what have we found in the last year? We have had the bold statement made that Italy, with her national schools, is now by the growth of infidelity, under a thraldom worse than that of Rome. But we need not confine our attention to Europe. In the United States fifty years ago, they began to adopt the same system of national schools; and we find the same growth of infidelity following in

their track. It may be said that this is not the result of the national or secular schools, but the result of something else. But I point out that it has followed their establishment in every case, and I say it would be a dangerous experiment for a young country like Canada, and especially a young country like the North-west. But before I sit down, I must refer to one or two remarks that were made by previous speakers. I was amused at the way the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) whittled away the provisions of the subsection which gives the right of appeal. According to him, the people had the right of appeal; but in no case was it possible for any good to come from the appeal, because, in all cases the majority must rule. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), however, frankly stated that he would do his best to whittle away the right of appeal as much as possible. He said the Governor in Council were to decide the appeal, not as a court of law would, in a strictly legal and technical sense, but in an administrative sense. I agree with him that far; but he does not leave us any hope of justice. He woud not rely on that. He says the qucstion is to be decided by the will of the majority. In a question of justice, a question of rights, and privileges, snatched away in a moment, no possible case would be left by the hon. member for Albert; but he would whittle away the right of the minority to appeal. He dwelt at considerable length on the difference between Parliament being empowered and being compelled. I will not argue that question, which is a matter of words more than of meaning. Another question the hon. member for North Bruce dwelt on at considerable length, no doubt following the lead of the hon. member for North Simcoe, was that the action of the Government last February, in giving ten days' notice of the appeal, was improper and undue haste. Ten days' notice may look short, but what was the notice for? Not necessarily to prepare a case. For five years that case had been prepared; for five years it had been hanging in the courts. What instruction of counsel was further required? What new material was there to bring forth? The reasonable delay was granted, and I think the reports will show that there was a very full and able discussion of the case; and the hon. gentleman who argued it comes here after six months, and is not able to add one single argument or fact to the statement he placed before the Government. For these reasons, I have pleasure in saying that I will not detain the House longer, and that I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. DAVIN. I cannot come to the discussion of this question in the same temper as my hon. and learned friend who has preceded me (Mr. Masson), because I can, under no circumstances, regard a question which might lead to grave controversies between the Dominion Parliament and any local legislature, between Dominion action and local sentiment, as so easily disposed of as my hon. friend seems to think it could be. At this late hour, at this stage of the discussion, not indeed on this particular motion of the hon. member for Simcoe, but at this late stage of the discussion on a subject which has now been before this Parliament on two or three motions, I am not going to take up the time of the House at any length. But, Sir, I come from the North-west Territories, I come from a country close to Manitoba, and perhaps it would be improper, even if I desired it, on my part, not to contribute some small share of any little knowledge I may have on the question, to the discussion. My hon. and learned friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) has commented, not I think unreasonably, on the silence which has characterized the Opposition upon this subject. He has expressed his wonder that one or more—either the leader of the Opposition or the ex-Finance Minister or my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—has not risen to give us the benefit of their wisdom on this question. Probably we might easily find a reason, if it were our cue to analyse the motives and the hopes that animate our friends in Opposition, but that is a matter probably after all of little consequence. We have had two or three speeches of the first order in this debate. While not agreeing in all the arguments brought forward by hon. gentlemen, I may say this, that thus far this question has been discussed with lucidity, with a reach of legal knowledge and legal acumen which would have done honour to any parliament. First, taking the motion before us, if I may crave the indulgence of the House for a short time, I shall afterwards refer to the reasons why I cannot, although a supporter of the Government give my approval of the position taken up by the Government on this question. Why I differ and how far I differ from this policy. And having done that, I shall have taken up all the time that I intend to occupy. What is the question really before the House? It has been announced here by the leader of this House and elsewhere by the Prime Minister that, contrary to the opinion which prevailed and the promise made solemnly in their capacity as a Government, the Government do not intend this session to bring forward remedial legislation, and they have given the reason for their delay. They say that they have reason to believe that the legislature of Manitoba itself will settle the question, but if Manitoba does not settle it then this House will be called to meet in January next and remedial legislation will be passed. So that what we have is this. Instead of having a measure of remedial legislation put before this Parliament this session, as was promised, and as those interested in that question had a right to expect, we are told that

a change of policy has been adopted; we are told that, in the hope that Manitoba will settle this question for itself, the Government will lie on its oars for the present, and that if Manitoba does not settle it by next session, a measure will then be pressed through this House. Now, what does my hon. and learned friend from Simcoe think? He brings forward a motion as an amendment to a motion to go into Committee of Supply, but which is really an amendment to the policy which has been adopted by the Government on this Manitoba school question, and this is how my learned friend's motion reads:

This House has heard with regret the statement recently made, defining the policy of the Government respecting the Manitoba school question.

That is the first part of it. I need hardly say that any member of this House, my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) on the one hand and my hon. friend the Controller of Customs on the other, could subscribe to that first proposition, approaching it either from the extreme Catholic point of view, or the extreme Protestant point of view. "This House has heard with regret the statement recently made defining the policy of the Government respecting the Manitoba school question." I suppose that my hon. and gallant friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) could agree with that, because he could express regret that legislation, upon which he and his friends have set their hearts, has been postponed for six months. The motion might mean, then, a regret at the postponement. The second part goes on to say:

—that this House is unwilling by silence to appear to acquiesce in it——

That is to acquiesce in the policy of postponement or trying to make an arrangement with the Manitoba Government:

—or to allow it to be assumed that at the session to be held in January next, any more than at the present session, it is prepared to pass a law to restore the system of separate schools in Manitoba on the lines of the remedial order of 21st March, 1895.

I think that if that resolution were to be complete, the hon. member should have gone on to say: And therefore we further regret that the Government has not determined to do so and so. So that, Sir, in criticising my hon. and learned friend's motion, I will say this, that I do not think—and I am in accord with my hon. friend from North Bruce in that—his motion is as definite as it is desirable it should be, either in that regard or in the expression of opinion. Now, Sir, I do not intend to go into the constitutional discussion further than to say that in the main I agree in the legal constitutional argument—I will not pause to point out where we differ, because I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House; but in the main I agree in the constitutional argument made by my hon. and learned friend from Simcoe and my hon. and learned friends from Albert and Bruce. In the main I agree with the constitutional argument made by my three learned friends, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), and my hon. friend who belongs to the same inn of court of London that I belong to myself, my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). But it was stated by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Masson), and was stated emphatically last night by the Minister of Justice that the views and directions and guidance of the Privy Council had been followed. I confess that I could not help thinking, the very moment I read the remedial order that it went too far. I could not help thinking that the remedial order almost wantonly exceeded the suggestions of the learned Privy Council, that high authority. I, of course, agree with my hon. and learned friends who preceded me that that august body had nothing whatever to do but to answer the questions that were submitted to them. I also agree with the comment made by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) that I can attach no importance whatever to the conversations that took place between judges and counsel as the case proceeded. And I quite see the point of my hon. friend from North Simcoe quoting Mr. Blake and Mr. Ewart. For it was their policy to state in the strongest possible way all they could claim, and they were good witnesses for the hon. member for North Simcoe. I sat in this House with Mr. Blake and I know him personally very slightly. But of course I know him by repute. Mr. Ewart is a friend of mine. We know that both Mr. Blake and Mr. Ewart are eminent as lawyers and are men of the very highest character, and both men who would fight hard for their clients. Therefore when they state their case setting forth what they claimed and what they looked for, they are witnesses of the highest authority and witnesses that were properly quoted by the hon. member for North Simcoe last night. But, Sir, to quote Lord this or Lord that, to quote even the Lord Chancellor giving obiter dicta which would have no authority and to quote their statement as having some strong bearing upon the opinion or judgment of this House, was a thing that no member of the House who speaks on the question can, with due regard to the dignity of the House, pass over in silence. But these gentlemen give you an answer to these questions placed before them, and in closing their opinion they say:

It is certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted, or that the precise provisions of those statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890, no doubt, commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of

the province. All legitimate ground of complaint would be removed if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessry to give effect to these provisions.

Now, what does the remedial order do? The remedial order tells the Government and legislature of Manitoba that the Acts and the provisions of the Acts that were repealed by the legislature in 1890 shall be restored. It is very brief, let me read what it says:

(a) The right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support Roman Catholic schools, in the manner provided for by the said statutes which were repealed by the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid.

(b) The right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for the purposes of education.

(c) The right of exception of such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic schools, from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools.

Why, Sir, that directs the establishment, not of the system that the hon. member for North Grey a short time ago described, and which he said he had some authority for stating would be satisfactory to the minority in Manitoba, but it describes the system that was in existence prior to 1890, and calls for its restoration. Now, Sir, I have pretty high authority for stating that if the system that obtains at the present time in the North-west Territories were given to Manitoba, the minority in Manitoba would be content. I have it on authority that I may describe as almost the very highest that can be had that they would be content with that. Now, what is that system? It is a very moderate system, wholly different from what is called for by the remedial order. In the North-west Territories we have public schools and we have separate schools. We have the same system of inspection for both, the same curriculum, the same books, the same teaching on the same schedule from 9 to 3. But from 3 to 3.30 the religion that is directed by the trustees to be taught in that school is taught. Now, I must say, that when I was told by a Roman Catholic gentleman who could speak with direct authority from the late Archbishop Taché whose entire confidence he had—this was before I came down here—that Manitoba would be satisfied with the system that obtains at present in the North-west Territories, I felt that that was an exceedingly moderate demand, and that if anything at all was to be done, less certainly could not be done. Now, knowing the sentiment of Manitoba as I do—a sentiment, I may say, that extends far beyond Manitoba, for the whole country is electric with regard to this education question—I could not agree with the extent to which the remedial order went. With what I have read from the opinion of the Privy Council before me, I could not think that it was necessary to go that length. Now, how do we stand to-day? In consequence, no doubt, of several causes, the Government, instead of bringing in remedial legislation says: We are not going to legislate this session, we have reason to believe that Manitoba will deal with this question. If they have for one moment any ground at all for supposing that Manitoba will deal with this question, it would be criminal on their part to attempt to deal with it in this House. Therefore, holding that view, I could not hesitate, when I was asked my opinion, in saying that I believe that the Government has taken a wise course in postponing action until a future day. There are various rumours abroad as to the grounds for the anticipation that Manitoba will act. I do not think that, in judging the conduct of the Government in this matter, I am to probe into its means of knowledge. Its means of knowledge may be such that it would not be right that I should know them at the moment, or the Government may consider it well to keep them to themselves. But when the Government states that it has reason to believe that the legislature of Manitoba will deal with this matter, then, in my opinion, I have nothing more to say at present. Now, believing as I do in provincial rights, believing that it is best for Manitoba and best for every province, I cannot for one moment hesitate to say, that as the Government takes the responsibility of declaring that Manitoba will deal with the question, leaving it for a few months that have yet to elapse, it will be time enough next session, in my opinion, to discuss the question that is propounded by the hon. member for Simcoe. I think it is a monstrous thing to ask this Parliament to vote want of confidence in the Government because of some action that it may possibly take five months from now, in consequence of something that may probably take place, and of which we would all approve, not having taken place in the meantime. But this is a motion of want of confidence, and if I vote for it, I declare that I want to have those gentlemen on the treasury benches replaced by gentlemen from the Opposition.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. It would be a good thing.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have never had a very profound reverence for the opinion of my hon. friend from Montmagny, but I can assure him it was never so low as at this moment. What would happen if the motion of my hon. friend from Simcoe was carried? Would his ends be accomplished, judging by his speech? I have no doubt that one of his ends would be accomplished, because I do not think that the sentiment in his heart towards the present Government is one of unbounded and unqualified love. But what would be the result? He

told us in his speech that he was opposed "à outrance" to the establishment of separate schools in Manitoba, and to remedial legislation. I am going to make a recantation, almost an apology, to the hon. and learned gentleman who leads the Opposition. I have declared again and again, and I have echoed and cheered similar declarations from other places, that on this question, as on so many other questions, the leader of the Opposition was absolutely without a policy, that his policy was, as Pope says,

To talk about it, goddess, and talk about it.

But I recant my declaration in that regard, and I want to impress my hon. and learned friend from Simcoe with a discovery I made. In a speech made by my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Laurier) on Monday night, he declared that in 1893 he had stated his policy. I remembered that we had had a great debate on this question in 1893, and I went and looked up the utterances of the leader of the Opposition. I find, Sir, that we have not been doing him justice in this matter. I find that he has declared his policy on this question, but I must say, in such a way that one might be excused for not remembering that he had, to a certain extent, nailed his colours to the mast. Now, he tells us in this very Parliament, and his words are almost vibrant still in the air, that in 1893 he declared his policy in regard to this question. On that occasion he went into an elaborate argument, referring to the history of the separate school question in Quebec, and this is what he declares to be his policy:

Now, Sir, what was the intention of the framers of the constitution on this point? Let us set aside Manitoba for a moment. Manifestly, Sir, the intention of the framers of the constitution was, that, whenever a law relating to education was passed in a province which had enjoyed a system of separate schools, which law the minority deemed oppressive, that minority should have the right to come before the Dominion Government—nay, before the Dominion Parliament—and claim justice—claim to be protected from that oppression. And, Sir, if there is an appeal,——

You see he went much further than my hon. friend from North Bruce went to-night, who stated that the appeal did not of necessity carry any remedy. This is what the leader of the Opposition said:

—And, Sir, if there is an appeal, it follows, as a consequence, that the authority to which the appeal lies has the right to interfere. But, Sir, so strong am I in my convictions of provincial rights that I am bound to say at once that this privilege of appeal should not be exercised except for very cogent reasons, and this interference should not take place either, except for very, very cogent reasons—reasons implying such an abuse of power on the part of the local legislature as no man with a heart in his bosom would submit to.

Later on, he says:—

Now, Sir, I can easily conceive, in view of what has taken place of late, of such an abuse of power taking place.

And he goes on:—

As you know, we have in Quebec no schools but religious schools—Roman Catholic schools and Protestant schools. Suppose the legislature of Quebec were to-morrow to abolish the system of separate schools existing there, so that the Protestant population would have either to send their children to the Roman Catholic schools or bring them up in ignorance or tax themselves a second time to establish schools of their own. Sir, if under the circumstances, an appeal were brought to this Government, is there a man in this House who would not say at once to the Government: It is your bounden duty at once to interfere and make away with this obnoxious and tyrannical legislation?

He goes on to say that the proper action would be remedial legislation, and he reiterates this on page 1998. So in 1893 the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition did what we had forgotten he did, he declared himself strongly for remedial legislation, though I grant that subsequently, for instance, when he went to Winnipeg—I have read his speech there on this subject again and again—no more on this subject than on any other subject on which he touched, such as the trade question, was I able to ascertain the opinion or policy of the hon. gentleman. So if we pass the motion of the hon. member for Simcoe and the parties cross the House and the leader of the Opposition takes the place of the present leader of the House, what would happen? The very result that the hon. member for Simcoe does not desire.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). One thing would happen: we would stay on this side.

Mr. DAVIN. Not for long. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) indicates that the hon. member for Bothwell said that Mr. McCarthy would stay on this side. I do not think that the hon. member for Bothwell could have said that because it would have been ungrammatical—he is not on this side now, he is on the other side. So the hon. member for Bothwell could not have said that. He would pass from this side of the House, if you like. Whether the hon. member for Simcoe crossed to this side or not, what would happen would be this, that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) would be on the other side and he would find his friends bringing in remedial legislation. In other words, then, on this subject of remedial legislation the Government of the day and the leader of the Opposition are at one. As to the hon. member for Simcoe and other hon. gentlemen, many of them on the Government side of the House, some of them probably on this side, who do not want provincial rights to be interfered with, what would they gain by a vote that would make parties change sides? I think it of great importance to those who take some interest in this question that they should know what are the opinions entertained and recently expressed by the leader of the Opposition. Referring to what the Government has done

in this matter, have we had not evidence before us that they had some reason to believe that Manitoba itself, which is the proper place to have this question settled, would deal with it? After the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) had passed his legislation of 1890, I had the honour of an interview which was suggested by an eminent person in Winnipeg, and we discussed this school question, and I begged of him then not to appeal to this Dominion Parliament or Dominion Government but to throw himself on the generosity, on the justice of the people of Manitoba, because I said, the very moment you go outside the province, the very moment you appeal against your own legislature, that moment you raise provincial feeling side by side with religious feeling which will be very dangerous to your contention. And so it has proved. But we have had a communication to the press from the author of this legislation, we have had a letter from the member for Winnipeg. It means one of two things: Either it was a sincere and an honest opinion, based on what he knew of the province and of the legislators of the province; or else it was insincere, and I will not attribute insincerity to him. The hon. gentleman quoted an opinion of the Minister of Public Works. The Minister had been credited with saying:

> However, it would be idle to discuss that now, as no legislation has been asked by the Catholics of Manitoba giving them the right to share in the funds provided for education by the government, or by the local authorities, if their schools are not up in secular teaching to the public schools of the province. All that they ask is to be at liberty to add to the secular education required in the public schools such religious teaching as will meet their religious views. I may say if that had been provided for in the legislation of 1890 we would never have heard of the Manitoba school question.

The impression conveyed by the authority in the west as to what would satisfy the Catholics of Manitoba is borne out, and this utterance of the Minister, whether authentic or not, would not be out of harmony with what I was told by the Catholics in the west. The member for Winnipeg, quoting the remarks alleged to have been made by the Minister of Public Works, said:

> There has been all along a very serious misunderstanding between the Roman Catholic Church and the people of Manitoba, if the above is an accurate statement of the position of the church.

I call the attention of the Minister of Justice, or I desire to do so, for a moment. I fear that as his voice comes over to me, my voice may incommode him. When Macready was playing at Liverpool on one occasion, and a baby began to cry in the pit, the tragedian stopped, and said: If this play is not stopped that baby can't go on. So I ask the hon. Minister to give me a chance. Mr. Martin who sent this letter to the newspapers goes on to say that if this was the view taken by the Minister of Public Works, who spoke with authority as representing his co-religionists, he thought from what he knew to be the opinion of the people of Manitoba there would be no difficulty in settling this question up there. He added:

> I have sufficient faith in the liberality of the Manitoba people to declare on their behalf, that, if a final settlement of this question can be reached upon the lines suggested by Col. Ouimet, they will do their part.

As I said when I commenced, I believe from what I have heard that a moderate settlement of this question would be acceptable and satisfactory to the Catholics of Manitoba, and with such an opinion as that given by the hon. member for Winnipeg, published over his own signature, if there was nothing else to influence the Ministers having charge of this matter, they might fairly pause before they attempted to hurry a settlement, because the proper place to settle this question is the legislature of Manitoba. I will go further and say that with the decision of the Privy Council before them and the opinions expressed there, although I attach no importance to anything except what appears as answers to the sixth question, and with the grave consequences that in view of everybody attach to the settlement of this question, for the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), while speaking strongly against separate schools, told the House how strongly he felt the danger of such a question as this, which tended to alarm and agitate the public mind, and the leader of the Opposition spoke of the fires of dissention being liable to be ignited by such a question as this, delay was advisable. In the early part of the session there was expressed the opinion of a gentleman from the west which would be able to solve the question. In the early days of the session and in the hearing of the Attorney General of Manitoba who sat in the gallery, I appealed to the patriotism, to the provincial patriotism, of the government of Manitoba to approach this question. Now, Sir, what is the rumour? The rumour is that they say they are ready to approach it, that they are ready to deal with it, that they are ready to discuss it, but that so long as the remedial order is before them they will do nothing whatever. That would be a very unpatriotic position for the Government of Manitoba to take. The other night the Minister of Justice stated that although the language of that order was very peremptory, and although as he stated it was the language of judgment, yet the Government did not expect that it would be carried out rigidly. I did not read the speech in "Hansard," but I gathered that the Government would be well satisfied and I am sure public opinion would be satisfied, and I am

perfectly certain the party to which I belong would be satisfied, and this House would be well satisfied, if the legislature of Manitoba comes forward with a settlement of this question; and what is still more important the Catholics of Manitoba would be well satisfied. But, Mr. Speaker, whether the Greenway Government does that or not, whether the Greenway Government does its duty or not, speaking generally in regard to the question now under discussion, I must say that I can never fail to view the interference of this Parliament, the coercive action of this Parliament, with sentiments other than those of disfavour and distrust, and the certainty that it can end in no good. When I say that, I will reiterate what I believe: that if the question be discussed, as discussed it will be in Manitoba, with the temperateness that it has been discussed here to-night, the result cannot fail to be that the sentiment of Manitoba itself will force, either Mr. Greenway's Government or some other government, to approach the question and to settle it eventually in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. COCKBURN. I rise to explain, Mr. Speaker, very briefly my position in reference to the resolution which is now before the House. Being no lawyer (and the hint has been given very distinctly to us to-night by more than one speaker that this is a legal question and reserved more particularly for legal lights)—I do not propose to take part in discussing the Manitoba school question, and a supposed remedial Bill which may or may not, according to certain contingencies, be brought before this House by the Government some time next year, generally supposed to be in January, 1896. Should such a Bill be presented to this House, I shall be prepared to speak my mind freely on the subject and to discuss it in its various aspects. At present no such Bill is before us, but we are invited by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to express our regret at the statements recently made defining the policy of the Government respecting the Manitoba school question. Now, so far as I understand the question, the policy of the Government is so to speak not absolute. It is contingent, and it is contingent upon the rejection of overtures to be made by them to the government of Manitoba for a peaceable settlement of the question before that time. The Government of the Dominion is no doubt most anxious that a peaceful solution of this question should be arrived at by the government of Manitoba themselves, believing as they must believe, and as we all believe, that this is the best course to pursue, and that any other course is beset with difficulties of the gravest character. Our Government wish to talk the matter over in a friendly way with our brethren in the young province of the West. They wish to look at the question in its various aspects, and to see if it is not possible to arrange some mode of settlement by which this vexed question will be removed from the arena of controversy. They feel assured that if this question is left unsettled much longer it will excite racial and religious animosities, the result of which no one can foresee. And, Sir, naturally they ask us to grant them four or five months to see what can be done towards a settlement. The request is a reasonable one. I assume that they have not come to this House without having good reasons for making this demand. If they have no other reasons than those which have been presented to us in the correspondence placed before the House, they are assuming a grave responsibility. But I take it for granted that they have knowledge which has not been communicated to us, and which perhaps in the interests of peace it is not desirable should be communicated to us at present. I can say then, that in this matter, from the bottom of my heart I wish them God speed, and I hope that when we all meet here next January we shall recognize the fact that a peaceful settlement has been obtained. But if unfortunately the efforts of this Government should not be crowned with success, if unfortunately they should not be able to arrive at a peaceful solution of this question with the Manitoba Government; then in accordance with a solemn declaration made on the floor of this House and on the floor of the Senate, they will, I suppose, be prepared to pass a law to restore the system of separate schools in Manitoba on the lines of the remedial order of the 21st March last. I earnestly hope that this necessity may never arise. I am deeply attached to the principles of the Liberal-Conservative party, and I firmly believe that the prosperity and the happiness of this country depend upon the principles of that party. It is therefore all the more painful for me to feel compelled to inform the Government, that if such a law or Bill is proposed by them, I shall be constrained, however reluctant to withdraw from them that generous confidence which I have hitherto reposed in them. It appears to me that Manitoba, and Manitoba alone, can solve the present difficulty, and that any attempt to force remedial legislation upon that province will be worse than useless, and will be fraught with the gravest danger to the confederation of which we are all so proud. I cannot but fondly indulge the hope, that as this time has been asked from us, there is every prospect that a peaceful solution will be achieved.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). On the time being lengthened.

Mr. COCKBURN. I speak of the time that must elapse between this and the calling of the House again, which cannot be more than four or five months. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) may be

prepared, but I am not prepared, to assume the responsibility of refusing to grant to the Government the opportunity of settling and amicably the present difficulty. Hon. gentlemen opposite, as is well known, have no views on this question; they are absolutely viewless; they are blind, and if they are able to lead a party contented with blindness, I can only say that they are departing far, far indeed, from the traditions of the great Liberal party which they pretended to represent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We see.

Mr. COCKBURN. Many a blind man has gone through this world thinking that he saw until he fell into the ditch; and if our hon. friends on the opposite side of this Chamber are disposed not to grant even the short time proposed for a possible settlement of this question, they must take upon themselves a responsibility which few men in their sane moments would care to assume. If, by granting this short respite, peace and happiness and contentment can be secured to this country, and a struggle of races and religions avoided—if we can get Manitoba to deal with this matter, which is the only power that can really deal with it, a great deal will have been achieved; and I shall look forward with confidence to the action that will be taken by the Conservative party in this matter, feeling assured that as they have led this country during the last twenty-five years on a glorious career, they will not now flinch from doing their duty in such a manner as still further to merit the confidence of the country.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can say anything to enlighten the House on this important question. I do not rise with any such idea. My only object is to state my views and the conclusion at which I have arrived, and I shall do so in a very few moments. It may not be amiss for me to say that although I hold very strong views on this question, I am not prompted by the slightest feeling of hostility to those whose faith is different from mine. In religious matters, I believe in perfect freedom; I claim that for myself, and I allow it to others. In matters of politics, I also claim the right to hold my own views, and I allow the same right to others. Now, there are certain facts which are patent to all of us in relation to this question. The first fact which comes to my mind very forcibly is this, that the law passed by the Manitoba legislature in 1890 was declared by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be intra vires. That is a fact which, I think, is sometimes forgotten—not by members of this House, but by those outside of this House who discuss this question. Another fact which is plain to all of us, and which was decided by the same Judicial Committee, is that the minority had a right to appeal to the Governor in Council. That appeal was made. The Government were bound to hear that appeal; we all agree as to that. But now we come to a point where some of us diverge. It is held by some that the Government were not only bound to hear that appeal, but that they were bound to grant it. I do not hold that opinion. I do not know that my opinion as to that is worth anything to anybody but myself. I do not speak as a constitutional lawyer; but from what I have studied and seen and heard of this question, my conclusion is that while the Government were bound to listen to the appeal, they were not bound to grant it. Now, Sir, the Government did grant this appeal, and make their remedial order. That order has not been obeyed by the Manitoba legislature. They have distinctly refused so far to obey it, and we have arrived at the present state of these proceedings. The Dominion Government have now decided not to introduce remedial legislation this session, but to postpone it until next January in order to give Manitoba an opportunity to make an arrangement with the minority; but if a satisfactory arrangement is not made by that time, then the Dominion Government pledge themselves to pass the necessary legislation. Now, Sir, my attitude on this question is this: I am opposed to interference with Manitoba. First, because I am not in favour of separate schools. My sentiments on this question have been declared in this House on more than one occasion. I know that a great many in this country who think as I do about interference with Manitoba, do not agree with me about the schools. While I would like to see religion taught in our schools if that were possible, and if we could all agree, at the same time, I hold that in a country like this, if we want to have a national system of education, the only way we can do it is to have a purely secular system of schools. For my part, I believe the state has no business to interfere with religion; I believe in the complete separation and absolute separation of church and state; and, holding that view, I believe that the secular school system is the proper system for this country. If that system were adopted, the argument so often used by our friends from Quebec would fall to the ground. They say: Look at the minority in Quebec, how well they are treated. I admit that; but I say they are treated in that way because the schools in that province which occupy the same position as the public schools of Ontario are really religious schools, and I suppose no one would expect the Protestants to send their children to Catholic religious schools to receive an education. But if the schools in this country were all secular schools, if they were devoted to the purpose for which, I think, they should be devoted, to give a secular education, and allow the religious education to be given by the parents at home, and by the pastors of the churches, then separate schools would not be a necessity at all. I think that those who hold

that religion of any kind should be taught in the schools are a little inconsistent when they oppose separate schools; but, on the ground I have stated, I oppose separate schools, which I think is a logical position. My second reason is this: Because I hold that it would be a most difficult matter to enforce a remedial law. We have all considered that question. I do not think any one has told us how a remedial order could be enforced. We are asked to wait until we see the provisions of the law; but I do not care what the provisions of the law may be. I hold that if this law is imposed on Manitoba, in opposition to the will of Manitoba, it will be not only difficult, but almost impossible to enforce any such law, I should look forward with great anxiety to a condition of things in which we would find the Dominion Government endeavouring to force a Dominion law upon an unwilling province. But, Sir, it is said by some that Parliament is bound by the Manitoba Act and the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to pass this remedial legislation. Now, if I believed that, if I believed that this Parliament was legally bound and morally bound, then my position would be entirely different. But I think it is not bound either legally or morally. That question has been argued with great force by other hon. members, and I need not pursue it further. I merely state my own views on the question. The Act says that Parliament may pass a law. It does not say that Parliament shall pass a law, and even if it did I do not think Parliament would even then be bound. But when the Act says that we may pass a law, the discretion is left to Parliament either to pass the law or to refuse to pass it. The argument of the minority is that this is a question of right under the constitution. The question was asked this afternoon, Why should Parliament deny the minority their rights? The question which rather suggested itself to my mind is this: Why should we deprive the majority of their rights? Why should we say to the large majority in Manitoba who are in favour of the law passed by them in 1890: We do not recognize your rights; the Privy Council have decided that you had a perfect right to pass that law, but we deny your right, and we propose to take that right away from you and to compel you to repeal that law. There is one right which I admit the minority have, and that is the right of appeal, and according to the Act that is the only right which is granted them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). For what purpose?

Mr. CRAIG. For the same purpose as any right of appeal. If I have a case in court and lose it, does my right to appeal guarantee that I shall win my case? Not at all. I am not a lawyer, but to my mind that view seems perfectly reasonable. I hold that there might be a case in which the evidence would be so strong that this Parliament might decide that it was bound beyond doubt to interfere, and many hon. members may say that such a case exists to-day. But I hold that such a case does not exist. I hold that no case has arisen calling for us to step in and dictate to the province of Manitoba a policy exactly the reverse of what the majority of that province approves. That Manitoba had a right to abolish separate schools we all admit, and my contention is that this Parliament is not called upon to pass a law which would in effect restore the separate schools that Manitoba, in the exercise of its constitutional right, decided to abolish. I have no fault to find with the minority in Manitoba in desiring separate schools, but I hold that no case has been made out why we should step in and override a law which has been declared intra vires. I am therefore prepared to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe.

Mr. MACLEAN (East York). The time has come when, if one has convictions, he ought to have the courage of his convictions. The Government have convictions, and I give them the credit of having the courage of their convictions. They have presented their convictions to this House in a very strong proposal. The Opposition, I am sorry to say, have no convictions, and therefore have been unable to present any resolution defining their policy. The Ministers from the province of Quebec have convictions by which they stand, and I give them credit for doing so. I also have my convictions, by which I propose to stand, and I hope to get credit from this House for not only stating but for standing by them. I shall now proceed to state where I take issue with the Government on this question. I am as ardent a constitutionalist as is the Minister of Justice. I do not yield to any one of them in my respect for the constitution and the whole constitution. I am as strong as any one in this House in the belief that government in Canada can only be conducted on the lines of compromise, still better on the lines of conciliation; and I must tell my French Conservative friends from Quebec that I am in no sense a Francophobe. I respect their laws and institutions. I read their newspapers and their books: I have lived among the French people of Lower Canada, and I respect them; I have enjoyed myself there among them, and I respect them above all things for their liberality. Having said this, I think they will give me credit for good faith in this matter, and I may say further that I respect them particularly because they are a minority and a very powerful minority in this Canada of ours. I also respect them as a Conservative, because the late Sir John Macdonald in his efforts to build up this country always commanded the respect and support of the great majority of the people of Lower Canada. It is just

because I have this respect for the French Canadians that I feel bound to protest against the Government of the Dominion declaring, as they do by the remedial order and by the statements twice made in this House by the leader of the House in reply to the leader of the Opposition and by the statement of the Minister of Justice last night, a policy of coercion to be applied to a province in the matter of education, as a part of the constitution and the policy of the Government. This is the crux of the whole question. The constitution was written with a pen of conciliation on the parchment of compromise, but not with the gall of coercion, and it is that which constitutes the bitterness of the Government's declaration to the people of Manitoba and to those who sympathize with them in the other provinces. I may be told that coercion in this particular case is only to be exercised contingent on the refusal of Manitoba to obey the remedial order. But that contingency is a mere side issue to the declaration of the Minister of Justice, which is a straight and categorical definition of the constitution and what it contains and the reasons which led the Government to come to the decisions they have come to in this matter. It may be that the motion of my hon. friend from North Simcoe is a double-edged motion. If that be the case, and it has been stated here by the Controller of Customs and the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), then it rested with those gentlemen to propose on a later occasion, if not on this occasion, a proposition that would meet their views and the views of those who sympathize with them. On account of their failure to produce such a motion, I must say that when the Government is challenged on its reading of the constitution I must declare myself: and if I am told that the question may never actually come up in this House, it is for that very reason, if for no other, that I must express my dissent from coercion as a part of the constitution. The Government have declared that coercion of a great province like Manitoba is a part of the constitution of this country and a part of the policy of this Conservative Government. Do they say coercion? Let them read the remedial order. It tells the Manitoba Government: You must do so and so, and if you do not we will put legislation on the statute-books of Canada that will carry out what we say. That is coercion in the broad sense, in the direct sense. It is coercion declared by the Government of Canada and declared in such a way that I very much regret it. I believe that conciliation is the only possible rule upon which government can be carried on in this country. And it is because the Government to-day asks that time may be given to carry on negotiations and to seek relief in that way that I regret, as the resolution says their employment of coercion as they have implied it by the statements they have made in the House, and by the remedial order they have issued. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that that constitutes the whole issue in this case. And, as a Canadian, as one hopeful of the future of the country, as one determined to live up to the constitution of the country, I regret to see that it has been declared in this House by the Government that coercion is to be employed upon a great and free province like Manitoba in regard to the matter of education.

Mr. HUGHES. At this late hour of the night, I shall not occupy much time of the House. There are two aspects of the case which present themselves to the people of Manitoba. One is the race cry or what we may call the French-Canadian aspect of the situation. The other is what we may call the religious or theological or Roman Catholic aspect of the case. Now, I agree with all that has fallen from the lips of a great many of the speakers in regard to the legal questions involved, more especially with the speech of the hon. member for Albert with whose views I heartily concur. I was very sorry he did not continue and carry his argument to its logical conclusion and connect the remedial order with the proposed legislation and with the means by which that legislation could be enforced upon the province of Manitoba. However, these are questions that will arise in due time in case of failure to come to terms with the province of Manitoba during the recess of this House. So far as the French-Canadian aspect of the case is concerned, I certainly dissent entirely from the lines of conduct followed by the hon. member for North Simcoe in past years. So far as our French-Canadian fellow-countrymen are concerned, I concede to them every right to have their language taught, not only in the schools of Quebec, but in the schools of Ontario, and in the schools of Manitoba, wherever there may be a sufficiently large colony of them to guarantee those schools. You cannot change the language of a people in a day. I have said before in this House, we may change one's religious views as often as the sun rises and sets. But you cannot change the language of a people in that way. Consequently I think it was certainly harsh on the part of the Government of Manitoba to wipe with one scratch of the pen the right of our French-Canadian fellow-countrymen of the proivnce of Manitoba to be taught their own language in their schools. I would insist upon the English language being taught in the schools of the province of Manitoba as in Ontario and the other provinces; but certainly I would have no objection whatever to the French language being taught to the French children, the Icelandic language to the Icelandic children, and so on. Yes, most assuredly Gaelic in the Gaelic settlements. In our own country, in the province of Ontario, that is done to-day. This may seem a little visionary; but

in many of the counties of the province of Ontario, the minutes of the county council are printed in one, two, or even three languages. I fail to see why a man who speaks two languages is not better than a man who speaks only one. And I am satisfied, still further, that if the policy of allowing our French-Canadian fellow-countrymen to use their own language in the schools in Manitoba had been adopted, this question would never have been brought up in this House as it is to-day. I do not purpose entering into the discussion at any length. I dissent from the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe for a number of reasons. In the first place, I cannot think that the hon. gentleman at this late hour of the session brings his resolution on in quite the good faith that ought to characterize an hon. member of this House in dealing with a question. We have no opportunity of moving any amendment to the hon. gentleman's amendment, as you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, is the case on going into Committee of Supply, and we cannot, therefore, express in the form of a resolution that which would meet our views. So we have to elect either to place the hon. member for North Simcoe in power and turn out the Government, or we have to sustain the Government. Now, I must dissent from placing the hon. gentleman in power on the school question, for it is well known what views I hold on this question. I am heartily and entirely in favour of a secular education. Last year, the hon. member for North Simcoe, in his place in the House—see "Hansard," vol. 2, page 6149—said :

> My argument was, and is now—if we hand this matter over to the control of the Territories,——

He was speaking on the North-west school question :

> —there will be no harm done. If the people in the North-west adopt a scheme of separate schools and afterwards apply for admission into confederation, there will be no great harm done to say : Very well ; nothing in any law we can give you shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with reference to denominational schools. But, if we do not give them power to choose, if we deny them the right to select for themselves, then, when the day comes, as it must before long, when some part of the Territories will ask for admission and be entitled by their population and position to have this clause enacted, then, this Parliament would be bound to repeal the law, otherwise we should be, as I say, riveting the system of separate schools upon them.

And on page 6151, he is reported as follows :—

> I have my own views about them, and, though I would agree with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in saying that I would sooner see a separate school system than a secular system, I see no necessity at all for a secular school system displacing a separate school system.

These being his views, no matter what his motion might be, I certainly would feel justified in opposing him rather than turn out the present Government. With the declaration of a policy by the leader of this Government I agree to this extent, that we have say six months in order to settle this question ; we have six months in which the people of this country may be educated. And I am satisfied from the speeches delivered here this evening by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and—to do him justice—by the hon. member for North Simcoe, have cleared the atmosphere and have removed a great deal of the sentimentality that has hitherto surrounded this question, the idea that we are obliged to get down on our knees and bow to the decision of the Privy Council upon a mere legal opinion. We have been told that the Queen has ordered us to restore these schools. All that has vanished, and I am satisfied that more progress has been made within the last few days in educating the people, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, in the true understanding of the case than has been done in all the months before. Let this education go on for six months, and even if Manitoba does not settle it, as I trust it will, when this Parliament meets next January my strong belief is it will meet with an entirely different feeling from that which prevails now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the subject should be under negotiation at the end of six months, what then ?

Mr. HUGHES. There is an old saying, that "It is time enough to bid His Majesty good morning when you meet him." However, when difficulties arise, so far as I am concerned, I have never yet hesitated to face them. If we were to turn this present Government out, what hope have we from our friends opposite ? So far as the Reform party from the province of Quebec is concerned, I do not know very much about it. I do remember the old days when the names of Lafontaine, and Dorion, and Geoffrion, and others like these were household words in the province of Ontario, and led many of us to think that possibly these were men with whom the Conservative party of Ontario should be in alliance. But we have no right to hope, from any declaration of the leader of the Opposition, or from any other hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, not even excepting the volatile member from L'Islet (Mr. Tarte)—we have no right to expect anything better from the Opposition than we have from the hon. member for North Simcoe. Therefore, why should we turn the Government out that has given us six months of a breathing spell in order to settle the question, for a Government that has no policy on the question, for a Government that, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, at all events, has fastened upon the people of that province, Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, a series of iniquities in relation

to Roman Catholic separate schools that are, I may say, not only a disgrace to the province of Ontario, but to civilization. When the Bill comes up we will take our stand. It is not necessary to say that should a remedial Bill be brought in, I, at least, will join hands with any hon. gentleman, be it the leader of the Opposition, who has no policy on this matter, or the hon. member for Simcoe, who does not seem to have a policy, either, except that he is opposed to secular schools—I certainly would be prepared to join hands with them in instructing the Government that we do not believe in coercing Manitoba. But I would suggest to the hon. gentlemen who are considering this matter in the meantime, that they should look into this question from various new points of view. It is a mistaken idea to think that our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens are all, or even a large number of them, in favour of remedial legislation. I would call the attention of the Government to a remarkable utterance made by Mr. Fitzpatrick, a Roman Catholic member of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Quebec. I had an extract from his speech, but I cannot lay my hands upon it now. Speaking from memory, he said, in effect, that the Roman Catholic schools in the province of Quebec were a disgrace to civilization. We also find various other Roman Catholics in the province of Quebec demanding that their teachers shall be thoroughly trained, pass a regular examination, and be legalized, in order that the children of the people in that province may have a better education. But I can give a higher Roman Catholic authority even than a member of the legislature of Quebec. On the 22nd February last, I chanced to be in Chicago, and, seeing an announcement that Archbishop Ireland, of Minnesota, and other leading men, were to address a meeting commemorating Washington's birthday, I attended in the auditorium, and heard him make an address on the subject of education in the United States, in the course of which he said:

> Wisely, indeed, in its official rulings, the Government of America permits no union between itself and church organizations.

He goes on to speak of the national aspect of Irish-American societies, French-American societies, and German organizations, and uses this language:

> No encouragement should be given to social and political organizations or methods which perpetuate in this country foreign ideas and customs. An Irish-American or a German-American vote is an intolerable anomaly. Efforts to concentrate immigrants in social groups and retard their americanization should be steadily frowned down.

I merely present these views from Archbishop Ireland as pertinent to this question. I notice that he has spoken later at South Bend, Ind., still more strongly in favour of state national schools. I commend these ideas to the Ministers and the gentlemen in charge of this case, so that during recess they may come to a conclusion, if possible, that in refusing to grant remedial legislation to the Catholic minority of Manitoba, and in endeavouring to bring about some fair settlement of the case that will be conciliatory to all parties, they would not be so highly offending Roman Catholic people, at all events of the province of Quebec and the Dominion of Canada, as they may suppose. So far as I am personally concerned, I shall oppose this motion of the hon. member for Simcoe; and when the time comes to treat the question of remedial legislation, I shall then be prepared, as I am now, to take my stand, and to oppose any form of coercion of the people of Manitoba; and I shall also be prepared to give my reasons, and I trust satisfactory reasons, therefor.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am sure the House will believe me when I say that it is not from a desire to speak that I rise at this late hour and at this late stage of the debate. I wish merely to challenge some of the statements made by previous speakers, and I shall do so as briefly as possible. I shall start upon the same ground as I took when I had the honour of saying a few words on the same subject during the debate on the Address, by stating my solemn conviction that this is, if not the most important question that has come before this Parliament since confederation, it is one of the most important, and worthy the best consideration of the best minds of the country. This is the first time, to my mind, that a test is being made of the validity of any guarantee given under the constitution under which we live. It is the first time that the country has been called upon, and that Parliament may be called upon, to solve that problem. Were the guarantees given at the time of confederation, valid? Were they worth anything more than the paper upon which they were written? Had they any object? Why were they put there? I was struck with the speech of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) who spoke in tones that must have impressed every hon. member in this House, and his kindly expressions were especially grateful, though we must differ, as I do particularly, from some of the sentiments and some of the arguments that he used. If, as he has concluded, it is after all only a question of majority, why was any guarantee pretended to be put in the constitution at all? Sir, suppose that Newfoundland were knocking at our doors for admission in the confederation, and were to say to us: We have a system of education now which is satisfactory. We are pretty evenly divided in Newfoundland between the two religious denominations, we are getting along harmoniously, we recognize the religious convictions of every section of our people, and we wish, as one condition of our entry into the confederation, that there should be a guarantee that if the majority should change in our island,

that change shall not prejudicially affect this happy condition of things that exists there to-day. Can you give us that guarantee in the constitution? The answer, I presume, would be on the old line, yes, we guarantee it in our constitution. But if an enemy of that union with Newfoundland appeared in the House or elsewhere and wished to excite distrust and was to say, place no faith on a guarantee given to a province, even if put in the Canadian constitution, and though it has the sanction of the Imperial Parliament, because it will not be worth anything when it comes to be against the will of a majority of the people. Sir, they will say, we will accept no guarantee, because we have been put on our guard; and they can have no better reason for making this refusal on account of their suspicions having been excited than the fact that all they have to do is to read not only public speeches in the newspapers but the debates of this Parliament. I therefore say it is of great importance that we should study the question from this point of view. Let me say that I protest against the arguments made, and I am afraid made for some purpose; I do not wish to say anything offensive or to be the first to use offensive epithets in this discussion, but I must disapprove of the lines taken by every speaker in this House or outside of it and by every newspaper in this country that attempts to create the conviction in the public mind, which is the judge after all, that this is coercion, that this is an attempt to fasten a system of separate schools on an unwilling people. I am not now speaking specially of separate schools, but I am speaking of a question of treaty, a question of right whether it involves Protestant schools or Catholic schools or common schools. There was a certain condition of things guaranteed to the people which should be supported by Parliament and a sense of justice among our people, and it is hardly fair to try to prejudice the minds of the people. It is not my business to dispute statements made, when hon. gentlemen point to the condition of affairs for 19 years, prior to 1890, and point to a deplorable condition of the separate schools of Manitoba at that time and ask, do you want similar schools re-established—I am not here to defend such schools or to dispute statements made in stump speeches even by the Attorney General of Manitoba on this subject, but I am here to say this, when hon. gentlemen ask, do you desire to restore the system under which it is pretended schools existed, that the minority of Manitoba do not want to restore any such inefficient educational condition in that country. Speaking for myself, but reflecting opinions more than my own, I am willing to adopt this broad principle, that the Catholics are as proud of educating their youth as are the Protestants, and they are willing to meet the Protestants, apart from religious instructions, on common ground and say that we value efficient education as much as you do. It is, therefore, unfair to try and prejudice the public mind, with the idea that it is an inefficient and corrupt system that is desired, because the financial management is also attacked, and to prejudice the public mind by declaring that the Dominion Parliament is attempting to force that condition of things on a province like Manitoba. Another appeal is made and it is to the question of provincial rights. Show me that there is any desire by the people of Manitoba or on the part of the minority to take away the slightest constitutional right belonging to the province and I will stand up with any man in declaring that not a single vestige of right belonging to any province shall be taken from it, even at the sacrifice of separate schools in that province. A comparison has been made between this school question and the New Brunswick school question. The comparison is entirely in favour of the minority in Manitoba. Even the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who has expressed his sincere convictions, who is broad enough to do justice from his own sense of justice, who has the advantage of the legal knowledge and training which I do not possess, admitted as much, but I speak from the facts. What was the history of the question in New Brunswick? The province appealed to this Parliament. Let me, however, take the statements in order. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) started out his argument with this statement that there is one principle laid down, and which has been laid down by both political parties, that no interference must be had with the question of education in the provinces. I meet the hon. gentleman squarely on that issue, and tell him that both political parties have gone so far as to vote for disallowance of the New Brunswick school law in sympathy with the minority there, whose rights have been taken away by the Act of 1872. I meet the hon. gentleman squarely on that statement, and I say he is wrong, and that both political parties have committed themselves to the policy that interference can be made by this Parliament with a province having a right to deal with educational matters. I can prove by the record that both political parties voted for disallowance in the case of New Brunswick; and what becomes of the new doctrine we have heard to-night, and which I was sorry to hear proclaimed by the hon. member for Albert, that after all it was monstrous to think the majority had not the right to rule.

Mr. WELDON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to remind him that the motion to disallow was not applied to the principal School Act of 1871, but to an auxiliary Assessment Act of 1872. The motion to disallow the main Act of 1871, if my memory is correct, was voted down in this Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The main Act was before the Judicial Committee at the time. The

amendment that legalized the assessment and took powers belonging to the ratepayers away, and put them in the hands of the nominee of the provincial government—these were Acts amending that Act, showing why it was inefficient and could not work. It was the soul of the Act. They were Acts of the legislature—call them amendments if you like—on the question of the New Brunswick schools. The vote was squarely on the disallowance of this Act. There was a majority of 35 in this Parliament which declared that grievances existed in New Brunswick, that the Acts were unjust and that it was the duty of the Government to advise His Excellency to disallow them. There we had the benefit of the majority. But the majority's opinion did not prevail. The question went to the highest tribunal, and I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the judgment was against the minority of New Brunswick. From that date to this you have never heard a voice raised in the name of the minority in opposition to or proposing to interfere with the judgment and decision of the court. We laymen, the laymen of the minority of Manitoba, think it strange we are not able to coincide in all the constitutional arguments put forward to show why in this case the judgment should not be carried out and justice done to the minority of Manitoba. Reference has been made to the Act of 1890 and its constitutionality, and as to the decision with reference to that Act the minority in Manitoba bow in obedience. But there was another clause in the Act; there was another guarantee, and that guarantee was for rights that were acquired after confederation. The powers of the constitution under that Act were tested, and the decision was given, not that the Act of 1890 was unconstitutional,—that had been settled before and the Act to-day is in full force—but the decision was, that in view of the fact that these rights existed, therefore a grievance existed because these rights had been taken away. Do not tell me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a question of policy of this Government, or a question of policy of the Opposition, or that it is the policy of this Parliament that separate schools are to be forced on Manitoba? Tell me rather that the Manitoba legislature, which some hon. gentlemen are seeking to throw so much sympathy around at the expense of a weak and powerless minority; tell me that that legislature of its own free act, and exercising its own power within the constitution, passed an Act that these people to-day ask you to protect them in. It is not that the Dominion Government wants to force the principle of separate schools on Manitoba. I have an appeal like every other man who feels interested in this question. I have an appeal like the minority, and to whom are we to appeal? Are we to take arms to fight for these rights? No; never will a Catholic in this country shoulder a musket or fire a shot in defence of these rights. We make a higher and nobler appeal. We appeal to the constitution, and if the constitution cannot give us our rights, then so much the worse for our country, so much the worse for her peace and prosperity. But, Sir, I believe that there is too much good sense, too much honesty, and too much patriotism in the people of Canada to refuse us our just rights. When the people of Canada understand thoroughly that the cry is not: Oh, this rotten system of separate schools is to be forced upon the free people of Manitoba, and we must fly to their aid, for there is an effort made to coerce them. When the people of Canada understand that there is no such effort at all, then they will do us justice. Our appeal and our efforts are made honestly, fairly and frankly as I make it here to-night. We Catholics are in the minority in this country, in every province except Quebec, and thank God the example of that province, in its treatment of the Protestant minority, stands out in bold relief for justice and fair play, and is a challenge to you my fellow-countrymen, the Protestants of the other provinces to do justice to minorities. Representing a portion of the people of this country here to-night, I ask you if there is anything unreasonable in the appeal for justice which we make to you. If the doctrine is to prevail that the majority is right and must rule we bow. We do not appeal to arms, but we appeal to a greater and a higher power than the power of the sword or the rifle. We appeal to the intelligence and to the sense of justice of our fellow-countrymen. We say to the Protestants of Canada, that we ask a fair consideration of this question. If you think honestly that the constitution has not provided for a redress of our grievances,—study the constitution and you will hesitate before you come to that conclusion. Some hon. gentlemen have been kind enough to say that if it was the intention of Parliament that that was a right to be guaranteed, then it should be maintained. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said: "If it was the intention of Parliament to guarantee that right I would not stand upon any technical defect of the law, but I would say, give it." In the name of this country I ask that every man be inspired with a broad view on this point, and if he reads the history of the question he must conclude that Parliament intended to guarantee these rights. If he concludes that, then I ask that the guarantee shall be fulfilled. Now, some hon. gentlemen have dwelt at great length on the word "practice." How did the word get into that Manitoba Act? It is susceptible of other explanations, but let me give you this explanation, and I believe it to be the correct one. New Brunswick lost its separate schools just in this way. New Brunswick had its separate schools and enjoyed them for years, under the law if not by a separate law.

So much was that the case that these separate schools could not be taken from the people of New Brunswick until the law was repealed under which they had that privilege. That law was repealed and the Act of 1872 came into force. Take the wording of the resolutions which constituted the treaty between the different provinces. The resolutions were the conditions upon which the different provinces agreed to come into confederation. The resolutions constituted a treaty securing to every province that agreed to them the conditions upon which they entered the confederation. If you read the resolutions and that particular clause, you will find that the rights and privileges enjoyed by the minority at that time in the province of New Brunswick were not to be prejudiced by going into confederation. When we went before the Judicial Committee in England on the New Brunswick school case, a judgment was given against us, and why? It was not because we did not enjoy these rights, but because in reading the Act, and not the resolutions, two words appeared in the Act which did not appear in the resolutions. These two words were "by law," and the Privy Council decided that because we had no separate school law we had no rights that were taken away. When this question came up in Parliament of affording a guarantee to the minority in Manitoba, and guaranteeing that their separate schools should not be interfered with, the experience of the past was before the eyes of every hon. member who discussed that question, and they said: "Let there be no mistake this time. Let there be no hitch now. If we insert in the statute: 'The rights and privileges enjoyed by the people of Manitoba by law,' it might be questioned as to whether they had a law or not; therefore put in the word 'practice' and you will nail it for ever beyond the possibility of a doubt." That is how the word "practice" came into the clause. Those members of the House who were here at the time will admit that that was the very reason, and that the intention of this Parliament was to give an honest guarantee to the people of Manitoba that these privileges would be respected. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) denies that the claims to separate schools were put forward by any bill of rights. When that argument was presented before the Privy Council it was fairly met by Mr. Ewart at the time, but the hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) went a little farther here and said: "Admitting that claims were put in by the handful of half-breeds and the few settlers that were there, does any one pretend it should have the force of a treaty? That is our own territory and we acquired it by purchase." I am sure the hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) did not mean to take such ground, and if I were to ask him now I feel he will say with me: that if he considers that a treaty with a foreign country would be binding upon him or upon this Parliament, he will not say that it would not be binding in favour of the most humble Canadians, or the most humble portion of the Canadian people.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Certainly.

Mr. McCARTHY. What I said was, that it was binding with the persons that were there, but not binding with others who go in that have no claims.

Mr. AMYOT. The persons there then were too old to go to school?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Now, Sir, let me take another ground and then I will be done. I am covering only points which I thought it would be well to refer to, because I keep before my mind that in a few months from now when Parliament assembles, Manitoba will either have made a satisfactory arrangement upon this question, or this Parliament will be obliged to exercise its sense of justice and right. In the meantime the question will be discussed before the country. I wish, and I ask, that it be discussed fairly. That is all I want; because I am sure that if it be fully and fairly discussed, and discussed with full knowledge of the subject, there will be but one verdict given, and that verdict will be in favour of doing right and justice to the minority. I wish to refer to an argument used by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon). When he talks about provincial rights,—as has been well said by a gentleman who spoke before me,—it must be remembered that provincial rights are just the rights that have been ceded to the province in the constitution given it, and no more nor no less. It has also been stated here: "that it would be a monstrous proposition to say that any province which might accidentally pass a separate school law after confederation should be debarred afterwards from repealing it." Well, it may be a very strange proposition, and it may seem unreasonable to some, but that Act was passed for a purpose, and it was a guarantee given at the time. But it was not passed by accident. The old Parliament of Canada for instance when discussing this subject, discussed that very point, and the objection was taken: "But that will take the power to that extent out of the hands of the local legislature." John Sandfield Macdonald, who was a strong advocate of separate schools himself, declared when the proposition was under discussion: "I protest against divided powers on the question of education. I insist that the power must be full and complete within the local legislature, and that the Dominion Parliament shall have no power of intervening in any right. I, as a Catholic, take the ground that I prefer my people to trust to the good sense of the ma-

jority in Ontario, as the minority in Quebec should trust to the majority there, rather than to have any divided power on the question of education." Now, that may be an unsound view, but we must look to the men who framed the constitution we are living under. This was brought out in the discussion at that time, and with what effect? In order to test the amount of support he could get for that view in Parliament, he moved his amendment to expunge that principle from the resolution, as follows :—

That the following words be added to the original motion :—"And that it be an instruction to the said committee to consider whether any constitutional restriction which shall exclude from the local legislature of Upper Canada the entire control and direction of education, subject only to the approval or disapproval of the general Parliament, is not calculated to create widespread dissatisfaction, and tend to foster and create jealousy and strife between the various religious bodies in that section of the province."

Eight men supported that resolution, their names being Messieurs Biggar, Burwell, Macdonald (Cornwall), Macdonald (Toronto West), Ross (Prince Edward), Rymal, Scatcherd, and Wallbridge (North Hastings). Eight men in that Parliament rose and declared that it would be a mistake that the Federal Parliament should have any power at all in the question of education. But, on the other hand, ninety-five representatives of the Canadian people said: No, in the interest of peace in the future, in view of our past excitement in this country, it is well that this question should be settled by us; and they endorsed the guarantee of an appeal that those minorities were looking for. Then, I am told that the provision of the Manitoba Act limiting the power of that province in the same direction, was inconsistent with the Confederation Act, and that there was little debate upon it, because as my hon. friend says, the report is very imperfect. There is no reference made in the debate to the school question, because those people trusted that there would be no necessity of making much noise: no one dreamed at that time any more than in the case of Quebec that the rights of the minority would be interfered with. But the Hon. William Macdougall tested the question. A motion was made by Mr. Oliver to strike out the education clause, and there was a discussion on that, but what strikes me particularly are the words used by Mr. Macdougall. He said:

The effect of the clause, if not struck out, would be to fix laws which the local legislature could not alter in future, and that it would be better to leave the matter to local authorities to decide, as in the other provinces. He quite agreed with his hon. friend in giving the same powers to this province as the others.

But though his views might be wise and well founded, when the vote was taken the clause was not struck out, the vote standing 30 to 81. I will not trespass any longer upon the patience of the House. Though I may not have convinced any one, I shall, perhaps, be excused for having risen at this late hour and trespassed to this extent upon the attention of the House.

Mr. BAKER. At two o'clock in the morning on the second day of this debate, I do not propose to make a speech; but I desire to offer one or two observations before the vote is taken, and I am constrained to do so by the remark which fell from the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan) in reference to the state of things which exists in the province of Quebec. I happen to belong to the Protestant minority in that province whose rights are to a certain extent guaranteed by the Act of Confederation, but whose rights are moreover affected by the same principle that underlies the doctrine that is to be applied to Manitoba. It is true that by subsection 2 of the Act of Confederation the privileges and powers by law conferred upon the Roman Catholics of Ontario were extended to the Protestants of Quebec. But before the Act of Confederation was passed there was discussion as to the proper mode of preserving the rights of that minority. Therefore, there is a second clause in the Act of Confederation which applies equally to the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec. It is provided by subsection 3 of section 93 of the Act of Confederation :

Where, in any province, a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

Now, although the rights of the Protestant minority are effectively guaranteed by subsection 2, they are also affected by subsection 3. In pursuance of that provision, the Quebec legislature enacted in the session of 1869 a law to amend the law respecting education in the province of Quebec. By that statute the rights of the Protestant minority were not only extended, but provision was made for the proper enforcement of those rights: and the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec is looking with anxiety to the decision to which this Parliament will arrive. I am proud and happy to say that, judging by past experience, the Protestant minority of Quebec have nothing to fear at the hands of the majority. But, Mr. Speaker, human nature is the same, and even French-Canadians are human, the opinion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to the contrary notwithstanding; and if, goaded by acts of injustice that may be perpetrated upon their co-religionists and co-nationalists in Manitoba, the majority in the

province of Quebec should attempt to deprive the Protestants in that province of rights which they have acquired under the statute of 1869, the Protestants would turn their eyes to this Parliament in appeal.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not in vain.

Mr. BAKER. Not in vain—I hope not ; for it is idle to give an appeal if under that appeal there is to be no redress. It is nothing short of mockery to say to the minority that there is an appeal to the Parliament of Canada if the Parliament of Canada will give no redress. It is true, there is no external power that can compel this Parliament to do justice. But Parliament itself in the exercise of the obligations and duties imposed by law upon it, is bound to do justice. I am not going to be drawn into a discussion of this question upon its merits. I confess to you frankly that I cannot understand the feelings of agitation which seems to prevade some parts of this Dominion, and which seems even to have found a foothold in this Chamber. I have lived all my life amongst French-Canadians—men who differ from me in nationality and religion—but no question of the kind has ever arisen between us. We meet and transact business, we go out and come in among each other, and we never ask at what altar a man worships his God. The question never arises, and I hope the day will never come when the peace that has always prevailed in the province of Quebec will be disturbed by an agitation which seems to find a foothold in the province of Ontario. In my opinion, the men are not the friends of Canada or of Canadian institutions, they are not the friends of true religion or of sound progress, who would seek to make political capital by stirring up religious discord and kindling a religious war. I hope that the effects of such an agitation will never extend to the province of Quebec, and I do not believe these effects ever will extend to that province. I have faith in the French-Canadian race and the Roman Catholic population of the province of Quebec, founded upon an acquaintance extending over the period of my whole life. And I should be sorry, Sir, to feel that a great injustice could be perpetrated against the minority of those who differ from the majority of the inhabitants of the Dominion in religious belief and in language. Mr. Speaker, with these observations I need scarcely add that I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. I must crave the indulgence of the House even at this late hour, and my desire to place myself fairly before my constituents must be my apology for so doing. The hon member for North Simcoe has placed before this House a motion which is sufficiently explicit, and the Government, have announced their policy, which I believe is also sufficiently explicit. And while at the outset I declare that I cannot vote for the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe, still do I reserve myself the right, when the question of whether or no we shall pass legislation to carry out the remedial order, to act as the interests of my country and the justice of the case shall demand. The Government have fairly and fearlessly placed before the people a proposition, and I say it would have been better for the country had this proposition been submitted earlier, because then the heart-burnings and troubles would in all probability have by this been buried. However, this matter must be specially dealt with in the course of a few months, one way or the other. The hon. gentleman's motion must of necessity, based as it is, opposed as it is by the Government, if carried, have the effect of defeating the Government, and as a result the Opposition must of necessity come into power, or the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. gentleman, followed as he is in this House, cannot hope to succeed as the Premier of this Dominion, or even cannot hope to be summoned by His Excellency in the event of the defeat of the Government. Not that I wish to minimize the importance of the hon. gentleman, but if he is not important in this House, I do conceive that he has importance in the country. As far as the Opposition are concerned, I can only say this, that I welcome the motion, because if they have not spoken, they will, at least on this motion, have to show some signs of activity or life, and we will then see whether they are a united or a divided party on this question. If this motion is carried, it must of necessity result in the Government of Manitoba being called upon to legislate in the premises. It is quite true, as the hon. member for North Simcoe has said, that their reply has been a dignified and courteous refusal. I do not look upon the reply of Manitoba in that light at all. I consider that they have held out the olive branch and have invited this Government to come to some arrangement for the settlement of this matter. If such a result can be brought about, it will be a matter of satisfaction to both sides of the House. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), who, by reason of his connection with the Liberal party in Manitoba and by reason of his connection with the legislation which has been the cause of all this turmoil, may be considered to voice the opinions of a large number of the people of Manitoba, appears anxious that this matter should be settled amicably ; and that being the case, I am prepared to support the policy of the Government in referring it back again to the Manitoba legislature, in the hope that an amicable settlement may be arrived at. When this House assembles again, if the Manitoba Government have not acquiesced in any settlement, if it has not treated the matter in that spirit and light which will give satisfaction to all parties concerned, then I shall reserve to myself the right to vote against remedial legislation or to accord the Administration my support in pass-

ing such legislation, according as the conditions and circumstances will then justify me in acting.

Mr. LAURIER. I did not deem it advisable to interfere at all in this debate, for the reason that the hon. gentleman who moves the motion belongs to the Conservative party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, whatever may be said on the other side, the hon. gentleman himself said on the floor of this House that he still hoped he was speaking as a Conservative, and it seemed to me that it was a family fight which had better be settled among hon. gentlemen opposite themselves.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He is a Conservative who always votes with the Opposition.

Mr. LAURIER. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been very anxious, all of them, to know what would be the position which the Opposition would take on this question. It seems to me that if the hon. gentlemen were actuated by anything like the spirit of fair play which we have the right to expect in this House from men who sit in the same House with us, though they do not share the same opinions, there could have been no hesitation whatever on their part, as regards the line of conduct which the Opposition, in so far as I can represent it, would take upon this question. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when it suits their purpose, say the Opposition has no policy on this question; and when it suits their purpose again, they say the Opposition has a policy upon it, and so they make statements, either in one sense or the other, just as they they can at the moment make a point in their favour, and against their opponents. I have my opinion of this question just as I spoke on it two years ago in this House, when I proclaimed in the hearing of every man present, that, looking at the clause 93, looking at the history of that clause, there could be no hesitation at all in admitting that any minority in any province, which enjoyed the system of separate schools and which felt aggrieved afterwards by provincial legislation, had a right to appeal to the Canadian executive. I stated that two years ago; I have repeated it twenty times, forty times—since in all parts of Canada from the province of Quebec to the Pacific Ocean. I then stood upon that ground, and upon that ground I stand to-day. We have listened for two days to fine spun arguments as to what really is the effect of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The judgment of the Judicial Committee simply declared the law as it is to be found in the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act. And the effect of it was to proclaim that the minority had the right of appeal under the constitution. Now, Sir, there may be difference of opinion even upon the interpretation of that judgment. The hon. gentleman from North Simcoe has stated that the power which is vested in the executive is simply discretionary with the Government and that they can refuse or allow an appeal. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has argued that the judgment was mandatory and that, as soon as an appeal was brought in, as a matter of right the remedy should follow. Speaking for myself individually upon that question, and speaking more from the point of view of a lawyer than from the political point of view, I would say that I would not carry the interpretation to the extent to which the Minister of Justice carried it. But I do not admit, as some members have argued, and as the hon. member for North Simcoe argued, that, though the right of appeal exists, the appeal should be denied in every case. Nor would I admit, as some claim, that the appeal should be allowed in every case. The right of appeal exists undoubtedly, but it exists as it was admitted by Mr. Blake and Sir John Macdonald, under ministerial responsibility, and it is to be exercised, as I conceive, for the good of the minority and, at the same time, for the peace and harmony of the whole Canadian people. Two years ago I stated that, in my estimation, the question was more one of facts than one of law, and that in view of the duties that the Government have to exercise and which they must exercise in the interest of the whole people, whatever may be the conclusion they reached, which they would have done well to fortify their case by an investigation of the facts. Sir, if all the members of this House were Protestants, or if they all were Catholics, there would be no question at all before the House to-day. But we are a mixed community of Protestants and Catholics and we know that upon this question the arguments that affect one religious mind do not affect another; we know that the arguments that affect Catholics do not appeal to Protestants in the same way. Protestants, as a rule are in favour of the system of common schools; the Catholics are unanimously in favour of separate schools. If this question is to be settled, it is not to be settled upon lines that will appeal to Protestants only or to Catholics only, but it is to be decided upon lines which appeal to the judgment of men and to the religious mind of all men. Therefore, I say it would have been better for the Government to fortify itself with a knowledge of what is going on in Manitoba. Now, if I may allude for a moment to a past debate, if I understood the Minister of Finance the other day, he stated that the schools were Protestant. Well, Sir, if the schools are Protestant—I address myself now to the Protestants of this House—there would not be a man who would tolerate such a system, such an outrage upon the minority in Manitoba. But there is a dispute as to whether the schools are Protestant or not Protestant. Now, would it not have been

wise to ascertain the fact beyond dispute; would it not have been wise for the Government to have an investigation of some kind which would have made known to the country positively what is the character of these schools. If the schools are Protestant, every Protestant will say the Government should interfere by all means and stop the outrage. If the schools are not Protestant, but are common, they are still offensive to the Catholics. Why? Because it is part of the Catholic doctrine that the children should have both secular and religious education. It may be said that that is a prejudice; that it should not be considered; that Catholics should be satisfied to have secular education in the schools—the teaching of reading, of history, of geography and so on. But if their conscientious conviction is that their children should be taught those religious truths, which they deem essential and necessary who can object so seriously? Would it not have been well to know these facts? There is a consideration of another nature which it would have been well to have before the House. I speak of the geographical distribution of population, in so far as religious belief is represented. If the distribution of population is such that it would have been possible to, by a system of grouping, to allow the Catholics of Manitoba to have their own schools, one great objection would have been removed from the minds of many. For the argument has been pressed with great force that the system will entail great expense. If the grouping of the population were such as to make that expense light, it surely would have been better to have these facts brought before the House, that the Government of the country might pass judgment. There is no doubt as to the right of the minority to appeal, still, in deciding the question whether the remedy sought can be prudently granted or not, it would surely have been better for the Government to have fortified themselves by an investigation of the facts, the result of which should have been brought before the House. Now, such is my position, such were the views I held a few years ago, such are the views I hold at the present time. I repeat again what I have said more than once, that I would be the last man to desire that the party to which I belong should walk into power through the door of religious strife. I would rather remain on this side of the House all my life than to benefit by the introduction of religious dissensions into this country. I was proud to hear my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker) state that in the province of Quebec we have been able to live in peace for all the days that he and I, at all events, have lived together in that province. I desire nothing more than that for the province of Quebec, nothing more than that for the whole Dominion. I repeat now what I said a few days ago, that, if we want to build up a nation in Canada, it must be founded on broad views of tolerance and Christian charity. The Government have at last taken a policy—so they say. I am not going to quarrel with them as to the character of that policy. If I were to quarrel with them, I might comment upon the numerous interpretations that have been placed upon this policy by the very men who have taken part in this debate, by the Controller of Customs amongst others, who have placed very dissimilar constructions upon that policy. We have had as many interpretations of it as we have had men expressing their opinion. Under such circumstances, I have to repeat here what I have said already, that I am not going, at this stage, to condemn the proposed legislation of the Government. I am not, at this stage, if we can prevent it, going to enter into a discussion which must come, unfortunately, if that legislation is introduced later on. I will not anticipate it. Everybody hopes, everybody expects, that this controversy will be settled by the people of Manitoba themselves. I have not lost all hope of that. I still hope that, more than ever, notwithstanding the difficulties that have been placed in the way, and I believe that the remedial order has been one of those difficulties, owing to the language in which it was couched. But it is not an insurmountable difficulty, after all. The limited time may be such an obstacle, but even of that I will not speak. I will only say this to-day, that we all hope, at least I do hope, as a Canadian, that this controversy will not come for final settlement upon the floor of the Canadian Parliament. I do hope, for my part, that we shall be spared the lamentable spectacle the lamentable event, which, however, I see must come, if this question is brought in for settlement upon the floor of this Parliament, when the lines of parties, I am afraid, will be broken from their present cleavage and reformed largely on lines dividing the Catholics and Protestants of this country into two camps. May that never come. But it will be time enough to engage in that strife when it comes. I do not want to engage in it in my day, and that is the reason why I propose to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am sure the House will not refuse me a hearing upon this question, although the hour is so late. The oracle has spoken at last, and, like the Delphic oracle of old, we know just as much now as we knew before that utterance was made. However, I am not in the slightest degree concerned with the policy of the Opposition, or with anything that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken might have to say with regard to it. My concern is with the resolution now before the House, and its effect upon the policy of the Government as set forth in the declarations which were made on two several occasions, and which

pledged the Government in the strongest terms in which a Government can be pledged, to a certain course of action. Now, whatever the result of this division may be, supposing there are ever so few that vote for it, at any rate, the results that have been obtained from this debate are of exceeding importance, important not only to this House, but to the country. For the first time this question has been debated in such a form and in such a manner and in such a temper, and with such ability, that I think we are able to understand what are its true merits, and we may understand how far the policy of the Government is justified according to those merits. Sir, we have arrived at certain conclusions. We find an admission given, unwillingly, I admit, given grudgingly, I admit, but we have a substantial admission by the Minister of Justice that what has been spoken of as a judgment of the Privy Council, what has been spoken of as a judgment binding upon the people of this country, is not after all a judgment at all, but is simply a decision upon the questions that were asked, asked in order that advice might be given to the Government upon which they might act with more certainty than they could without that advice being given. Therefore, I trust that we shall hear no more of the fiction which has been so frequently, so carefully, and so assiduously driven into the minds of the people of this country, that, in acting as they have done, the Government were simply obeying a judgment which they had no right nor power to disobey. Sir, the opinion of the Minister of Justice has been fortified by the opinion of every gentleman who has spoken upon this side of the House, with one single exception. All their supporters who have expressed their opinion on this question, have declared their conviction that the attitude taken, I will not say by the Government, but taken by their representatives in the press, and adopted by many of their supporters in the country, and, I think, taken by individual members of the Government themselves, has not the least foundation to rest upon. The very able argument of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), as well as that of the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), have effectually taken away from the Minister of Justice the little shred of comfort that he derived from the remarks which have been so frequently quoted as given by the judges, but which form no part of their ultimate decision. I think we have also got rid of the fiction which has been frequently put forward, that, in dealing with this matter, the Government simply handed over to the province of Manitoba a judgment upon which they were either to act or not, as they chose. Now, these two things have been so frequently impressed upon the people that many of them had no correct understanding of what the real merits of the question are; but I think, when they read the debates that have taken place upon this question during the last two days, they will no longer labour under that misapprehension, but they will understand fully what we have endeavoured to make them understand, that in acting upon this question the Government must act as a political body, and not as a judicial body, that they must act upon their own responsibility as the advisers of the Crown, and that their action is entirely dependent upon the political views they choose to take of the situation. Now, Sir, I have to congratulate the House and the country, that after the clear argument we have heard from hon. gentlemen, every one of whom is a supporter of the Government, that view which has been so assiduously put forward with the view of misleading the people of this country, can no longer be maintained. Sir, exception has been taken to the terms of this resolution, and, I think, very unreasonably taken. My hon. friend from North Bruce characterizes it as a tricky resolution. Well, I am a little afraid that my hon. friend's dread of that terrible catastrophe, the downfall of the present Administration, rather blinded his judgment as to the terms of this resolution.

Mr. McNEILL. No fear.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, I am not going to discuss whether there is fear or not, I am only saying that I think the hon. gentleman's very strong partisan feeling somewhat blinded his usually clear judgment as to the terms of this resolution. What does it say:

> This House hears with regret the statement recently made, defining the policy of the Government.

That is, those of us who desire that Manitoba should not be coerced in this matter. The term "coerced," although it has been objected to frequently during this debate, certainly expresses the conclusion to which a number of members on this side of the House have come. We certainly regret that the Government have come to that conclusion, pending a contingency which no man in his heart believes will ever arrive. I venture to say, there is not a dozen men on either side of this House, who, if they expressed their opinion, would say that they had the slightest hope that the province of Manitoba will yield. Then, I say, having that conviction, we might reasonably expect them to join in expressing the opinion:

> That this House has heard with regret the statements recently made defining the policy of the Government respecting the Manitoba school question;

And they would also join with us in expressing the opinion that this House

> Is unwilling by silence to allow it to be assumed that, at the session to be held in January next any more than at the present session, it is prepared to pass a law to restore the system of separate schools in Manitoba on the lines of the order of 21st March, 1895.

The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) objected to that resolution because it did not go far enough. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is very hard to please. If it went further, then it would be charged that we were going beyond the policy of the Administration. That resolution is carefully framed so that it will challenge the action of the Government, because it is their own definition of it. Of course, there will be differences of opinion as to the precise meaning of the action which the Government has taken. But it is generally admitted, and I cannot understand how anybody can read the order without coming to the conclusion, that the only logical sequence of the terms of the order is, that, whatever was done away with by the legislation of 1890, must be restored by whatever legislation is brought forward in the future. If I understand the temper of hon. gentlemen who support the claim of the minority, I can only come to the conclusion that nothing less than that will satisfy their demand. I am, therefore, obliged to come to the conclusion, not only from the terms of the remedial order itself, but also from the demand made by the supporters of the Government from Quebec, that nothing short of the re-establishment of separate schools in Manitoba is intended. There is another subject to which I will briefly allude. A subordinate member of the Administration has stated in the most public manner, not only in this House, but elsewhere, his opposition to the policy of the Government of which he is a member. That is a doctrine which might have held good before the time of Sir Robert Walpole, but it is impossible to maintain at the present day. There is nothing more clearly laid down by constitutional authorities than that members of a cabinet must be united on their policy. We have ascertained from the First Minister and from the leader of the House, and we had assurances last night from the Minister of Justice, that the Cabinet were united, that they were acting as one man in this matter, that there could be no possible question as to what their action would be. So far their position is a constitutional one. But what can be thought of a subordinate member of the Administration who, while occupying that position, with the advantages deriving from it, deliberately challenges this position and declares his opposition to the policy of the Government which is the very basis of the existence of the administration? The authority we quote frequently on subjects of this character leaves no possible doubt on this question, and I will take the liberty of quoting a very short passage to show how completely that this doctrine is established. It is as follows:—

> The responsibility of a minister who has no seat in the cabinet is less comprehensive, although in its degree no less complete. Such a one is required to render active assistance in sustaining the policy of the government, and in carrying out intelligently and faithfully the instructions given him by his political chief. But this is his individual responsibility and ends here. If called upon to represent the department to which he belongs, in either House of Parliament, he does so, strictly speaking, as the organ and mouthpiece of his official superior. He cannot be held answerable for a policy in the framing of which he has had no share; although, upon questions of special importance, he should rather resign than become a party to decisions to which he entertained strong and unsurmountable objections.

The position of the gentleman to whom I allude, who to-night made a speech which, I venture to say, no other member of all the 215 members would have made, is a most remarkable one. One can understand the position of the Secretary of State or the Minister of Railways, because they have boldly stated the position they take, and they are prepared to risk their political future upon it; but the hon. gentleman to whom I have alluded coolly tells this House and the country: I am entirely opposed to the policy of the Government, but until the time comes when I am called on to vote I will continue to attend to my department and draw my salary. The hon. gentleman is in the position of a soldier, one of a party called to lead an attack. He takes up his musket and enters the ranks and tells his superiors that the moment he comes under fire he is going to drop his musket and run to the rear. The hon. gentleman's position is one for which it is impossible to find any parallel in English parliamentary history, at all events during that period of it in which we have had something like responsible government and ministerial responsibility maintained. There is one proposition I should like to make. The debate has been carried on with such entire freedom from reference to any subject likely to create ill-feeling that I will carefully avoid doing anything which might bring the debate to a conclusion on any other terms. But we have forgotten one great principle, and, if I lay down the proposition which I am about to lay down, I hope it will be received as something at least worthy of consideration. The proposition I desire to lay down is this, that, excepting such rights as they have in common with all Her Majesty's subjects, the minority in this country have no rights. I say the Roman Catholic minority in any of the provinces, or the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec, have no rights except such as they enjoy with all the subjects of Her Majesty, and until we come down to that understanding and to that basis we shall always have these difficulties. Why, because a man is a French-Canadian or a Roman Catholic living in one province, or a Protestant living in another, what rights does it give him? I say, absolutely no rights. The whole is a misconception, growing out of these persistent attempts in this country to carry on our affairs by conciliation and by giving privileges for which no foundation ever ex-

isted. I said, a few moments ago, and I repeat now, that whatever may be the result of the division in this case, however small the numbers on one side, and however large the number on the other, not only have we arrived at a clearer understanding of the real merits of the case, but we have also had from hon. members supporting the Government the clearest possible indication as to the course they will pursue when the question comes up for consideration at the session about to be held. The country, therefore, understands not only the political merits of the case, but the position of individuals with respect to it, and such being the case, and having these clear and distinct definitions and understandings, whatever other results the debate has had, it has produced these general understandings and has put an end to those misconceptions by which the public has been misled, and so, when we come to consider the case in January next, or at any other date, or deal with it at the polls, not only the members, but the electors generally, will be in a position to deal with it intelligently, fairly and honestly.

Amendment negatived.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sault Ste. Marie Canal..... $150,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Give some explanation of this.

Mr. HAGGART. The purpose of this vote is to pay the following :—

To pay Hugh Ryan & Co. for work on contract for lift-lock and prism.....	$ 91,600
To pay Hugh Ryan & Co., lower entrance	100,000
do Allan & Fleming, upper entrance.	39,100
do Hugh Ryan & Co., lock gates.....	16,000
do Hugh Ryan & Co., power pipes...	6,300
do Hugh Ryan & Co., lock valves...	9,400
do Hugh Ryan & Co., motor houses..	3,700
do Canadian Electric Co., electric apparatus	7,350
To pay Wm. Kennedy & Sons, water wheels, shafts. &c.....	3,000
To pay Canadian Locomotive and Engine Co., machinery for gates.....	500
To pay Miller Bros., gate pontoon.....	3,000
do Hugh Ryan & Co., difference in price Portland and natural cement.....	14,000
Salaries of staff.....	5,500
Sundries (equipment).....	2,250
To pay for concrete and masonry piers and anchors for moveable dam.....	3,350
To pay Hugh Ryan & Co., for work on contract, lower entrance	24,700
To pay Allan & Fleming, upper entrance.	17,100
do Dominion Bridge Co., movable dam	75,700
To pay for concrete and masonry anchors anchors for movable dam.....	8,350
To pay Miller Bros. for work on contract, for spare lock gates	14,000
To pay for erecting a stone building for offices	7,000
To pay for workshops.....	2,500
do towards levelling grounds.....	2,300
do for salaries and expenses of officers	1,700

Resolutions reported.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That for the remainder of the session there shall be two sittings each day, one from 10 a.m. to half-past 1 p.m., and the other from 3 o'clock p.m. until the hour of adjournment.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot agree to that.

Mr. FOSTER. All right ; it cannot be carried then. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 2.45 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 18th July, 1895.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

POSTMASTER AT TROIS PISTOLES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Whether charges have been made against the postmaster of Rivière Trois Pistoles, county of Témiscouata ? If so, has an inquiry been held with a view to ascertain whether such charges are well founded, and what is the result of the inquiry, if held ? If not, why not ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Charges have been made against the postmaster at Trois Pistoles. An inquiry has been ordered, but the charges are still under investigation.

STEAMER "CITY OF MIDLAND."

Mr. EDGAR asked, Was the steamer "City of Midland," of the North Shore Navigation Company, seized at Collingwood during the summer of 1894, for an infraction of the revenue laws ? Was any penalty inflicted for an infraction of the revenue laws by the steamer "City of Midland," or its officers last summer, and what was the amount of the penalty ? Has any, and what portion of such penalty been remitted or refunded ?

Mr. WALLACE. 1. The steamer "City of Midland," of the North Shore Navigation Company, was seized at Collingwood on the 19th July, 1894, charged with having landed at the port of Collingwood, without payment of duty, two barrels of oil which had been entered for use on board the vessel as ship's stores. 2. A deposit of $400 was exacted before release of the vessel. 3. The value of the oil, with duty added, has been deposited to the credit of the Receiver-General ; balance of penalty has been remitted to vessel owners. The evidence establishes that the vessel owners had no knowledge of and had not authorized removal of the oil from steamer "City of Midland" ; oil was required for an excursion boat and the engineer of latter vessel, on his own authority, boarded former vessel while lying at the wharf, and

as he needed oil immediately, ordered removal of the quantity seized to the excursion vessel.

COAL CONTRACT AT OTTAWA.

Mr. LISTER asked, 1. Who are contractors for supply of coal to Public Buildings, Ottawa? 2. What is the quantity contracted for? 3. What is the price per ton? 4. Were tenders asked for by publication? 5. Who were the tenderers, and what was the price per ton of each tender? 6. When was the contract entered into?

Mr. OUIMET. 1st. J. W. McRae & Co. 2nd. 2,580 tons anthracite coal. 3rd. $4.70 per ton, namely: $1.40 lower than a large contract given here after public tenders. 4th. No. Last year's contract was continued as it was thought impossible to obtain as low a price by calling for new tenders. 6th. On the 8th July, 1895.

SCHEDULE AGAINST CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Sproule) asked, Whether, in view of the change of Government in England and the appointment of a new President of the Board of Agriculture, it is the intention of the Government to renew the application for the removal of the schedule against the importation of Canadian cattle to that country without having them slaughtered at the port of debarkation?

Mr. OUIMET. The correspondence already set on foot with the Imperial authorities on the question of the removal of Canada from the cattle schedule is not yet concluded, an answer not having been received to the representations made in the last report by the Minister of Agriculture. It is the intention to continue to press the claim of Canada in this matter.

PRIVILEGE—THE HONOURABLE THE CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the proceedings of the day are commenced, I desire to call the attention of the House to a question which appears to me to be of grave constitutional moment, and if required I will conclude with a motion in order to bring the matter properly before the consideration of the House. The situation, Sir, so far as I know, is one of a very extraordinary, in fact, of an absolutely unprecedented character. Within a few days, the Government of Canada in the most formal manner possible have made in this House a declaration of their policy on a question of very vital consequence to the welfare of this country. In addition to this they then propose taking very unusual, indeed almost unheard of steps, for the purpose of giving effect to the determination at which they have arrived, they propose to hold a sixth session of Parliament, a thing which has never yet been done since confederation. They also propose to hold that session at a time which makes it morally certain that this Parliament will be dissolved by the efflux of time instead of in the ordinary method. Now, Sir, under such circumstances, after the Government have formally committed themselves in this way to a declaration of policy, and apparently have also committed His Excellency to consent to their proceedings, we find ourselves confronted with this extraordinary situation: that after the formal declaration I have alluded to a junior member of their Administration has risen in his place, and has publicly repudiated and denounced the conclusion at which the Government of which he is a member have arrived. That particular class of officials to which the hon. gentleman to whom I have alluded belongs, is a new class in Canada. We have not enough experience in this Parliament of their ways and work, or of the extent to which they may choose to consider themselves bound by the precedents which have hitherto ruled. But I believe their position is exactly analogous to that occupied by under-secretaries of state and by junior members of the various departments in England; and I hope it is not necessary for me to tell the House that such a proceeding as that to which I have alluded is one for which no precedent whatever, so far as I know, will be found in British annals. I do not mean to say for one moment that there is no precedent for junior members of an Administration disagreeing with their superior officers; but I do mean to say that it is utterly unknown in British practice that such a thing should occur, and that the gentleman who disagreed with the Cabinet should have continued to remain a colleague of theirs. One of two things has always happened in such cases: either the party in question has sent in his resignation to the Government, or the Prime Minister has felt it incumbent upon him to ask for his resignation; and it appears to me that honour, reason and common sense alike dictate following British precedents in all such cases. More than that, Sir, in this particular instance, it appears to me that the good faith of the Government is at stake in the very highest degree. We know that one of their late colleagues justified his resignation on the express ground that it was impossible for him to feel any confidence that the pledges of the Government would be redeemed; and I am bound to say that it looks very much as if the statement made by Mr. Angers was likely to be fully justified. Now, Sir, this is a crucial test of the sincerity of the Government. If the Government of Canada choose under such circumstances to retain the services of the junior official who has publicly repudiated their policy, then most assuredly we cannot be expected—and least of all can those gentlemen who lately left the Cabinet on that ac-

ccunt be expected—to retain any belief in the sincerity of the professions which the Government have made. If, on the other hand, they adopt the English precedent, and dispense with the services of their colleague, then, whether their action may be well advised or ill advised, undoubtedly their sincerity may be admitted. Now, Sir, I think we have a right to inquire of the leader of the House, who is supposed to represent the Premier here, what course he proposes to adopt under the circumstances. I can hardly imagine that under ordinary conditions there could be any doubt in the mind of the hon. gentleman, or in the minds of his colleagues, as to what their clear duty is. Let this House fancy, if it can, what would happen to a junior Lord of the Admiralty or a junior Lord of the Treasury, or any similarly placed official in England, if, after Lord Palmerston or Mr. Gladstone had formally announced the policy of the Government on any important question, such an official should have been found rising in his place and repudiating it. But, Sir, to come to an instance more familiar to us, what does this House suppose the late Prime Minister, Sir John Macdonald, would have been likely to do under similar circumstances? I was not particularly in love with Sir John Macdonald's methods, but I will say this for him, that in such a case not four-and-twenty hours would have elapsed before one of two things would have happened: either his colleague would have handed in his resignation or he would have retracted his statement. Sir, we are about to close this session within a few days, it may be within a few hours; and before we go this House has a right to know, and the country has a right to know, whether in this matter the Government are in earnest or not. What is wanted here are acts, not words. I am not going to discuss on its merits the question whether the Controller of Customs was right or wrong in the conclusions at which he arrived. I do not want to import one word about that into the discussion. The question is simply this: whether, after the Government of which he is a member have formally announced their policy, he has any right to remain in it, distinctly repudiates the policy as he does. I, for my part, cannot see how the Government can retain any shadow of self-respect, and pass over such utterances as those of the hon. gentleman in question. Sir, the hon. gentlemen are very fond on all occasions of referring to British precedents. Let them, if they can, show me a single case in which a subordinate member of a British Cabinet has been allowed to repudiate the settled policy of the Government to which he belonged, and has retained office any longer than was necessary to demand his resignation. Are they prepared to ignore British precedents? Are they prepared to stultify themselves? Are they prepared still more to let this House break up, and to justify their opponents in saying after the exhibition to which we ourselves listened within a few hours, that they are not in the slightest degree in earnest in desiring to fulfil the solemn and formal pledge which but a few days ago they gave to the people of this country with respect to the measure I have alluded to. I consider, Sir, that there is a constitutional question of very considerable gravity involved in this matter; and, without desiring to prolong this debate, as the question is a plain one which any man can understand for himself, in order that the Government may state their view upon it, and in order that other members may state their views, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the House will excuse me if I interpose between the hon. gentleman who has just spoken and the hon. leader of the Government in this House, in order briefly to call attention to a few considerations that have been suggested by the hon. gentleman's observations. I think the course the hon. gentleman has taken is rather extraordinary; that is to say, he has called attention to a question undoubtedly of great interest and importance, and he has pointed out that this country has been without long experience of officers of the Government sitting in Parliament who are not members of the Cabinet. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that there are precedents in regard to the relation to the Cabinet of gentlemen occupying similar positions to those of the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue, it does seem to me that it would have been more in the line of ordinary parliamentary usages if the hon. gentleman had given some notice, not so much for the benefit of the Government as for the benefit of the House. It is obvious that in the discussion which he has precipitated this afternoon there is no time to examine thoroughly the precedents to which he has referred, nor do I, for one, agree that there can be accord upon the statement of facts which he has made as the basis of his observations. He has said, for instance, that a member of the Government, not in the Cabinet, denounced and repudiated the Government's policy. Now I, for one, do not admit that. I submit that the position taken by the Controller of Customs cannot fairly be described as a position denunciatory of or repudiating the position of the Government of which he is a member. If the hon. gentleman's premises were correct, the question he has raised, suddenly, as it has been raised, would be of very great importance indeed. But he has admitted that some very extraordinary things have occurred this session. He referred, for instance, to the policy of the Government involving a sixth session of this Parliament. That, undoubtedly, is unusual and extraordinary. He could have gone on to say that the policy of the Government, if

he liked, was an extraordinary policy, that the question with which that policy has to deal is a most extraordinary question, and that the consideration of that question by some members of Parliament has been also extraordinary. The position, for instance, of the hon. gentleman himself, holding, as he does, a leading position in Parliament, himself a man of great parliamentary experience, who has held high office in the Government, yet who allowed this extraordinary question to which he has referred to-day to be debated for days without giving this Parliament the benefit of one single idea as to what he thinks on that subject—a subject of equal importance, I think you will admit, to that question he has so suddenly sprung upon this House when we were expecting to be winding up the business on the Order Paper—is a very extraordinary and peculiar one. I cannot, of course, at the moment, speak for the Government. I rise merely to observe that I do not think the hon. gentleman has placed the House in a position to fairly and properly consider the very important question he has raised. It was due, I think, to the Government, it was certainly due to the hon. gentleman who is chiefly concerned, to have given notice, not so much for the purpose of ordinary fair-play, as for the purpose of putting clearly before this House the particular observations made by the Controller of Customs which have given ground for the position taken by the hon. gentleman. If we are to thoroughly debate and fairly consider the points which the hon. gentleman desires should be considered, we must have the motion brought up in some other way. We must have the facts fairly before us, fairly under the eyes of hon. gentlemen, before we can begin to apply the various precedents that undoubtedly exist, and those precedents are interesting. Speaking at the moment, this is my idea of the trend of the cases that have come before the British Parliament in matters of this kind. Some of the authorities were referred to last night, and only one of them seemed to be a little inconsistent with what I am about to say of the general trend of those authorities. It is this, that a member of the Government, not occupying a seat in the Cabinet, is not supposed to be consulted, as to the initial stage at any rate, in the consideration of questions of public policy by the Cabinet. The Cabinet are supposed to deal with these matters independently of members of the Government who do not sit in the Cabinet; and when the Ministry comes down to the House with a public measure, with an Act of Parliament, and opportunity is given to the outside members of the Cabinet, so to speak,—not necessarily the junior members in the sense to which the hon. gentleman referred to them but in this case the Controllers—to consider the measure fully in all its bearings and in its application, then it is for those gentlemen either to support the measure or to retire from the Administration. But surely the hon. gentleman will admit on consideration that in a case of this kind, where leading members of Parliament have argued and he has not met them or joined issue with them on the points raised, this whole question, difficult and burning as it is admitted to be, may possibly be decided without this Government asking Parliament to take any particular course of action. That is the main point. That has almost been conceded by the majority of minds in the House, so far as one is able to judge from this somewhat extended debate. There has been almost a universal expression of the hope that the Parliament of Canada may ultimately find it unnecessary to debate or discuss this measure. Under those circumstances, I for one take the risk of saying—while it is true I have no parliamentary reputation to risk,—that in the short examination I have made of the text books—and I have gone no further: I have not gone to the fountain head, nor do I believe the hon. gentleman himself has examined fully into all these cases,—that there will be found ample authority to justify the Controller of Customs in the position he has taken. Probably, though I know nothing of that, he has considered fully his course and his position, and all I am prepared to concede now, and I frankly state that from the impression I have formed, from the reading I have given of the books of parliamentary procedure and government, that when we come down with the measure to which reference has been made—should it be necessary to do so on the lines of the statement of the leader of the Government, and necessary it will be if legislation or satisfactory action does not take place in the province concerned.—then the Controller of Customs, if he finds he is opposed to that measure will either have to support it or retire from the Government. I therefore think, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman, that his observations are rather premature.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In order to examine this subject fairly, we have to consider what changes have taken place in the system of parliamentary government in England, and how far the adoption of the principles of the Cabinet speaking with one voice on the floor of Parliament has modified the doctrine which formerly existed on this subject. There were those in the House of Commons of England, years ago, who thought there was nothing improper in a government permitting of a large number of what may be called open questions—a class of questions upon which members of the government might take, if they saw proper, different sides. Mr. Macaulay, when a member of Lord Melbourne's administration, voted against his colleagues on the subject of the ballot; and in the speech by which he defended his vote in opposing the views of the govern-

ment on that subject and taking a line of his own, he laid down this doctrine, that the government ought to speak wtih a united voice on all questions respecting the administration of public affairs and all questions affecting the peace, order and good government of the country. But that when the questions were of such a character that they might with propriety have been left alone by the administration, as an administration, when they might have been left in the hands of private members, then it was not improper to permit members of the administration to divide on such questions. Mr. Macaulay perhaps stated his own peculiar opinions as broadly as they ever have been stated by any member of any government since the parliamentary system was introduced. If a member of the Government were to declare the Government's policy upon a public question, and a member of the Administration, who is also a member of the Cabinet, should rise and combat that policy, there would be but one course open to that Minister, and that would be to tender his resignation and withdraw from the Government. Now we have, in this case, to consider how far that rule should bind members of the Government who are not responsible for the policy of the Administration, these members of the Ministry who are outside of the Cabinet. Now, I do not deny that the Controller of Customs might, according to the recognized usage in England, entertain views at variance with those which the Government have expressed. I do not deny that a member of the Administration outside of the Cabinet may postpone the question of his resignation until the question comes practically before this House. But, Sir, that contention is controlled and limited by other considerations. It is not usual for a Government to come before Parliament and announce its policy upon a public question if it is not prepared immediately to deal with that question; and so it is not usual for members of the Administration who may dissent from the policy determined upon by the Government to declare before Parliament their hostility to that policy. But the Government thought that this matter was of such importance to the public well-being and to the interests of the Administration, that it was necessary that they should come before Parliament and formally declare what their determinations were for the next session of Parliament. They have adopted the unusual course of asking permission from the Crown to come here and announce this session that they intend by a particular day to begin another session, and that session one that it is not usual to have during the life of a Parliament. At the very time when the policy of the Administration on this matter upon which they have made a formal announcement, is under discussion in the House, a member of the Administration, not of the Cabinet, rises and argues against the policy the Government intended to take. Now, I contend that he is exactly in the position of a member of the Administration who, when a Bill is submitted by the Administration, combats and resists the adoption of that Bill. A Minister of the Crown who is not a member of the Government is not obliged to anticipate the action of his colleagues, and so long as the difference between them remains unknown, he may with propriety remain a member of the Administration. He may take the risk of considering that this question may be, as the Minister of Justice says, settled before the time comes for Parliament to deal with it, and so may never find it necessary to resign. But that cannot hold in this case, because the Government have come down here and enunciated their policy; they have declared their intentions; those intentions are as well defined and as well known as if resolutions embodying them had been submitted to the House. And upon the declaration of these intentions the Controller of Customs has come here and has seriously argued against the policy, and declares that if it is persisted in, and it becomes necessary to legislate upon the subject, he will resist that legislation. The self-respect of the Minister and the self-respect of his chief, the head of the department, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, make it necessary that his membership in the Government should come to an end. Nothing is clearer, when you look at the cases, than that that is the principle. What is the rule long since established in England? In 1829, when Sir Charles Wetherall was Attorney General of England—and the Attorney General is not a member of the Cabinet, though a member of the Ministry—differed from the Government upon the subject of Catholic emancipation, he was compelled to withdraw from the Government, and Sir James Scarlett took his place. And you have many instances of parties being dismissed from the Administration for antagonizing upon the floor of Parliament the policy upon which the Government had pledged themselves to a definite line of action. And the Minister who is not of the Cabinet is not at liberty to combat that policy, if it be a matter of great importance, without first tendering to the Government his resignation. I contend that the hon. gentleman's position is an anomalous position, and one wholly inconsistent with the principle of united responsibility, and with the obligations which Ministers of the Crown owe to the representatives of the people in Parliament.

Mr. DAVIN. It would seem to me that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is entirely mistaken in the main proposition he lays down. The main proposition he lays down is this—that if a Government measure or a Government proposition be discussed in Parliament, a subordinate member of that Administration, that

is a member who is not in the Cabinet, cannot express disapproval of that measure or that policy without placing himself in such a position that he must resign or be dismissed. Now, in 1849 Mr. Baines, the President of the Poor Law Board, voted against the Government measure for the repeal of the navigation laws. But the Prime Minister explained that Mr. Baines had only accepted office conditionally that he should be allowed to vote as he thought fit upon this question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. This case shows that this principle of the subordinate members of the Government voting against the policy of the Cabinet is so well understood that they actually make arrangement with the gentleman accepting such a position that he may openly in Parliament express the strongest disapproval of the Government's policy, not by mere comment only, but by voting against it. Then, in 1854, upon another question, Mr. Baines felt it his duty to oppose his colleagues, but his proffered resignation was declined on account of the high sense entertained of his public services.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Simcoe says, "Hear, hear." I do not know exactly the point that he tries to make, but I apprehend it is that the high consideration entertained by the Government of the day of his services, may be translated into language such as this, that the Government felt that his services to the country, and to the Administration, and to Parliament, were such that they would prefer that he should remain in the Administration. Well, the estimate of the services of a particular Minister is a physiological circumstance for the Cabinet, it is a circumstance that we have no means of measuring, we cannot tell in the minds of what members of the Cabinet it may inhere. We must only take the precedents, only take the fact, supposing the fact to be as stated by the hon. member for South Oxford, namely, that the Controller of Customs has expressed disapproval of the policy of the Government, and yet the Government considers that there is nothing in that to make them insist that he should take any action, or that should cause them to take any active part themselves. Now, there is reason, surely, in all these things, and what is the obvious reason? A man who is not a member of a Cabinet has nothing to do with framing its policy, he is not consulted about Bills over which they cogitate. He is an officer indeed of the Government, and occupying a high position, but he has no Cabinet responsibility. What is the difference between his position as a member of the Government, and the position of a member of Parliament, on a question, say, like that on which Mr. Baines differed from his colleagues, or on the question on which the Controller of Customs spoke last night? What is to prevent him, if he has nothing to do with the framing of measures, from giving his opinion? I apprehend that a moment might arrive then it would become inconvenient for the Ministry, or for the hon. gentleman himself, and then it would be time for him to think of resigning. But the point made by the hon. member for Bothwell is clearly not inconsistent with any precedent in the British Parliament.

Mr. CASEY. I think the Government may well say, and particularly the Controller of Customs, Save us from our friends. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has done everything in his power to minimize the position of the Controller of Customs in the Government, and has done something, I think, to increase the embarrassment that must exist within the Government itself on account of their retention of that gentleman. He says the Controller of Customs is not a Minister, he is only an official.

Mr. DAVIN. No, not a Cabinet Minister.

Mr. CASEY. An official of the Government, were the hon. gentleman's words. His position in discussing questions differs, he says, in no way from that of a private member. He says he has nothing to do with framing the policy of the Government, he is not consulted about the Bills they frame. Well, all this will be pleasant information for those friends of the Controller of Customs outside of the House who believe that he is a power, and a prevailing power, within the Government, although he be not within the precincts of the Cabinet itself. I leave that point to be settled between the hon. gentleman and the Controller of Customs.

But he attempts to draw an analogy with the case of the President of the Poor Law Board, in the English Administration of 1849, who was retained in office, although he had voted against the Government on the one question of the navigation laws. Well, in the first place, that precedent does not apply here, because the navigation laws were not the essential policy on which the Government staked its existence. The policy of remedial legislation for Manitoba is the policy on which this Government claims to stake its very existence as a Government, whatever that policy may, in the end, turn out to be.

The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says that in this particular case the Premier had made an agreement with the President of the Poor Law Board, Mr. Baines, that he might on this question differ with his colleagues, and oppose them in the House. Why did the hon. member bring in that illustration? Is it a fact that in this case the Government have an understanding with the Controller of Customs that

he might differ from the Cabinet on the question of separate schools, that he might vote against them in the House, that he might speak against their policy in the country, in order that he might rally his Orange friends to the support of the Government; while my hon. friends the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General are rallying the people of the province of Quebec to the support of the Government, for an opposite reason? Is there an agreement of that sort? Have the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General made a solemn bargain with the Controller of Customs that they would let him kick over the traces and abuse the Government's policy, here and throughout the country, in order that he might stay in the Government, nominally, and bring the support of his Orange friends to the Administration? If so, it is time that the friends of those hon. gentlemen in the province of Quebec knew it; it is also time that the friends of the Controller in the province of Ontario knew it.

But I think there can be no serious debate as to the propriety, the decency, I may say, of retaining a member of the Government, for, although he may not be a member of the Cabinet, he is a member of the administrative Government—of keeping such a gentleman in office while he is at variance with the Government on the one vital point on which they are now asking the confidence of the country. There can be no question as to the decency of such a proceeding. The only question can be that raised by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, as to how far the utterances of the Controller indicate want of confidence in the policy of the Government, and an intention to oppose that policy.

Now, on that point, I think we can rest easy. The Controller has delivered utterances which certainly mean a declared opposition to that policy, which certainly must be accepted as declarations of his opposition to that policy, and which I think can be interpreted in no other sense—although the Minister himself seems to have thought, on a late occasion, that there was a way of holding his present views consistently with sustaining that policy. When the hon. Controller of Customs addressed his subjects—I am using that word rather in a jocular sense, because I see he is Supreme Grand Sovereign of the Orange Order, and I do not know how else we can refer to them—when he addressed the Orangemen here on the 12th July, he said:

> For my part, and I speak under a full sense of the responsibility of my utterances, I have to say frankly and firmly, that I favour the maintenance of a non-sectarian school system in Manitoba.

And then there were cheers from the assembled faithful. Now, if favouring the maintenance of a non-sectarian school system does not mean opposition to the introduction of separate schools by remedial legislation originating in this House, then the English language does not mean anything, and I am sure the hon. Controller knows enough of the English language to express his views clearly in that particular.

> If our constitution permitted it, I would advocate with the same fervour a similar system throughout the Dominion. (Renewed cheers.)

So, the Controller is not only against separate schools in Manitoba, but against separate schools anywhere in Canada. Here is a part of his speech to which I wish to call special attention:

> More than that, I have to say, that if occasion should arise to require a declaration to this effect on my part, by my voice and vote in Parliament, I will not hesitate for one moment to give effect to the view which I have just announced.

The Controller says that by his voice and vote in Parliament, on the first occasion which arises, he will give effect to his view that non-sectarian schools should prevail in Manitoba, and that separate schools should not be granted to Roman Catholics there:

> There is, further, this very important aspect of the case to be considered, namely, the difficulty of imposing a school system upon Manitoba by means of federal legislation. The constitution commits to the provinces exclusive jurisdiction in matters of education, and, while it is true that certain reservations are made, that specified limitations are placed upon the powers of the provinces, there is no provision whereby effect can be given to any conclusion Parliament might arrive at contrary to the views of the province.

So the Controller says that if remedial legislation were passed by this Parliament, it would be impracticable and it could not be carried into effect. Could any one imagine stronger opposition presented to the views of the Government than is made by the Controller? It is true that this speech was delivered principally to the faithful on a great occasion, but it was carefully prepared and written out and given to the press, and I read this extract from the speech as it appeared in the official organ of the Government, the "Mail and Empire," of Toronto. I notice that this important statement was omitted from the published report given by the Government organ in Ottawa, but it appeared in the Toronto organ; the hon. gentleman did not get his proof revised in time for the Toronto organ, although it was revised for the Ottawa one. After pointing out the impracticability of having the remedial order carried into effect in Manitoba, he said:

> So that, apart altogether from the cardinal principle of the question, there is a real and substantial difficulty in the way of details to be confronted which gives added weight to the objection to parliamentary interference with Manitoba. I propose, however, to await events rather than to anticipate what may never occur.

The Controller thinks it possible that this Government, of which he is an outside member, sitting on the door-step of it, may never

carry out the policy on which they have challenged the country to support them. He said: "He would not anticipate what may never occur," namely, the necessity of opposing remedial legislation. The reason is that he does not believe his colleagues intend to bring their policy to a focus in the shape of actual legislation submitted to the House, and waiting for that time, although his colleagues promised to do what he said they should not do, he would calmly await events—among these, no doubt, being the receipt during six months, of salary cheques, for the dates which would intervene between his speech and the end of the session of Parliament, to be called in January next.

He continued:

Nor do I intend to be led or entrapped into precipitate action upon the subject by any device, no matter from what quarter it may come.

No one believes that any one could arouse the hon. gentleman from his sphinx-like calm, and induce him to precipitate his decision and forestall the arrival of those pleasant events which occur to a man in receipt of salary.

On another occasion, and in a more responsible manner, the hon. gentleman stated:

It is clear to me that the proposal that those schools should be restored virtually as they had existed previous to 1890, is a proposition that will not meet with acceptance in this House nor with acceptance at the hands of the people of this country. The facts are undeniable.

The hon. gentleman quoted the evidence of Mr. Sifton to show that the schools existing before 1890 were absolutely inefficient, and he said it would not do to restore schools like those. He added:

It is quite clear that the schools in a sparsely-settled country, such as Manitoba is and must be for many years to come, will be inefficient if two or three different schools are to be established in one district, because not only the Protestants and Roman Catholics, but the various branches of the Protestant Church will each demand separate schools, and I do not see how the demand can be refused. It has been stated by the hon. member for Provencher that Archbishop McLean, of the English Church, is an advocate of the separate school system. I believe that he is correct, and also that there are very many clergy of the Church of England who are strong advocates of the separate school system. Belonging to that church myself, I have had an opportunity of ascertaining the opinions of the laity, and I believe the desire for separate schools as regards the Church of England is confined almost entirely to the clergy of that church, and that such a proposal does not meet with any favour among the laity of that church. If separate schools are to be given to Roman Catholics, you cannot refuse them to each of the other churches.

The Controller is in direct opposition to the policy of the Government, and if the Minister of Justice is not now satisfied it is impossible to convince him, for the policy of the Government as expressed in the remedial order, after reciting the rights of which the people of Manitoba have been deprived by the local Act of 1890, sets forth:

And His Excellency the Governor General in Council was further pleased to declare and decide, and it is hereby declared, that it seems requisite that the system of education embodied in the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid, shall be supplemented by a provincial Act or Acts which will restore to the Roman Catholic minority the said rights and privileges of which such minority has been so deprived as aforesaid, and which will modify the said Acts of 1890, so far, and so far only, as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions restoring the rights and privileges in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), hereinbefore mentioned.

There is the clear issue of policy between the Government and its hanger-on, for as such he has been described by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to attribute to me such language. I never used the word "hanger-on."

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member did not use the word "hanger-on," but the position in which the Controller is standing, as stated by the hon. member for Assiniboia, can only be described by the word "hanger-on." I father that word myself, but the material on which the description was based was afforded by the hon. member for Assiniboia. It does not consort with the dignity of a Government to have a hanger-on who will not follow orders, even if he be Grand Sovereign of British North America. Let him be Grand Sovereign of what he likes, so long as he remains in a Government, he should be in accord with its policy and not opposed to it, as he is showing to be by his speeches on the floor of the House, as well as before the Orangemen on the 12th July. Let him be a man or a mouse; let him take one side or the other. Let him retire to his own sovereignty, and be content with that, or accept his position as an attachment to this Government, and support faithfully and loyally the poli " of those whose bread he eats.

Of those on the other hand, who are in accord with the policy of the Government, those two Ministers especially who resigned from that Government, and came back again only on the especially strengthened assurance, with special endorsement upon it, that its promise would be carried out, what are we to say? Are they going to sit on the same treasury benches—I won't say the same Council table, because they have not taken the Supreme Grand Sovereign into the Council chamber—will they sit on the same treasury benches with a man who reviles the separate schools of Manitoba, and says no relief shall be granted the minority? Will these gentlemen who nearly, very, very nearly, indeed, wrecked the Government in order to secure the promise of remedial legislation, be content to associate in the Administration with a man who says

he will oppose this policy? I leave it for the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General, and the Controller of Customs to fight it out amongst themselves.

They have had plenty of fighting amongst themselves, they had changes of fighting and quarrelling and kissing and making it up again. I do not know how far the process of making it up has gone, or whether the reunion is so firm that nothing can break it. I do not know whether the love that exists between the remedial legislation Ministers, and the anti-remedial legislation Ministers is such as will carry them over all the vicissitudes of fortune that may occur between now and next session. But I do say, this is one blot upon their record as a Government which they can avoid. They can see that the Government is unanimous on this vital question of their policy, or if not, they must submit to know that they have earned the contempt of the country.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am not going to discuss at any length the matter which has been brought under the notice of the House by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but I think it is well at all events, in justice to gentlemen of high position, and of high character who have been traduced in a most outrageous manner in this House, that a defence should be made, even if it be short, of the position which they took. It is especially important that the attention of the Government should be called in a particular manner to a declaration which was made by a member of the Government on the floor of this House yesterday evening. I am not going to refer, even on the motion of adjournment, to a previous debate, but I am going to quote words which were spoken in the city of Ottawa by the Controller of Customs, and which were repeated on the floor of this House yesterday afternoon. A charge was made by the Controller of Customs against his lordship the Bishop of Nicolet, and that charge was made in the last. That charge was repeated on the floor of this House again yesterday, and the man making that charge spoke as a member of the Government of Canada. After referring to the part which the Bishop of Nicolet took in certain negotiations, the Controller of Customs proceeded to say:

> This deliberate attempt to influence a judicial decision would be characterized in ordinary cases as an attempt to get at the jury, and is very properly an indictable offence. Such methods are not only reprehensible, but they are dangerous, as they tend to cloud with doubt the decisions of our highest tribunals, while at the same time the publication of the facts by the Bishop of Nicolet reveals the startling truth that the ecclesiastics of this church deem it both wise and just to resort to practices which the common law of Canada not only forbids, but punishes.

I would like to know if the Government endorses the language uttered yesterday afternoon by a member of the Government. I would like to know if the Controller of Customs, speaking here yesterday, when he repeated the statement he made on the 12th July last, spoke the sentiments of the Government of Canada. I think the matter is of sufficient importance to be brought thus publicly before the attention of the Government. My intention is to offer a defence by quoting an article which appeared in the daily Nor'wester on Wednesday, 26th June, 1895, and having reference to the same question. Dr. Grant, it will be understood, referred to the same subject, and the article says:

> We might suggest to Principal Grant, whose usual clear-headedness has failed him on this occasion, that before hastening off to the Colonial Minister or to Rome in his indignation, he will do better first to discipline a dignitary of his own church. A professor of Manitoba College, Dr. Bryce, has put himself very much in evidence in this school matter, and is doubtless, therefore, well known to the Principal. At every meeting of the synod for four or five years past he has been forward with resolutions on the subject, and which were not by any means as oil on the troubled waters. Two years ago he advanced as a reason why a resolution he had introduced should pass, that a former kindred one had been transmitted to the Privy Council, and that no doubt it had its effect in influencing the judgment of that tribunal against the Catholic contention that the legislation of 1890 was unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly sure that nobody is aware that any Catholic in this country, in this House, ever took objection to the position assumed by the Rev. Dr. Bryce, or that we ever said that he subverted the laws of the land, that he was guilty of an indictable offence, or that we ever traduced him in any possible way, especially in such language as those heads of our own church were traduced by the Controller of Customs, a member of this Government. And, after all, what was the great crime charged against the Bishop of Nicolet? The article goes on to say:

> Here was a deliberate and open acknowledgment of what Principal Grant would call "a deliberate attempt to subvert justice." By wigging Bishop Gravel for a perfectly innocent act, innocent at least in comparison with this, why not turn his attention to the Rev. Dr. Bryce?

And why does not the Controller of Customs turn his attention to Dr. Bryce?

> Our own opinion is, that the transmission of that resolution for the purpose stated was an exceedingly improper act, and that the acknowledgment of it was evidence of an indelicacy that comes of callousness. But we are sometimes in doubt of our own judgment in the matter, when we remember that the Chief Justice of Manitoba was present at the synod at which the statement was made, and there is no report that he administered a rebuke to the over-zealous Doctor who thus boasted of his "deliberate attempt to subvert justice." For we take it that His Lordship has a full appreciation of the respect due to the courts, and is so jealously mindful of it that he

would not permit any religious rivalries or animosities to stand between him and his duty on an occasion of that kind. However, one thing seems clear: If to remind a Colonial Minister of a certain historical fact is "a deliberate attempt to subvert justice," it is not less so to transmit to the Privy Council a violent resolution which is acknowledged to have been sent for the purpose of influencing its judgment. And we would like Principal Grant to tell us why the one may not be done from Rome if the other is permitted to a Presbyterian synod of Manitoba.

That is the defence made of the act of his lordship the Bishop of Nicolet. Mr. Speaker, the Controller of Customs was not satisfied to make his charge against the Bishop of Nicolet, but he included in that charge these statements, also:

The ecclesiastics of this church deem it both wise and just to resort to practices which the common law of Canada not only forbids, but punishes.

I question if there ever was in this House of Commons such an insult hurled against the Roman Catholic bishops of Canada, as the one contained in this sentence, uttered by the Controller of Customs a week ago, and repeated on the floor of this House yesterday. I consider that it is of far more importance than even the matter brought under the special notice of the House by the hon. member for South Oxford. He not only insults the Bishop of Nicolet in this House, composed as it is of Protestant and Catholic members—Catholic members who have always been careful to respect the feelings of their Protestant colleagues, and who have never been known in this House or out of it to utter one disrespectful word towards a minister of a Protestant church, but who have been careful in all their dealings with them to respect them in every possible way. And they have to stand insults of this kind in this House, coming from a man whose position is high, and whose salary is paid by Catholics as well as by Protestants. It is an outrage, Sir, one of the worst ever perpetrated in this House; and I avail myself of this opportunity, not as a Catholic, but as a member of the House of Commons and as a citizen of Canada, to protest against this insult offered to men whose character is high, far higher than that of the Controller of Customs; whose aim is high, far higher than that of the Controller of Customs; whose position is noble, far nobler than that of the Controller of Customs. Was he satisfied to stop there, Mr. Speaker? Was he satisfied to hurl his insults against this bishop and against the living colleagues of this bishop? No, Sir; he could not be satisfied with insulting the great living Roman Catholics of Canada. He had to go to the dead, and traduce the late Archbishop Taché. He said distinctly yesterday that the late Archbishop of Manitoba was a party to a corrupt bargain. Sir, I resent this; I deny this: I want to know what the corrupt bargain was. In this connection the hon. gentleman charges corruption against Mr. Greenway. Mr. Greenway, I have no doubt, is well able to defend himself; but he especially charges corruption against the late Archbishop of Manitoba. As a result of the negotiations which then took place, what did the late Archbishop of Manitoba receive, and what promise did he make? I am not aware that any promise was made. If I correctly understand what occurred on that occasion, it was this—that a government was being formed for that province, that the premier of that province desired to have in the government a representative of the French Canadian and Catholic minority; that he was anxious to have one who would be acceptable to that minority and an honour and credit to it; and that, in this connection, he asked the opinion of the late archbishop, through his vicar-general, of Mr. James Prendergast, who was afterwards taken into the cabinet. Where is the corruption in this? I rose for the purpose of protesting against these insinuations, hurled across the floor by the Controller of Customs, against the living and against the dead. He could not content himself with insulting those who are able to defend themselves, but he had to go even to the grave and insult one who commanded the respect of those who differed from him, as he commanded the esteem and the love of those who belong to the church of which he was such a bright ornament. Sir, I could not let the session close without calling attention to these subjects. I have been careful, in all the debates that have taken place—perhaps angry debates at times—not to say anything that could be hurtful to any hon. member. I have sat day after day during the last week and listened to charges which I knew were unfounded in fact, and I still said not one word, because I was desirous of not bringing even the slightest dissension into the matter or of increasing the trouble which actually exists. There is no doubt about my own feelings on the question which has formed the basis of so much discussion in the House during the last few days. My sympathies have ever been with those who are oppressed—with the cause of the minority who have the written constitution of the land on their side. That is the position I have maintained ever since I have been in this House, and it will continue to be my position no matter what the consequences may be; it is the position to which I will cling to the end. But, Sir, I do not wish even to take part in this debate, for the reason that I do not know how the question stands; I did not know in whom to place faith, whether in the Controller of Customs, who said we were to have nothing, or in the other members of the Government, who said that we were to have relief. I thought it better to remain quiet and see what we will have; but I could not in silence listen to insults hurled against those whom I hon-

our for their nobility of character, their grandeur of aim, and especially their high services to their country and to the faith to which they belong.

Mr. MARTIN. I have a few observations to offer to the House with regard to the statement made by the Controller of Customs in justification of his remaining in this Government while he disagrees with its announced policy. The hon. Minister of Justice stated that it was the general opinion of most of those who had engaged in this debate that in all probability a settlement would be obtained from the province of Manitoba which would obviate any necessity of this Parliament legislating on the subject. Now, Sir, I cannot allow that statement to pass unchallenged. I have failed to hear from any gentleman who has interposed in the debates in this House on this question, any reason whatever for the hope that a satisfactory settlement would be obtained between now and the first Thursday in January from the province of Manitoba. In fact, I think it is clear, beyond the necessity of argument, that there is no hope whatever of any such consummation. The statement of the policy of the Government is that unless the province of Manitoba agrees to a compromise upon the lines of the remedial order, at a session to commence here on the first Thursday in January, a Bill based on the remedial order will be introduced and pressed through this House by the Government. What suggestion has been made which would justify even the shadow of the hope that the province of Manitoba intended to make any such compromise. The action of the Government of that province has been in that matter most deliberate. They have had plenty of time to consider the matter, they have considered it fully, and have given to the Government of Canada, and to this House their deliberate answer to the remedial order. They have deliberately stated that they cannot take the responsibility of carrying out the terms of the remedial order What possible suggestion therefore has been put forward that the Government of Manitoba might be induced, by any negotiations proceeding from this Government, to reconsider that answer? There has been, in my opinion, no such suggestion; and I am very much mistaken indeed if the Government of Manitoba and the people whom that Government represent will recede in the slightest degree from the position they have taken. It is not proposed to commence the negotiations with Manitoba or an investigation of this subject apart from the remedial order. There can, I think, be no doubt upon that point, judging by the original statement made to the House by the hon. Finance Minister. If there were any doubt as to what the nature of the renewed negotiations were to be, the question put to the Minister of Finance by the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Girouard), and the answer received by him places that beyond all controversy. It is proposed, in the face of the plain, distinct and explicit refusal of the Manitoba legislature to carry out the terms of the remedial order, to reopen negotiations with that province with the view of obtaining the reversal of that decision. If there was, as the hon. Minister of Justice says, in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, any hope, however slight, of any such consummation as that, I think that it is only fair for me to say that there is no possible justification for such hope. In the argument put forward by one of the speakers, as some justification for that hope, was the letter written by myself in connection with this matter. Now, I stand by everything I said in that letter, and I may say that I believe if this Government, instead of adopting the course they did, instead of forcing on, against the protest of Manitoba, the hearing of this case before the Privy Council and pressing on the remedial order which, in its terms, orders Manitoba to restore, in every respect, the system of schools as they were prior to 1890—if, instead of adopting that course, they had proceeded then to negotiate with Manitoba, I believe that the province of Manitoba would have been prepared to go into this question and to give to the minority such a measure of relief, if the minority were prepared to be reasonable in their demands, as would have been satisfactory to the Dominion at large. Unfortunately the Government did not think fit to adopt that course, but took the opposite course, and they passed the remedial order, which they are authorized to pass by section 22 of the Manitoba Act, as interpreted by the Privy Council. They took their stand, and under these circumstances it became necessary for Manitoba to take its stand, which Manitoba did; and I am sure that the Government of Manitoba will not be allowed—even should it desire to do so, which I am sure it does not—by the people of Manitoba in any way to recede from that stand. On the other hand, as I stated in my letter, if the statement made by the Minister of Public Works in the authorized interview to which I referred in that letter, that all the minority in Manitoba desired was an opportunity to give such religious instruction in the schools as they thought proper, without interfering in any degree, with the School Act of 1890, so far as that School Act made changes in the school law of Manitoba and made the schools of that province efficient and subject to Government inspection and in every way public and national schools—if that be the desire of the minority, if the Minister of Public Works rightly expressed the views of the minority, then I undertook in that letter to state, that, so far as I was concerned, I thought there was justice in their claim. As

I stated in that letter, I am one of those opposed to any religious exercises or instruction whatever in the public schools. I have been constantly of that opinion from the first, and I am still of that opinion. The province of Manitoba, however, has not adopted that course, but established public national schools, which are declared by the statute to be non-sectarian, but into which they allow a certain amount of religious instruction to be introduced. The introduction of such religious instruction as is provided in that Act is satisfactory, to a certain extent, to the Protestants of that province. It is not fully satisfactory even to the Protestants of that province. There are many there who think that a great deal more religious instruction should be had in those schools. The Roman Catholics agree with the Protestants who are not satisfied with the modicum of religious instruction which is allowed by that statute. Under these circumstances, I expressed in my letter the belief that the imposition of such an amount of religious instruction or such a course of religious instruction as was only satisfactory to a part of the community was rank tyranny. In that view I could not justify the refusal of the legislature of Manitoba to extend these religious exercises, so that religious instruction to such an extent as to be satisfactory to any of the component parts of the population of Manitoba might be given. And I believe that if this Government, instead of proposing as they have done to negotiate with Manitoba on the terms of the remedial order with a view to that province legislating on the terms of that order, were, even now, to take the course they should have taken in the beginning—repeal the remedial order and then apply to Manitoba to do justice in the premises.—I believe that the people of Manitoba would respond to that appeal and would do justice under the circumstances. It must be remembered, and I think it is understood and appreciated by those in this House who have the cause of the minority in Manitoba at heart, that no legislation which may be passed by this Parliament with a view to restoring separate schools in Manitoba will be effectual unless and until the legislature of Manitoba concurs in and co-operates with that legislation. That being so, I think it will be admitted by those who advocate justice to the minority of Manitoba that it would be very much preferable if, instead of legislation being passed in this House forcing Manitoba in this matter, the legislation should come from the legislature of Manitoba, without whose co-operation such legislation passed in this House, would, as I have said, be without effect. And the legislature of Manitoba in their answer to the demands of the remedial order were careful to draw attention to the fact——

Mr. SPEAKER. I have been trying to discover how the argument the hon. gentleman is presenting was relevant to the subject before the House, but I confess I have not succeeded.

Mr. MARTIN. The matter was introduced by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think not. The subject before the House is the action of the Controller of Customs remaining in the Government while at variance with the policy of the Government, and that was a perfectly legitimate subject of discussion.

Mr. MARTIN. As I understood the Minister of Justice, he stated that one reason that would justify the Controller of Customs in remaining in his position was that there was every prospect of this question being settled by the action of Manitoba before the second Thursday in January.

Mr. SPEAKER. So long as the member for Winnipeg confined himself to that branch of the question, I did not interfere. But the hon. gentleman, I think, is bringing up the whole question of the Manitoba schools.

Mr. MARTIN. If I have gone further than an attempt to show how impossible it is to hope for action from Manitoba, I certainly have gone beyond what I intended. I simply started out to show that, looking at the answer that Manitoba gave to the remedial order, and also from my own views as to the state of public opinion in Manitoba, there could be no possible hope of the Manitoba Government or legislature departing or receding in the slightest degree from the position they had taken in that answer. That answer clearly, explicitly and distinctly refuses to obey the terms of the remedial order. It makes the proposal that the Government should make investigation into the state of educational affairs there. That the Government have refused to do. Then it winds up with a reference to a suggestion that has been made that moneys apart from public moneys had been taken, practically confiscated, by the Government, and it makes the offer that the Government will be prepared at any time to refund any money so taken. These are the salient points of the answer; and, as I have said before, I am satisfied that the people of Manitoba will insist that their government shall adhere to that answer in every respect.

Mr. McCARTHY. I had not thought well hitherto to say anything in this discussion because I thought it was rather understood from the observations of the Minister of Justice that he had merely, as he said, interposed in the debate and so that the leader of the House and the representative of the Prime Minister would be heard from and that we should have a definite statement from that hon. gentleman of the views of the Government upon this very important constitutional question. I regret that there has been a divergence from the question under discussion. And in saying that I do not refer

to the speech made by my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), because it appears to me that it was exceedingly pertinent to this discussion to point out that there would be no reasonable hope, no hope of any kind, that before January next there would be any recantation—because I think we may call it that—on the part of the province of Manitoba, and therefore there is the more importance to be attached to the expressed hostility of the Controller of Customs to the policy of the Government. I regret that the hon. gentleman from the county of Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) introduced a matter which did not appear to me to be in the slightest degree relevant to this discussion and as to which I have views which perhaps different from his, but views very strong, as to the propriety of the action which the Bishop of Nicolet took and which he himself reports he took with reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But, Sir, I will refrain now from following that hon. gentleman, and I merely make the observation I have made in order to let it be distinctly understood that I do not accept the views that were put forward by that hon. gentleman in defence of his lordship the Bishop of Nicolet, nor, if the facts are correctly reported, would I have anything more to say in favour of the course ascribed to Dr. Bryce. Now, the question before the House is a new question here, and necessarily so, because we have had these junior officers of the Administration only for a few years past. But this question, it does appear to me, is one deserving of very careful consideration, because upon the line that is now adopted, and the precedent that is now established, we would be announcing the constitutional rule that ought to prevail in cases of this kind. There must be some matters that are reasonably plain according to English precedent. It does appear to be clear that the junior officials, the under-secretaries, the Attorney General, &c., the gentlemen who are not in the Cabinet, are not responsible for the views of the Administration, as to which, of course, they have never been consulted, and until those views are brought to the notice of Parliament, and it becomes necessary for the subordinate officials to take some parliamentary action, they may maintain their position in the Administration without injury to the public service, because that, after all, is the question to be considered. It is a question as to whether the service which the Administration, as the advisers of His Excellency the Governor General, has to perform, is injured, or affected, or influenced by such a divergence of opinion as we now know to exist between the Cabinet officers and one of the Controllers who is not of that body. I say it is plain that up to that time the junior official, simply because he might disapprove of the policy, is not bound, it is a matter of taste on his part altogether, he is not required, according to constitutional usage, to resign his position; and, of course, the Prime Minister can find no fault with him because he is not supposed to know that he entertains that different view. But it is equally clear that when the matter becomes necessary to be dealt with in Parliament, and when the official has to take some parliamentary stand one way or the other, he cannot be permitted on the floor of Parliament to oppose the policy or the measure, or the acts of the Government, although not a member of the Cabinet. Now, I take this illustration that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) brought to our notice in the speech he delivered this afternoon, and I think that hon. gentleman and the House will see at once the distinction, a distinction which more clearly points out that rule in the case of Mr. Baines, the President of the Poor Law Board, who, in the discussion in Parliament, differed from his colleagues, and voted against the Government measure for the repeal of the navigation laws. The Prime Minister explained that so far as that gentleman was concerned, it was an open question, and the Prime Minister had been willing to accept him as a subordinate official upon the distinct understanding that he might take that ground. Well, we know there may be open questions. There might be a question in which Cabinet Ministers might differ, and which the Cabinet might wish themselves to be treated as an open question, and in which there would not necessarily be unity, even among the members of the Cabinet. But there are questions and questions; and while, in a minor matter, or even in a matter of some importance, we could understand a subordinate member of the Administration differing, and even giving expression to that difference of opinion, as to the policy proposed by his colleagues, what is to be said on a question so important as this is admitted to be? I will not adopt the extravagant language of the Minister of Justice; I think rather that it is not the most important question that has been before us. But it is an important question, it is a question deemed by the Government of such moment that it is necessary to call a sixth session of this Parliament. It has been deemed by some members of the Administration of such moment that they retired from office because the negotiation with Manitoba was to anticipate the action of the Administration. If you look at the statement made by Mr. Angers, and the statement we have here, you will realize how important the most trifling difference on this question appears to have been to the members of the Cabinet itself. Mr. Angers resigned because the Cabinet insisted that before the next session of Parliament, negotiations should take place with the province of Manitoba, and Mr. Angers said: Let us announce that we will legislate, agreeing that the legislation might be postponed until next session;

let that announcement be communicated to Manitoba, and if Manitoba thinks fit to act, let her make the advance, and then we will not be embarrassed by any such condition as is proposed in the resolution of Council which was adopted by the majority. I refer to that merely to show how important this question is. Now, I desire this to be treated simply as a constitutional question, and one of considerable importance, as it appears to me, being the first of the kind we have ever had. I wish therefore to reiterate the argument of the hon. gentleman that there is no reasonable hope, and no expectation of the province of Manitoba recanting what the legislature of that province did in the month of June last. But I draw attention to this consideration, and I invite the attention of the leader of the House to it: Is this not a question upon which, among the Cabinet, and among the followers behind them, there is a very strong feeling, and a very great difference of opinion? Is it not a matter in which it is important that the Government should educate public opinion if they hope or expect in another possible session, to carry this remedial legislation? If that be so, is it proper or right that a member of that Cabinet should stand up at a great public meeting and denounce this policy in unmeasured and emphatic terms as one that could never be acceptable to the people of this country?

Mr. HUGHES. He did it because you were not there to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. A locum tenens.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to know he expressed my views, as he did very satisfactorily, and that it was not necessary for me to speak. I am drawing attention to this, that if that be so, according to our idea of administrative unity, then the majority of the members of this Cabinet, according to the constitution and the law, may pass this remedial Bill, while on the same platform the Controller is sitting, and would rise up and denounce that policy and point out that in the best interests of the country, it could not be adopted. Now, there is no doubt about what the Controller said. I understand he repeated it verbatim, or in substance, here yesterday evening, but I did not hear it, and I have not had an opportunity of consulting the "Hansard" to read it. Here is what he said at this meeting of the 12th July:

> Now, for my own part, having recited the circumstances with which we are all now so very familiar, and I speak under a full sense of the responsibility of my utterances, I have to say frankly and firmly, that I favour the maintenance of a non-sectarian school system in Manitoba, and that, if our constitution permitted it, I would advocate with the same fervour a similar system throughout the Dominion.
>
> I propose, however, to await events rather than to anticipate those which may never occur. Nor do I intend to be led or trapped into precipitate action upon the subject by any device, no matter from what quarter it may come. Our duty, it seems to me, is to adhere resolutely to the main principles,——

Here is what he invites the whole audience to adopt with him and the people of Canada to back him up in:

> —to keep them always in view and swerve neither to the right hand nor to the left.

What main principles are dealt with there? The principle he believes in is that there shall be no separate schools in this part of the Dominion, and that where we have the power, as we have in Manitoba, separate schools shall not be imposed there. Surely that is not what is meant by this language. We are not to go either to the right hand nor to the left with respect to this guiding principle of the hon. gentleman. He proceeded:

> And in this position I trust I shall not only have the approbation of yourselves, but the support of the great majority of the people of Canada.

So the Controller, speaking at a public meeting, speaking in a position of great authority and influence, invited the members of the body to which he belongs and the people of Canada with them, to stand by him against the imposition of separate schools on Manitoba, and against the expressed policy of the Government that in January next, under possible circumstances, they will introduce a Bill to impose separate schools on that province. Surely that is a scandal, the equal of which we have not on record as existing between one member of the Administration and another. I desire to eliminate all questions except the one abstract constitutional point, whether or not on the leading question of policy—because I think at this moment I may properly so describe it, of the Government—it can be tolerated that one of the members of the Administration is to be in a position to stump the country and arouse public opinion against the policy of the Cabinet of which he is a junior member. Take the instance we have here. The general principle is very clearly laid down by Todd. After speaking as to what is not now in question, that the Cabinet must be united—and no one will contend that any one member of the Administration could be allowed to speak as the Controller has spoken—the author says:

> The responsibility of a minister who has no seat in the cabinet is less comprehensive, although in its degree no less complete. Such a one is required to render active assistance in sustaining the policy of the government.

This is what the Controller of Customs is openly and properly, from my point of view—but that is not a question involved here—declaring that he will do his best to oppose, and when the time comes for that

action, he will be found in his place in Parliament offering it every opposition. That is the general rule, and some of the cases have been cited, including one in 1829 where Sir Charles Wetherall opposed the Roman Catholic Bill brought in as a Government measure, and resigned office, and Sir James Scarlett was appointed in his place. Not only was the statement to which I have referred, made by the Controller on 12th July last, not only was that the position in which matters stood on that date, but we have been engaged in a debate in this House for two days in which this policy has been actually challenged, and as to which the Controller has expressed his positive dissent and disagreement. Under these circumstances, I submit it is a matter of such importance that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was well guided in submitting it for our consideration, and I hope it will be dealt with by the House irrespective of party considerations, and simply and solely as to the effect it may have upon the future relationship between subordinate officers of the Cabinet and the Cabinet itself.

Mr. DICKEY. I am glad for some reasons that the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) thought it proper to bring this question before the House, because it gave those hon. gentlemen on his own side of the House who had not an opportunity yesterday, owing to party discipline, to ventilate their opinion on the Manitoba school question, and give us the benefit of the advice they have to offer, although it comes a little late in the day. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman entered into a conspiracy against the hon. member for Bothwell by which that hon. gentleman should have an opportunity of delivering a speech on constitutional law; but, at all events, the effect of his action has been that the last speech on constitutional law, which I thought yesterday the hon. member for Bothwell was anxious to get rid of, was presented to the House this afternoon. I regret exceedingly, to speak more seriously, that the hon. gentleman who has introduced this matter before the House which, he says, is a matter of serious constitutional import, should not have thought it better to have taken measures to have a more intelligent discussion of it on this side of the House, because the hon. gentleman is quite aware that while he has, no doubt, investigated the matter, and taken action to inform himself on the law and practice, it is quite impossible to expect members of the Administration, after such a run of hard work as we have had lately, to be prepared to deal with a matter like this, and to consider it off-hand, except upon the most general principles. I may say, frankly, that so far as I am concerned, I am not prepared to give a definite opinion on the exact status of the position of the Controllers who have been recently appointed under the new system we have adopted. The hon. member for Simcoe suggested that it was limited to the practical side, that that interference in the Government's policy which would weaken the efficiency of the officers in their department would be a test. I do not know whether that was a correct definition or not, but, assuming it to be so, I presume it would result in this, that the Controllers could not remain in office if they differed with the Government in the administration of affairs in their own departments.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not what I desired to put to the House.

Mr. DICKEY. I understood the hon. gentleman to suggest that as one test.

Mr. McCARTHY. That would be a very flagrant case, if it was a matter connected with the Customs Department. My point is this: This policy has been enunciated in the name and on behalf of the Crown. This policy, it is the duty of the servants of the Crown, the Administration and its members, by every means in their power, to implement, and that where it becomes of sufficient importance, as in this case, it requires united action of the Cabinet and of the members of the Administration. That is the test which ought to be applied.

Mr. DICKEY. That, the hon. gentleman will see, is another branch. But he will grant me that the first instance I gave is a good one: that the difference of opinion between the Controller and the Administration as to the conduct of his own department would be a fatal case. Another, I should say would be, a radical difference between his opinion, and the opinion of the Government as to the general administration of affairs; and for this reason, that there cannot be confidence between the Administration and a subordinate officer with reference to the administration of the department, if there was a loss of confidence upon the general policy of the Government. I say frankly that I am not prepared to give an opinion as to the particular responsibility on a question like this. Although this is an important question, it is not the general policy of the Government as we have understood it in this country. It is important, but it is a particular question which has arisen within the last two months. Now, Sir, the Government has offered a policy which contains two branches. In the first place, negotiation with the province of Manitoba, and in the second place, in the event of that failing, the introduction of legislation. It is quite certain that hon. gentlemen on his side of the House—the only class of gentlemen in the House who felt at liberty yesterday to express any opinion upon this particular point—did as a matter of fact consider this a policy composed of two branches. Some of them refused to vote for the amend-

ment of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) for the very reason that they approved, and approved strongly, of a part of the Government policy. At the worst, you have this: That the Controller of Customs has expressed an opinion adverse to a part of the Government policy upon a question which is not the general policy of the Government. But, Sir, as I understand the matter, the hon. the Controller of Customs did not express any opinion of the sort at all. The hon. Controller expressed here as elsewhere his own conviction against separate schools as a principle. Now, Sir, I do not think that that would be a matter of vital importance. I speak of course with great reservation, not having considered the question. It appears that a subordinate officer of the Administration holds general views which do not accord with the Government of an incidental policy, and it does not strike me that that is a matter that would cause any very serious consequences on the part of the Controller. The only case that I am aware of bearing on the matter at all—and it is one handed me by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)—is the case of Mr. Bright, who wrote a letter to be used at a public meeting in Bermingham attacking very violently the constitution of the House of Lords in England—a matter in direct contravention of the policy of the Government of which he was a member. That was brought up in the House, and in "Hansard" of June 17th, 1869, the matter was discussed by Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Gladstone said: That although that did not represent the views of the Government, he had no objection whatever to any colleague of his expressing his opinion upon an abstract principle with reference to the House of Lords or any other matter. Further than that, it does not seem to me that the Controller of Customs has gone. However, I speak with reserve, and I claim the right to speak with reserve and to retain to myself further action, because the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did not give me an opportunity of looking into the question before he brought it up, and therefore, I am not able at present to give a decided opinion upon it. I think the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was wrong, with reference to the Baines case. I think that if Mr. Baines' case applied to this, that there would not be any difficulty whatever about it, but I do not think that the fact that Mr. Baines stipulated that it should be an open question is a relevant fact at present. I believe, speaking entirely from general impression, that the rule has changed since Mr. Baines' case was decided, and that the principles of responsibility are stricter now than they were then, and that that case would have been otherwise held if it had arisen at a later day. Taking the whole question, although it is a matter fairly for discussion, I think it would have been discussed better, and the House would have been better informed upon it, if the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) had been good enough to observe the ordinary practice and give the Administration time to inform themselves upon the question. But, looking upon the matter as I have viewed it, I do not think it is serious enough to call for such peremptory action as the hon. gentleman invites, to adjourn the House. Therefore, I hope that the hon. gentleman will withdraw his motion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As it is evident my hon. friend wants a good deal of time to consider, I have no objection to withdraw the motion. I may observe with respect to this question of notice, that had it been a vote of want of confidence I would have given notice. Hon. gentlemen are aware that at this stage of the session, I had no choice and I had to bring it up now or practically not at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Motion withdrawn.

PROROGATION.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, probably it would be in line with the thoughts of most of the members on both sides of the House, if we were to come to a conclusion, approximate at least, as to the time of prorogation. Speaking for this side of the House, and with regard to the business that we have to get through with, I can say that I see no reason why, if we have two sessions a day, as I suppose my hon. friend will agree to now, we should not do all the business that this House has to transact to-day and to-morrow, and be able to prorogue on Saturday or at the furthest on Monday. If my hon. friend agrees to that, I would like to know.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if he can now make an announcement with regard to the Act respecting the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. That Bill, I think, will go on, but I want to say, prior to its introduction and to give information to the House as to something of its importance, that it is not a Bill which makes any money grant or anything of the kind. It is simply a little change in a contract which already exists with reference to the transport subsidy which is now under contract. I have not consulted my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and I do not know whether it would meet with his approval or not, but if he has no objection, I think we will take up the Superannuation Bill at the next session of Parliament and discuss it when there is more time, and when that voluminous return he has asked will be at hand. I believe it is the intention of my hon. colleague not to proceed with the Salmon

Fisheries Bill, owing to the question being before the courts. He feels that he is estopped from legislation until it is settled.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend will, I am sure, realize that it is a little awkward for me to give any intimation in regard to the statement he has made until the new measure is introduced, and until we see whether it contains any new feature. I suppose we are not likely to engage in any great amount of discussion; and, such being the case, I do not see why prorogation should not take place at the time the hon. gentleman mentions. I may say that we, on this side, had several questions of great moment and great interest to bring up, but as we have now reached the dog-days, and there is no great reason to remain longer, we shall have to postpone these matters until we come here again on the 4th of January.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Finance Minister, in announcing the withdrawal of the Bill on the superannuation question, was good enough to make reference to me. As that Bill is to stand over till next session, I hope he will then introduce a measure of the character of the one I proposed this session. I think he will find that the return brought down will show a condition of things worse than was generally supposed.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to say a word with regard to the Bill respecting the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company. I have looked at the statute now on our books, and it seems to me that we could not have properly understood its purport when we assented to it. It enables the Crown to grant the sum of $80,000 a year for twenty years, and it makes no provision that the services which are to be rendered for that shall be performed. Now, if there is to be any change in that Act, this feature of it may require a great deal of consideration. As the law now stands, the $80,000 can be granted to the company, and they can assign it to secure the interest on their bonds. While the $80,000 is in consideration of the postal services, whether they are performed or not, that sum will have to be paid for twenty years. We have heard it rumoured that the proposal is to divide the $80,000, and to give one-half of it for one purpose, and the other half for another purpose. Certainly it will require a great deal of consideration whether we ought not to amend instead of enlarging the scope of that legislation.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for North Simcoe partly anticipated what I desired to say. I would add my objection to the action of the Government in bringing down a measure, apparently of great importance, within a few hours of prorogation. The notice of the introduction of this Bill has been upon the Order paper since the 8th of July; no doubt the matter involved has been before the attention of the Government since the commencement of this session, and I submit whether it is in the public interest, or fair to the members of this House, that legislation of this kind should be introduced in the last moments of the session. I would remind the Minister of Finance that this is not the first time that he has offended in this regard. Legislation introduced now goes through without any fair criticism. Several times we have had to call attention to this practice, and while we cannot tie the hands of the Government, I think the time will arrive when we shall have to adopt some rule to prevent them putting through shady transactions when there are practically no members of Parliament present. The members have been going away to-day in pairs; to-morrow there will scarcely be a quorum present, and the Minister has only given us in a fragmentary way an idea of what this Bill will contain. The Minister of Railways is absent. Surely we ought to know what the Bill will contain. It is, I am told, really incorporating a new company, abandoning the old Hudson Bay Railway, and rendering it unnecessary to start at the end of the 40 miles already constructed—in fact, granting aid to a new enterprise, called by the name of the old line, but in fact having no relation to it. I submit that this is not fair on the part of the Government.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask whether any of the liens or debts of the present Hudson Bay Railway Company will be placed in jeopardy by any change proposed to be made by this new Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say to my hon. friend that I have not drawn the Bill. It is not in my department. I did not intend to give an exposé of its contents. When the Bill is introduced, then will be the time to ask for these particulars.

Mr. MULOCK. When will it be introduced?

Mr. FOSTER. I think to-night.

Mr. LAURIER. I wish to state, for my part, that while willing to assist in reaching prorogation at the time proposed, I guarded myself by pointing out to the hon. gentleman that if the Bill proposed any new legislation or any important departure, it would be very difficult to have prorogation at the time suggested.

Mr. FOSTER. I absolve the hon. gentleman on that score. He guarded himself, of course. I do not think he will find the Bill very dreadful.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved:

That all Bills already reported, or to be reported, from standing committees during the remain-

der of the session, and all private Bills reported from the Senate with amendments, be placed on the Order paper immediately after Government Orders on each day, commencing with to-day.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 143) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Foster.)

SECOND AND THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 144) further to amend the Winding Up Act.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 51) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I propose, if the committee is willing, to drop the two clauses that stood over for further consideration, and which I may call the contentious clauses of this Bill. The House will remember that we went through the practically non-contentious clauses, those dealing largely with procedure. Then we dealt with the Sunday observance section, and then two clauses stood over, one relating to contractors subscribing to elections, and the other to combines—striking out the word "unduly" in the present Act. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) took a great deal of interest in these two clauses, upon which there was considerable difference of opinion. I explained the case to that hon. gentleman, and I think he will be satisfied to have the clause stand over, for it relates to elections, and a full opportunity will be given for the consideration of the clause at the next session of the House, the time for which is fixed. As to the clause relating to combines, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) had a Bill on this subject, which was referred to the special committee on the Criminal Code enactments. That clause will cause a great deal of discussion, and, considering the late period of the session, I propose to drop that also. With the permission of the committee, I would like to go back to section 197, which was debated, in order to add some words so as to make it clear that the law, as it stands, does not apply to newspaper establishments in connection with the publication of bets. It is not the object of the code to affect newspapers publishing the results of betting. The words have been carefully considered, and I propose to change the clause so as to make it read as follows. This will prevent any of the newspaper establishments being affected, as it is not intended that that should be done :—

Or (c) opened, kept or used for the purpose of facilitating, encouraging or assisting in the making of bets upon any contingency or event, horse-race or other race, fight, game or sport, by announcing the betting upon, or announcing or displaying the result of horse-races or other races, fights, games or sports, or in any other manner, whether such contingency or event, horse-race or other race, fight, game or sport occurs or takes place in Canada or elsewhere.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the leader of the House had an understanding with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), which I was not aware of when this Order was called, that we should not take up this Bill until to-night. So I will move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, so that the hon. gentleman may have the opportunity of bringing up the matter he desires to have discussed.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I understood that the hon. Minister of Justice intimated that he would consider a suggestion made before the special committee by myself, for the amendment of clause 785. The last time this matter came before the House I wanted to urge the consideration of this matter, but the hon. Minister told me I would have another opportunity.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When we go into committee to-night the hon. gentleman can bring up the question. Or, perhaps, in a quarter of an hour between now and six o'clock the matter can be considered. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow the Solicitor General to speak, as he has looked into the subject.

Mr. LAVERGNE. The law as it is at present applies only to the province of Ontario, and we have found considerable inconvenience from the lack of a similar provision in Quebec. If the jurisdiction of the court of general sessions were given to our district magistrates, it would avoid jury trials in many instances. We have in Quebec, by the Revised Statutes of Quebec, a court of general sessions of the peace, but it has never been established in our district, nor I think in any other district of the province of Quebec. Now, this court must be presided over, either by a judge of the Superior Court, or by two justices of the peace. This court has to be established by proclamation, but it has never been done yet. In our district, we generally have a criminal term and a sitting of the court of Queen's Bench, every two years, or three years, according to the number of accused persons awaiting trial, as the Attorney General will not consent to call a jury except for very important offences. The consequence is that parties are left in jail, or they are allowed to go out under bonds, these bonds being renewed every six months, for one or two years. After that term has expired, the offender is released on his personal bond, and if he is not tried at the next term, he is discharged altogether. This is a very unsatisfac-

tory state of affairs, and the amendment which is proposed is simply the extension of that section 785 to the province of Quebec. I have asked the Minister of Justice what was the objection to adopting that legislation to the province of Quebec as well as to the province of Ontario, and I was told that this jurisdiction, granted to certain magistrates in Ontario, was given because they had that jurisdiction previous to the code; and, secondly, that they had special qualifications for the office. I think this second reason is really of no importance. As to the statement that they had these powers before the code, that was a reason to continue the jurisdiction. But I do not see that it is a reason why it should not be extended to the province of Quebec. If it was good in Ontario before the code, and if it has been deemed to be good when this legislation was passed, why should it not be good for the province of Quebec, where it would be specially useful in all the rural districts? There is a court of general sessions of the peace in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, before which, without calling a criminal term, without calling a sitting of the court of Queen's Bench, we can try almost any offence, except murder and treason. This system ought to be established in the rural districts, and the legislation that is now asked for will have that effect. Why should it not work as well in Quebec as it does in Ontario? Will it be said that our district magistrates are not well qualified? The Minister of Justice stated that when the question was brought up, the committee took strong grounds against extending it to the province of Quebec, because somebody had said that the jurisdiction was given to magistrates in Ontario because they had special qualifications. I may tell the hon. gentleman that our district magistrates in the province of Quebec have been appointed with great care. They are bound to be advocates of at least five years practice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me, though he has fairly reported my words in the committee. I did not desire to discriminate in the slightest degree between the respective officers. I could know nothing of them. But what I meant was that while we had carried forward the practice that had long obtained in Ontario, in giving extraordinary jurisdiction to certain minor judicial officers, the experience was not at all satisfactory. What I desired to point out was that instead of extending a system that was not altogether satisfactory, the question would have to be considered in the near future, of the abolition of that special jurisdiction in the case of Ontario. That is a single instance, and the only one, I think, in Canada, where these powers are vested in that class of officers. I did not desire to draw any comparison between the officers of Quebec and those in Ontario.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I merely want to point out to the hon. gentleman that these officers are appointed with a great deal of care, and they are bound to have certain qualifications. They have to be practicing lawyers for five years, and, in fact, I do not know of any, who have not been practicing law at least ten years before being appointed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All of them?

Mr. LAVERGNE. I think so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not know that.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I would not answer for the whole of them, but most of them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the law require that?

Mr. LAVERGNE. The law does not require more than five years' practice. What I say is that this court of general sessions of the peace has been established by the Revised Statutes of Quebec, and must be presided over, either by a judge of the Superior Court, or by two justices of the peace, and that statute comes into force by proclamation. These magistrates are far better qualified than any justice of the peace, they have the same jurisdiction as two justices of the peace, they sit in a great number of cases, and are better qualified to occupy that position than two justices of the peace would be. Then I suggest that without another statute, and under the terms of that Act, we can avoid the preliminary investigation, with the consent of the defendant. If the defendant wishes to be tried before these magistrates, I think we can avoid the expense and time of a preliminary investigation. We can also avoid in a great many cases, trials by jury, by accepting that legislation, although I must say that we have very few criminal cases in any of our rural districts. I have yet to hear of any good reason why that plan should not be adopted. I understand from the Minister of Justice that it works badly in Ontario. Well, I can tell him, from my knowledge of the qualification of these officers in our province, that I believe it would work perfectly in the province of Quebec, and it would work far better than if this court of general sessions of the peace were established by proclamation, and if it were presided over by two justices of the peace. For all these reasons I hope the Government will accept this view, and consent to this amendment, which I think would be of great benefit.

Mr. CURRAN. It is a great pity that the hon. gentleman was not present in the committee when this matter was brought up.

Mr. LAVERGNE. When I was there it was almost consented to, but the Minister said: We will leave it stand over, because I want to know why it has only been applied to Ontario. That was the only objection made. If any objections were made afterwards at another sitting, I was not present, and know nothing of them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The matter was up at another meeting of the committee, and the committee was unanimous in agreeing not to deal with the subject, on a memo. which I have now in my hand, and which I read to the committee.

Mr. LAVERGNE. The reasons given, I understand, were that the magistrates in Ontario were not well qualified to sit on these cases.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Perhaps as this is somewhat in the nature of a contentious section, about which there is a great deal of difference of opinion, we had better let it stand, that we may look into it more carefully and get further information as to the effect of extending that jurisdiction to Quebec. From the information I have had, I have been inclined to look unfavourably upon it. The hon. gentleman presses it very strongly, and as I do not think there is a prospect of its becoming law this session, under the circumstances, perhaps the hon. gentleman would be content to let the matter stand.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I think this is the most important amendment in the Criminal Code which has been proposed. But it is simply a question of procedure, it is not a question that requires a great deal of consideration. I know that the hon. members for Quebec were not opposed to it; I know no hon. members from that province who are opposed to it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman's argument be correct—and I am not prepared to admit it is correct—instead of going on province by province, a clause will have to be prepared and considered by which this system will become uniform. I will make this undertaking, which perhaps will be satisfactory to the hon. gentleman, that I will communicate with the Attorney General during the recess, and probably we may decide on some uniform clause in substitution of the clause now standing in the code, which applies to Ontario only. The hon. gentleman may, perhaps, be willing to allow the matter to rest with that undertaking.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Hon. members coming from my province would not give an inaccurate opinion as to qualifications for magistrates and other matters. I have spoken to members of the committee from Quebec and I have found that they are not opposed to the proposition. Some hon. members may have expressed the opinions referred to, but they were evidently not qualified to do so and did not understand fully the circumstances of the case. However, I am satisfied with the statement made by the Minister of Justice.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 51) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

DAIRY PRODUCTS ACT, 1893.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 21) to amend the Dairy Products Act of 1893.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This, as the House knows, is a Bill introduced by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan). It deals with the question of branding upon cheese and butter the month in which that cheese and butter is produced, the idea being to prevent any deterioration of the reputation of our butter in the British market by any attempt to substitute the butter of one month for the butter of another month. The Bill was discussed to a certain extent by some members of the House when it was introduced, and the hon. member for Glengarry made a speech in which he gave a good deal of information to the House as to his desires and intentions as expressed in the Bill, together with considerable information he had received from producers as well as purchasers with respect to the necessity of the measure. The hon. gentleman gave the House considerable information, and afterwards the Agricultural Committee took up the subject and sent the owners of cheese factories and others interested in such a Bill a circular asking them for their opinion on the Bill. The replies received to that circular were somewhat contradictory. Although the weight of evidence seemed to be in favour of some such proposal, there was sufficient evidence against it to apparently justify the Agricultural Committee in not reporting any particular decision to the House, so that instead of reporting any particular decision on the merits of the Bill or the desirability of its becoming law, they simply reported to the House the evidence. I have said that opinion is somewhat divided upon it. It is pointed out on the one side that it will save the character of our cheese or our butter in the English market from the result of the practice to which I have already alluded, that of selling summer cheese for fall cheese. On the other hand, it is pointed out by those opposed to such a Bill, that in many parts of the country the

cheese produced in the summer months, and this particularly applies to that part of the country where pastures are green during the whole season, just as good milk, making just as good cheese, is produced in June, July and August as in September and October, and that the effect of the Bill would be to brand the cheese made from June and July milk as June and July cheese, that it would be classed as June and July cheese made where the pastures were not so good, and consequently there would be a depreciation in the value of that product which is really as good as the fall product. Such is the objection to the Bill made by those who have taken it into careful consideration. However, there is a good deal to be said on both sides of the question, which is one in which the dairymen of the country are very largely interested, and as the subject has not been very thoroughly discussed and as the Bill has not been long before the House, the Bill, with the consent of the House, was placed on the Government Orders in order that it might receive a more thorough discussion. No doubt some legislation of this kind would be advantageous to the dairy interests. We have placed the Bill before the House, for the purpose either of passing it now or placing the discussion before the country with the view of legislating on the subject at some future day.

Mr. McLENNAN. I have listened to the remarks made by the hon. Secretary of State in regard to this measure. It was discussed in the House some time ago as a public Bill, and I may say that it has created more interest in the country than any other public Bill that has been before the House this session. The farmers, the manufacturers of cheese, and the sellers of cheese have all taken a great interest in it. Resolutions have been passed in its favour in various parts of the country. The hon. Secretary of State says the Committee on Agriculture has not reported upon it. I understand that that committee has nothing to do with making a report upon this measure. I was present at that committee when the question came up, and it was understood that the matter would come before the Committee of the Whole House as a public Bill. There is no doubt that at the last meeting of this committee there was a majority in favour of this Bill, and as to opinions being divided in regard to it in the country, the facts will show that opinions are not divided. I have here a statement of the number of replies which we obtained to an inquiry which was sent to the people chiefly interested in this product, and it shows that from the province of Quebec 430 replies were received, of which only 11 were against the Bill, and I think I can show that these 11 were largely influenced by speculators who were interested in not having this measure carried out. From the province of Ontario 348 replies were received, of which only 53 were against the Bill. Out of 778 replies received from the two provinces, only 64 were against the Bill, or 8 per cent. Therefore it cannot be said that opinions are divided in reference to this measure. I may say that the Bill has been reprinted as proposed to be amended in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman read it as reprinted ?

Mr. CARPENTER. Will the hon. gentleman read the circular sent out to the manufacturers ?

Mr. McLENNAN. I intend to do so. In the first Bill it was proposed to require Americans to brand cheese coming into this country ; but it has been considered better not to interfere with the Americans further than is done by the legislation we have at present. The great objection raised against this Bill in the Agricultural Committee was that it included butter. It was said that butter lost flavour and depreciated in value immediately after it was made, and it was contended that if kept in cold storage it could be placed on the market in good condition. Consequently, the provision requiring butter to be branded with the date of manufacture has been taken out of the Bill, so that it now deals with cheese alone. As I have been asked to read the Bill as amended, it is as follows :—

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot go through the Bill clause by clause on the second reading.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think my hon. friend is reading the Bill as he proposed to submit it to the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. He cannot do that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What I think, Mr. Speaker says is that the hon. member cannot read the Bill clause by clause and comment on each clause.

Mr. SPEAKER. No. The hon. member may indicate the changes from the original Bill which are proposed to be made.

Mr. McLENNAN. The principal change is that butter is omitted. Cheese is to be branded with the day instead of the year of manufacture, and is to be registered by number :

Every manufacturer of cheese shall register with the dairy commissioner at Ottawa the location and post office address of each and every factory owned or operated by him for the manufacture of cheese, and the commissioner shall forthwith send by registered letter to the manufacturer a certificate of registration showing the number allotted by the commissioner to his factory or factories.

A question was raised as to the propriety

of having an army of inspectors to inspect the cheese, and a sub-clause is inserted providing that every cheese manufacturer in the country shall register his factory with the dairy commissioner at Ottawa, giving the name of the place where it is located, the lot, the concession, the township, and the post office address of the man who owns it; and the dairy commissioner will send back a certificate of registration and the number to be put on the cheese. Every factory in the Dominion is to be registered in this way, and this will do away with the necessity of having inspectors. The result will be that when any cheese is placed on the market in London, Bristol or anywhere else, anyone can turn the cheese over and see by the brand where it was made, the date of its manufacture, and everything connected with it. So that it is not necessary for the Government to spend one dollar in providing inspectors to look after this matter. I have some other changes to propose, which it is not necessary for me to go into details unless I have an opportunity of amending the Bill in committee. I have here a resolution adopted by the Butter and Cheese Association of Montreal, in favour of this Bill, which reads as follows :—

RESOLUTION adopted at special meeting of the Montreal Butter and Cheese Association, held Wednesday, 29th May, 1895.

Resolved, That, in view of the meeting of the Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Agriculture and Colonization to be held at Ottawa, on Friday, 31st May, 1895, for the purpose of securing an expression of opinion from the various dairy associations re branding of the date of manufacture on all cheese made in Canada, this association hereby places itself on record as strongly in favour of such branding, that being the unanimous wish of the entire cheese trade in Great Britain. And, further, that this association's committee on the subject (appointed 14th January, 1895) do proceed to Ottawa and attend the meeting of the select standing committee mentioned.

At a meeting of the Dairy Association of Western Ontario, at which were present over 800 representative factorymen and farmers from the whole province, the following resolution was passed :—

RESOLUTION passed by Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario, at Stratford, 15th, 16th and 17th January, 1895.

That in view of the fact that recent reports would seem to indicate that Canadian cheese made during one month has been sold on the British market as the make of another month, therefore, be it resolved, that this Convention of Dairymen, assembled in the city of Stratford, would strongly recommend that such regulations be adopted and such laws be enacted as would compel our cheese factories to brand on each cheese the date and name of the month upon which the cheese was made.

Here is a resolution of the Dairy Association of the province of Quebec, met at St. Hyacinthe, endorsing the resolution of the western association. The people of Quebec are still of the same opinion with regard to the matter, for I have had, recently, other resolutions and letters from that section of the country, approving of the principle contained in the Bill. I have a circular, issued in Great Britain, which is very important and which is necessary I should read to the House, to give hon. gentlemen an idea of the feeling in that country on this matter. This circular proves that Canadian Cheese is placed in a bad condition on the English market, and that the particulars in connection with it are misrepresented, or otherwise it would not be necessary to send out such circulars as I shall now read :

HOME AND FOREIGN PRODUCE EXCHANGE, LIMITED.

CHEESE SUB-COMMITTEE.

Hibernia Chambers, London Bridge,
London, E.C., 1895.

To the Producers of Canadian Cheese.

It has, no doubt, come to your knowledge that there has been considerable dissatisfaction among the cheese distributors on this side of the Atlantic as to the course of the business during the last two or three years, especially as to buyers, who in many cases alleged that they did not receive the special month's make they had contracted for, which called for frequent arbitration during the season just closed.

The result has been to injure the good reputation of the Canadian product, and to destroy that confidence in dealing which is so essential between seller and buyer.

As the result of a conference representing a great majority of the trade in Great Britain, suggestions have been made to your Government as to the desirability of an Act making it compulsory to brand the date at the time of manufacture upon each cheese. It is fully believed that such protection will be a decided advantage to the factorymen and to the distributors throughout the United Kingdom, as it will at once restore confidence on this side, and effectually prevent any speculative or unscrupulous shipper covering his transactions by substituting one month's make for another. It is earnestly hoped that the factorymen throughout the Dominion will at once commence dating their cheese, especially as the desire is pretty general among the importers to favour those factories adopting this system.

Our interest is as yours, that goods should be sold honestly for what they are, and that the reputation and market price of fine fall makes should not be destroyed by the improper substitution of the earlier summer product.

Several of the shippers now and recently in England have also been approached on the subject, and they cordially endorse the action taken.

By order of the cheese sub-committee,

C. J. HIGGINSON,
Secretary.

The result was that all these arbitrations referred to were decided against Canadians who placed that cheese on the market, and misrepresented it by stating that one month's cheese was another month's make. I have a memorial here from Bristol, England, the original of which was sent to the Secretary of State and a copy sent to me.

The memorial, which is addressed to this Parliament, is as follows :—

To the Honourable the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Canada, in Parliament assembled.

This Memorial sheweth :

That we, the undersigned importers of Canadian product, are strongly of opinion, that it would be a distinct advantage to both producers and distributors of Canadian cheese, if the date and make was legibly and indelibly marked on each cheese before it leaves the factory where made.

Your memorialists, therefore, pray your Honourable House to pass a law making it compulsory upon all manufacturers of cheese in Canada to so mark each cheese before it leaves the factory where made.

SYMES & CO.
WILLIAM TITLEY & SONS.
GARDNER, THOMAS & CO.
PRICE & PARKER.
SAMUEL ILES.
ALFRED DUNN & CO.
JAMES DOLE & CO.
CREW, WIDGERY & CO.
EDWIN WHITWORTH.
KENISTON & BRO.
H. H. & S. BUDGETT & CO.
JOHN WHITE & CO.
G. E. SPEAR & BROS.
F. W. GEDYE & SONS.
G. H. WICKS.
C. J. KEETON.

Bristol, England, 25th March, 1895.

These are the names of sixteen of the leading firms in Bristol to whom we export a large amount of our cheese. The following is an extract from the Toronto "Empire," bearing on the matter :—

TORONTO "EMPIRE," 18th JANUARY, 1895.

A few years ago the export of cheese from the United States to Great Britain was very large. However, when their product was going abroad in great quantities every year, they came to the conclusion that anything would do for the English consumer. So they charged their cheese with hog's fat and other spurious articles. But the British consumer of cheese resented this treatment by spurning the stuff sent them from the States. The result was that the cheese-makers of that country lost the confidence of the English consumer, and they have not yet regained it. This fraudulent imposition ruined the cheese trade of Michigan, which had gained a leading position in the British market.

The Canadian manufacturers were honest in their dealings, and from the first they have endeavoured to improve the quality of their goods.

I have many letters from persons interested in the cheese industry, and I will undertake to deal with the statement made by the Secretary of State, that one cheese is better in one section of the country than it is in another. I think it will be clear to everybody that that is all the greater reason why it should be branded. Mr. D. M. McPherson, a gentleman from my county, who is the largest manufacturer of cheese in the Dominion of Canada, he puts the case as strong as he possibly can, and states that it took twenty-five years of honest and hard labour to build up the cheese trade to its present standard, and that it is highly necessary that we should maintain that standard. He says :

Allan Grove Cheese Factories,
Lancaster, Ont., 13th May, 1895.

Major R. R. McLennan, M.P., Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 10th instant, would say, in reference to the Cheese Bill you are introducing re dating, &c., that you can have free use of my previous letter and my name to assist you in whatever way you think best to promote the adoption and passing of the Bill proposed.

One of the strongest arguments I see that can be used in favour of the Bill is, that the English dealers desire it to protect them from dishonest dealing ; and some factorymen and dealers on this side oppose it because it will prevent them from obtaining the unjust benefit in the future which they have been receiving in the past by misrepresentation and false pretenses. The few dealers who do this misrepresentation on this side of the water blame the factorymen, and the factorymen who do the same thing blame the dealers ; and it is in this way that the dealers and factorymen get out of the loss incurred by such dishonest dealing. And the English dealers and consumers have to stand the loss directly received from the deal, and the honest producer in this country (farmer and factoryman) has to stand the great loss in the future from the depreciated reputation which this dishonest dealing tends to develop.

It has taken honest dairymen and factorymen some twenty-five years to build up an enviable reputation for good quality and large quantity, but all this can be ruined in a few years by dishonest dealing.

Unprincipled dealers in all parts will take advantage of these opportunities to "misrepresent conditions," create speculation, deceive the trade, and thereby do immense damage to the trade of the country at large. I claim it is a public necessity for the good of all that such a Bill should be passed, and hence my strong and urgent support of its becoming a law.

Mr. McPherson, in another letter to me, strongly urges the branding of cheese, with the month and the day of manufacture. Mr. Alexander, who was over in England, endorses the statement sent from London and Bristol, and says :

Montreal, 27th May, 1895.

I have just returned from England, and know something of the complaints made there, and am bound to say the complaints are not exaggerated. I attribute the present demoralized state of the cheese market mostly to the enormous quantities of summer-made cheese (undated) that were stored last season, cheese which should have gone into consumption long ago, but are now flooding the markets. If the farmers gained anything, when these cheese were being stored, they are paying sweetly for it now.

These letters from men who are in this business, some of them the largest dealers in Canada, and they are honest dealers, I am happy to say. This is a portion of the letter I referred to as having received from Mr. D. M. McPherson :

Allan Grove Cheese Factories,
Lancaster, Ont., 4th May, 1895.

Major R. R. McLennan, M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I notice from press reports, that you have introduced a Bill to compel all cheese and butter factories to label their product with the month made and name or brand of maker.

You have my hearty support and sympathy in the promotion of the Act; and I take this opportunity of writing you in reference to same, and take the privilege of offering a few suggestions. The aims and objects of the Bill should be to prevent fraud by unprincipled and dishonest cheese and butter manufacturers as well as dealers, to maintain the good reputation and confidence of all dealers and consumers, for our dairy product in the future, which has taken years of persistent labour honestly and faithfully carried out to acquire. With this in view, I would suggest to have the month, or the number of the month, as well as the day of the month, marked on the cheese itself, and merely the month, or number of the month, marked on the outside of the box.

As to requiring the name of maker or brand, and place, post office, &c., I have no complaint from myself to mention, or from the trade, either in Montreal or England. However, I would suggest that all factories be compelled to brand or label all packages with their known brand and post office, as well as "Canada." This insures justice to all, whether the individual makes good or poor quality. If good quality is made, the party will receive the benefit in full, and if poor quality is made, the brand and the knowledge of his being known to turn out a poor article, will either stimulate him to improvement in the future, or naturally drop out of the business, which he should do, if he persists in making an inferior quality.

I have statements made by the parties who were sent for to give their opinion on this matter before the Agricultural Committee. These parties were Messrs. Arthur Hodgson, A. McPherson, Leitch, Professor Robertson, and Ballantyne. By a resolution, Mr. Hodgson stated that he and Mr. McPherson, of Montreal, were appointed delegates by the Montreal cheese dealers to attend a meeting of the Agricultural and Colonization Committee. He presented a resolution stating:

That the association hereby places itself on record as strongly in favour of branding and dating the month on all cheese, such being the unanimous desire of the entire cheese dealers of Great Britain.

These men are large exporters of cheese and in a position to know the requirements of the trade. Mr. Hodgson stated that the reason why they wished to comply with the desires of the English dealers in cheese was that England was the principal outlet for this product, and he suggested that the manufacturers, and not the merchants, should be the parties who should brand the cheese. I may say that this Bill has been so changed as to make the manufacturer the party who shall do the branding. Mr. D. M. McPherson, one of the delegates sent from the city of Montreal to the meeting of the committee (the Agricultural and Colonization Committee), expressed himself very strongly in favour of the branding of cheese. He said that he had talked to men from the east and west, and as far as his experience went, he had met none but who is in favour of it. He had also talked to farmers who came into Montreal to sell their cheese, and they also are in favour of the branding of the date upon the cheese to keep up the reputation of this product. Mr. McPherson continued:

It may be, that some agent, without instruction, in Brockville market or any other market, with a view to getting at the seller, may say: "Mr. Seller, if you brand the cheese, I will not give you such a high price," and that sort of conversation spread about the Brockville Board, or any other board, produces a feeling against the branding of cheese. And from that you get the feeling in the country papers that the country is against the branding of cheese; but I am satisfied, from the papers you have sent, that, if you asked them, their answer would be in accordance with those already received.

The hon. member for West Middlesex (Dr. Roome) asked him: "Do not the sellers represent the Patrons?" and Mr. McPherson replied:

The sellers represent the Patrons, certainly; but I do not think, if you consult the sellers here, that they will represent the farmers.

Mr. Bush said: August and September cheese have the preference over that of July or June, but also June and July cheese was really better than August cheese. I think that was universally admitted last year. Mr. Hodgson said: July cheese has often brought a higher price than June. There were higher prices for July last year than June. In his evidence before the committee, Mr. J. A. Leitch said: That the trade in England was divided upon the necessity of branding and dating cheese. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) asked him: "Have you any letters in your possession to that effect?" and he replied: "I have not. I have no evidence to show that there is one man opposed to the branding and dating of cheese." Mr. Leitch said in the committee that he had not spoken to half a dozen farmers about this, but yet he said everybody was opposed to it. Before I go any further, I might deal with the question which the Secretary of State has placed before you. I have Mr. Ballantyne's evidence here, which I would like to place on record, but I am afraid I will be taking up too much of the time of the House in so doing. I may say briefly that Mr. Ballantyne is strongly in favour of the branding and dating of cheese. He said in the committee: that he had been a producer of milk and manufacturer of cheese, and also had been a dealer, buying and selling cheese for the last twenty-five years. He had been in England every year but one, and at almost every month in the year for the last twenty-five years, and he had just returned from England. He had been shipping on

an average about 125,000 boxes of cheese each year to England, which would be about one-fifteenth of the export of Great Britain, and he was therefore in a position to know what that country required. He always placed his cheese on the markets as manufactured in the month in which it actually was made. He said:

I buy from the factory, according to the month's make. When I buy, May, I get May; when I buy June, I get June, and ship them as of the month in which they were manufactured.

He said in the committee that he got more money for July cheese during the last six years than he got for June cheese every year, without any exception. All the evidence given in the committee was to the effect that July cheese was worth more last year than June cheese. The important point they attempt to make against us, that there is a prejudice against July cheese; and if our people make good cheese in July in some sections—in certain years they say the July cheese is equal to the September make—would it not be the best way in the world to get over the prejudice in the English market by branding the cheese in order to show that we manufacture good cheese in July? There is a large amount manufactured in Canada in July which is placed on the English market as the cheese of some other month, after having been kept in cold storage for several months. Professor Robertson, at Brockville, advised the sellers to send their cheese forward every week and thus keep the market clear. It is well known to every one who has anything to do with the manufacture of cheese that the cheese is sold from the factory every two weeks or at the furthest every month at the current price of the month, but the men who buy it keep it over from two to four months in order to obtain a higher price. The farmer or the factoryman, however, does not get a cent of that advantage. It will pay to keep it, for an increase of one cent a pound on the cheese exported to Great Britain will amount to over a million and a quarter dollars per year. The farmer disposes of his cheese, the patrons of the factory are paid according to the prices received for it. Go through any factory and you will not find a pound of cheese kept over a month, and in many not a pound kept over two weeks. How can it be to the advantage of the farmers that this method of buying and selling should be allowed to go on? Suppose the speculator buys 10,000 pounds of July cheese, 5,000 of which he sells as August—getting August prices—and only the 5,000 pounds are sold as July. The whole is accounted for at July prices to the farmers. This is no advantage to him, but it is to the speculator who pockets the advance price in the 5,000 sold as August. Cheese is kept over from the spring and the middle of the summer, and is put upon the English market in the fall and sold at fall prices. When there is so much cheese placed upon the market as there was last year, the result is that in the spring the price of cheese is lower than it would have been if the people were compelled to brand their cheese at the factory. The farmers and factorymen do not receive any benefit from these profits on the part of the speculators. The speculators are doing everything they can to defeat this Bill, it is in their interest to defeat it. But when about 90 per cent of the people interested are in favour of this measure, how can the Parliament refuse to grant it? If there is anything dishonest in this Bill let those who are opposed to it show it. Suppose that the cheese is better in one part of the country than another by reason of the natural advantages of that section, suppose the cheese is better in New Brunswick or better in Nova Scotia—that very fact makes it all the more necessary that it should be branded. The buyer or speculator goes to New Brunswick or Nova Scotia and finds the cheese not branded. He buys it at the current price in the month of July, holds it and sells it for September cheese. Then he puts the poorer cheese on the market as July cheese, thus keeping up the prejudice which exists owing to such conduct on the part of the speculators. If that cheese is branded, it will go upon the English market as July cheese and the buyers and consumers in Britain will see that it is a good article, and the result will be to break down any prejudice that might exist. The people of Great Britain are complaining about the way this cheese is put upon the market, and they would not complain, if there was no ground for complaint. Professor Robertson states that he is in favour of branding but does not want to make the branding compulsory. He says:

Well, if you make the branding of the date compulsory, these cheese-buyers are not easily gotten round and use all kinds of suave and other arguments when they try to buy cheese, in order to get it cheap. If some of them have gone to the farmers and said: "If you brand the month on the cheese, I will give you less money," they will say, when the Bill is passed: "There is a prejudice in England against July cheese, and now that is branded 'July'; we cannot give so much for it." They use arguments such as this to crush the prices down, and I would not put an instrument in their hands for that purpose.

Then in answer to a question by Mr. McNeill, Prof. Robertson says:

They may come and say: "Your cheese is branded, and I will not give you so much for them," but without the compulsory legislation, the salesman can reply: "My cheese shall be branded if I can get as much money for them, but, if you will pay more, and prefer them unbranded, unbranded they shall be.

Dishonesty? What does this prove but the clearest attempt at dishonesty? If they brand their cheese there is no such bartering or trading as this. Are we, as a legislature mak-

ing laws, in the interest of the people of the country, to put up with such conduct as this on the part of the buyer and seller? Are we to go on record as refusing to do what is necessary in order to place our product upon the English market in a fair and honourable way? Here is evidence of what will be done with the cheese of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island or any other part of the country if it is specially good cheese. The quality will be taken advantage of by the speculator and the farmer will get the current price of the month in which it is made—it is away from him and he will receive no further benefit from it. It is proposed that this branding should not be compulsory. But so long as it is not compulsory the same kind of deception will be carried on. You cannot make a success of any legislation unless it is made compulsory. There is legislation to compel the farmer to furnish good milk to the factory. If he sends skim milk, he is punished. But you refuse to punish the people who put upon the market in a fraudulent way the article that is manufactured from the milk which the farmer must supply pure or suffer punishment for dishonesty. I understand that in some way the dairy commissioner is opposed to this. He was very strongly opposed to it before the first meeting, but he was much more reasonable at the last meeting. At the last meeting, he said that branding would be a good thing, and he recommended branding in every place where he went; that they were branding the articles made by the Government, but he did not want to make it compulsory. Now, regarding Prof. Robertson, I have it from the best authority that on or about the 20th April he said that he would recommend that cheese should not be branded, and that it would not be done. It is about time that I should know, as representative of a constituency in this House, whether Prof. Robertson is controlling legislation in this Parliament or not. I say it is most unfair to the representatives of the people that a paid employee should undertake to dictate in regard to legislation. I am sorry to say that it looks as if his opinion was going to be adopted, because he said at the early part of the session: This legislation will not pass because I say so. More than that, the dairymen in the province of New Brunswick passed a resolution in favour of branding cheese, and sent it to a member of Parliament in this House who showed it to Prof. Robertson, and Prof. Robertson told him never to show it to anybody, but to suppress it. Is that fair treatment? Is that the way the people of the province of New Brunswick and the people of the rest of the Dominion are to be treated? Sir, I feel strongly on this question. I know that I have a Bill that the whole country is in favour of. I have a Bill which 90 per cent of the farmers of the country and the manufacturers of this article, are in favour of, and why should it not be allowed to come to the front and become law? Besides the statements that I have shown you, I have here a number of letters that were sent in answer to inquiries, showing that about 90 per cent of the answers were in favour, and only 8 per cent against, with a few doubtful ones. I have in my hand a bunch of letters, being the answers from presidents, secretaries and treasurers of dairy associations throughout the province of Ontario, counted as one, but representing all their patrons, representing their directorates, and representing the people in the whole surrounding country asking for this legislation. I think it is proper we should get this legislation when 90 per cent of the people are asking for it; and I hope the Secretary of State and the leader of the House will allow this Bill to go into committee, and let us take the sense of the House on the question. If the Government will not consent, then let it go: but if Prof. Robertson is going to legislate instead of the members of this House, I say it is unfair. I have a great many other statements with reference to Prof. Robertson that I will reserve. I think he is taking a little too much upon himself to oppose this Bill. Prof. Robertson is all right in his own legitimate business in the manufacturing of cheese, but selling and buying is not in his line, and he cannot possibly know as much as men that have been in this business for thirty years. I have shown you the feeling throughout the country on this matter: I have many other statements of the same nature, but owing to the lateness of the session, I will not take up the time of the House by reading them to you. I sincerely hope that the Government will see fit to put this Bill through and make it law. The country demands it, Great Britain demands it, justice and fair play demand it, and I think that this House should not hesitate to pass this legislation.

Mr. CARPENTER. Before this motion is put, I would like to say a word or two respecting it. With the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) I agree that a good deal of consideration was given to this question before the Agricultural Committee, but I disagree with him as to the nature of the evidence that was produced. The gentlemen who appeared before us were all dealers in cheese, and when they were asked the question as to whether the cheese was sold in the English market on its merits or simply in consequence of the brand, in every instance the answer was that it was sold on its merits. They also told us, in reply to questions, that in many instances, after the cheese was placed in the hands of retailers, the brand was taken off, so that no brand appeared upon it. I think that is satisfactory evidence that the cheese was sold on its merits and not by reason of the brand. I

think that a Bill of this character, which is calculated to make so radical a change, should be allowed to stand over until another session, at any rate. If we were to pass this legislation at the present session, I believe the consequence would be to take money out of the pockets of the farmers of this country, the very people whom we are anxious to benefit by reason of a brand placed on the cheese of certain months, against which there is a very strong prejudice in the English market, and I would suggest that the matter be allowed to stand until another year.

Mr. McNEILL. I think this Bill that has been brought before the House by my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) is one of very great importance indeed to the agricultural interests of this country, and I think it is very important that it should not be allowed to stand over. I think it should be pressed on as quickly as possible, because it has reference to one of the greatest trades that Canada possesses, the trade in cheese. The position in which we stand at present with regard to that great staple industry is this: that the people of the country in which lies our market for cheese, the people of the United Kingdom, have become doubtful as to whether they are being honestly provided with the article that we profess to provide them with. There is no doubt at all that the present condition of feeling, the present condition of distrust, among buyers in England, is calculated very seriously to jeopardize the interests of the farmers of this country. The question we have to decide to-night, so far as this Bill is concerned, is simply whether we shall now take measures to remove that unfavourable impression from the minds of buyers in England. With reference to the evidence that was given before the committee, I may say that Prof. Robertson, who, I am sure, is only actuated by what he believes to be in the best interest of this industry, in the evidence that he first gave, so far as I was able to follow him, seemed to be inclined to the opinion that it would be detrimental in the first instance to the farming interests, if the cheese were branded in the way suggested. He seemed to be of opinion that at first it would reduce the price of some of the cheese produced in certain months of the year. He was of opinion that it would reduce the price of our July cheese on the British market. The whole difficulty lies in this, that certain Canadian dealers have been selling cheese on the British market branded as September cheese, which was not September cheese at all, with the result that their action has brought discredit upon this industry in Canada. There is this year a great reduction in the price of cheese and some of those gentlemen who appeared before the committee, and who are experts, and who have been dealing with cheese for many years, were of opinion that one cause for this depreciation in the price of Canadian cheese was the fact to which I have referred, that July cheese was branded as September cheese and sold in the English market under false pretenses. What we want to do is to remove from the minds of the English people the idea that we are dealing with them dishonestly. There is too much confusion in the minds of the people there between the people of this country and the people south of the line, and they know very well that dealers on the south of the line are not very particular as to the course they take in order to have goods placed on the market, and we do not want our Canadian cheese to be subjected to suspicion and our Canadian producers to be subjected to the suspicion that our dealings are the same as those conducted on the other side of the line. I therefore say that this is not a matter we should allow to stand over, but it is one we should deal with during the present session, so that we may have this erroneous impression removed. Professor Robertson, in the first instance, seemed to be of opinion that the branding of cheese would reduce the price of cheese in the English market for our farmers during the first year or two, but I ask hon. gentlemen who desire to give attention to this question, and who are concerned in our agricultural interests, to note that Professor Robertson, on the second occasion, admitted that, in his opinion, it would not even reduce the price this year: he thought the right thing was to have the cheese branded, and the cheese sold from the experimental farm was branded, and the only reason he assigned why he thought this measure should not go into operation this year was a purely political reason, not one given as an expert at all, but an opinion that we were legislating in advance of the opinion of the farmers of the country. That is a purely political question, a question for this House to consider, not a question to be dealt with by a dairy expert as Professor Robertson is: and the question we have to decide in this House is: whether it is best in the farmers' interests that cheese should be branded, and if so, whether we should proceed to carry that provision into effect now, or let it stand over longer and subject this trade to the discredit which it is now bearing in England.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not desire to discuss the merits of the Bill at the present time. Expressing my own opinion, it is very much in accord with the hon. member for Glengarry. But I call the attention of the Government to this, that the question has created a great deal of interest throughout the country, especially in those sections where this important industry is carried on to a large extent, and it is admitted we are dealing with a large and important industry in the country. It is unfortunate we should be called upon to

discuss a Bill affecting so large and important an industry in the dying moments of the session. As the hon. member for Glengarry has well pointed out, many able men dealing in cheese, especially, have differed very widely in opinion with respect to what is best to be done. While I agree almost entirely with the opinions expressed by the hon. member, I find among manufacturers and dealers in the section where I live, which is, perhaps, the most important section engaged in this business, there are different opinions, and at meetings called, where manufacturers, dealers and farmers were represented, such differences of opinion existed. In view of this state of affairs, where the parties most interested and those who have considered this matter most fully, and know it in every detail, have not been able to come to a conclusion with any unanimity as to what is the best mode of procedure, I would strongly urge on the Government not to press this Bill through the House at the present time. I am sure the Government and the House will recognize the importance of the question, and I suggest that the whole matter stand over a very few months, when it can be taken up, and when those most interested will have more fully considered it, and they can have an opportunaity of again expressing their mature opinions regarding it.

Mr. FOSTER. With respect to this Bill, I think there is a good deal of force in what the hon. gentleman has just stated. No one doubts the importance of the subject with which the Bill proposes to deal. The Bill was introduced by a private member, and he deserves the thanks of the House for bringing such an important question before it. He has bestowed a great deal of attention upon it, and formed very decided opinions, and he has taken a great deal of trouble in obtaining information and giving that information to the House on two or three different occasions. However, it is undoubted that there is a good deal of opposition to the Bill in different sections of the country, and since discussions have taken place in this House, I have received information to that effect from various sections. The circulation of the Bill, and the discussions in the House will all go to the country, and have the effect of inviting criticism on the subject, and I am quite sure the best course to pursue is to postpone the Bill, instead of attempting, as we must necessarily do, to consider it in a very hurried way at this hour of the session, and with so much business before the House it is impossible to frame a Bill which would be acceptable and at the same time be a benefit to the industry, and so the best course to adopt is to take the matter into consideration in the meantime. We shall be here again in four of five months at the latest. The Department of Agriculture can make it its business to thoroughly look into this matter, and be prepared when the House comes together to submit its information, perhaps, in the form of a Bill, and then we will be better prepared than we are now to take decided action upon it. If this Bill became law to-day, it would have no practical effect this season, and the mover was quite willing, if the Bill was passed, that it should contain a proviso bringing it into force next year. Taking all these considerations into account, I suggest to the House and to my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) particularly, that having performed the duty of bringing up this matter where it has caught the public eye, and where the members of this House have been informed of it, I would suggest that it would be better to leave it over for a few months during which time the department can consider it, and bring it up next session when we will have a representative House. I find that many hon. gentlemen interested in this industry on both sides have now taken their departure at this late hour of the session. I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad to hear the Minister of Finance make that statement. This is a matter which requires very careful consideration before legislation is applied to it. Now that it is proposed to leave the matter over, I earnestly hope that the new Minister of Agriculture will get in touch with the feeling of the country on this important question. The cheese industry has become very important, and I quite commend the course taken by the Government in not legislating too hastily in reference to it. To use the words of the Controller of Customs in reference to the Manitoba school question, I would recommend the Government to go slowly in this matter. It is possible that hasty and inconsiderate legislation might injure this growing industry, an industry of which we have a right to feel proud.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES REPRESENTATION ACT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Daly for:

Third reading of Bill (No. 121) an Act further to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act; the motion of Mr. Edgar in amendment thereto, and the motion of Mr. McCarthy in amendment to the said amendment.

Mr. DALY. I find that I was correct in the statement made by me that clause 44 was repealed last session by section 14 of the Act then passed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If it is repealed I hope the hon. gentleman will restore it. My information is that heretofore, more than half the voters registered on the day of polling. If the hon. Minister persists in

this Bill he will disfranchise a great number of the inhabitants of the North-west Territories. This is not a voters' list in the proper sense of the term, but a list for the convenience of the returning officer, and it would be a monstrous thing, if those qualified to go upon the list by making only an affidavit, should not be at liberty to make his affidavit and have their names put on the list on polling day.

Mr. DALY. My information is exactly the opposite of the hon. gentleman. My information is that instead of being a boon to the electors, the law as it stood was the very opposite and had the effect, especially in villages, of causing a number of men who were not entitled to vote, to take the oath in order to get in their vote. The enumeration districts are not at all large. The enumerator knows almost every person in the district and the people take such a keen interest in the elections that any one who does not get his name upon the list has no person to blame but himself. The hon. gentleman forgets that any creditable person can get the name of his neighbour put on the list if necessary. No harm will be done by this but on the contrary it will make a great improvement.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. McCarthy) negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Edgar) negatived.

Bill read the third time and passed.

SILVER-LEAD SMELTING.

On the order for third reading of Bill (No. 142) to encourage silver-lead smelting.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the Bill be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the committee for consideration.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is for reconsideration ?

Mr. FOSTER. The object is to include ores, which I explained before were necessary to the flux, but which I find are not in the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MARA. I wish to amend this clause so as to bring within its scope other silver and gold ores, besides lead ores. In the West Kootenay district there are three mining camps, several miles apart, each one shipping a distinct class of ore. Toad Mountain is about seventy miles from Slocan, and Trail Creek about sixty miles from Toad Mountain, and about 120 miles in another direction from Slocan. The Slocan ores are silver and lead, the Toad Mountain ores are silver and copper, while the ores shipped from Trail Creek are gold, with a little silver, and sufficient iron for fluxing purposes. Until recently, the Slocan mining camp was the largest shipping camp in Kootenay. Last year the Nakusp and Slocan railway was completed, and in a very few months after the line reached Three Forks, between 6,000 and 7,000 tons of high-grade, hand-picked ore were shipped to American smelters; but for every ton of ore shipped, it is estimated that at least eight tons of low-grade are lying on the dump, or in the tunnels, in sight, that will not stand the cost of transportation, and are lying there waste and idle. The same conditions prevail, to a certain extent, in the Toad Mountain camp. There has not been as much ore shipped from that camp as from Slocan, but a large portion of the ore is low grade, and will not stand the cost of transportation. In Trail Creek, where the ores are gold and silver, with iron, a large quantity has been shipped this year. The Trail Creek camp was struck about four years ago, but last year the Le Roi River Mining Company shipped about 1,000 tons, which attracted considerable attention to the camp; and last fall an American, Mr. Clark, a mining man of considerable experience, bonded a claim called the War Eagle for $15,000, and spent $17,500 in development. Within a few months sufficient ore was taken out to pay off the bond and cost of development; and since then they have paid a dividend of $50,000. Now, it might not be out of place to give the House a little information regarding this camp. As the hour is late, I will read only a few extracts, which will give hon. members some information about this camp, and, at the same time, show them the class of ores which it is intended to encourage by this Bill. The following is an extract from the Slocan local paper:—

> The officers of the War Eagle Mining Company yesterday declared a dividend of $50,000, or 10 cents a share. This is the War Eagle's second dividend. The first was paid 1st March of this year, and was 6½ cents per share, or a total of $32,500. The first dividend paid for the mine and all improvements and put the owners on "velvet". The second dividend is, therefore, clear profit. It represents three and a half months' limited production. During March, owing to bad roads, hardly any ore was shipped, and since then the mine has been restricted by bad roads between Trail Creek and the Columbia, and the repeated breaking of the cable at the crossing of the river. The owners figure on paying quarterly dividends of $50,000 from this time on.
>
> The War Eagle stock was originally sold for 6 cents a share. It is now in a position to pay a dividend of $200,000 per annum, or nearly six times what it cost altogether to buy the mine and put it on a paying basis. There are not many War Eagles in the world. There will be one or two more in Trail Creek.

Here is an item from one of our own local

papers, commenting on the above—and I can substantiate the correctness of these statements :

Many dividends declared by mining companies are misleading, most are Irish. The dividend declared by the War Eagle Mining Company last week represented the actual profit to date for three months and a half, but it did not represent the capacity of the mine for the following reasons :—During the last three months and a half shipments have been continually interrupted, and whenever they were interrupted, there was a cessation of production from want of storage room. The mine has a considerable quantity of ore on the road to the smelter, and at the smelter, mined and shipped during the last three months and a half, for which returns are not yet to hand. It is said the net return on this ore will almost equal the dividend already paid. With the present openings and present rate of production the War Eagle is in shape to pay more nearly monthly than quarterly dividends of $50,000.

The company has ordered a 20-drill Rand compressor, and as soon as the plant is on the ground the longest and largest tunnel ever driven in Kootenay will be started. It will be begun on Centre Star Creek, and will traverse nearly the whole length of the Iron Mask ground. Thirteen hundred feet will have to be driven before the War Eagle ore chute is struck. This will be the main working tunnel of the War Eagle mine. It will give a depth of 450 feet, and from that down the mine will have to be worked by sinking.

Here is another statement on the same subject :

Mr. Wm. Teague, of Yale, gives the following report of the mining boom at Rossland, where he has recently been inspecting some mining properties for an English company :—

"I have never seen such strong mineral lodes in any country in the world. The War Eagle has got a solid mineral belt at a 320-feet level, 19 feet wide, which will go from $250 to $260 a ton. The ore comprises copper and arsenic pyrites, iron cap and all forms of diorite.

"The strike of the lode is north-east, and south-west, with a dip of about 30 degrees north. They are shipping ore under difficulties. Fully 100 four-horse teams are on the road between Rossland and Northport, shipping ore. There are from 500 to 700 men away in the mountains prospecting, and the sound of the picks puts one in mind of the time the railway was being built through Yale. Rossland has a population of from 1,500 to 2,000 people already ; buildings are going up night and day, and I was compelled to pay 50 cents for a lay-down in something very little better than a shack. The camp is highly promising and undoubtedly permanent, and my opinion is, that within nine months there will be 6,000 people there. A claim called the Robert Lee was struck about 6 miles from the War Eagle in a direct line. The lode is 10 feet wide, assays $50 to $60 in gold, and is bonded for $50,000 with 10 per cent down. There is another one called the Commander on another mountain, about 5 miles from the above group, which was discovered about three weeks ago, and is considered superior to the War Eagle. It has been bonded for $60,000 to a gentleman who owned the Montana smelter. Living is cheap there too. The mining licenses issued last month amounted to $1,000, and the customs receipts are over $2,000 a week. The pay-roll averages $1,000 a day. I never saw a better geological combination calculated to ensure permanency in the mineral formation."

As the Bill now reads, the ores of the Trail Creek camp will be excluded. It is advisable that these should be brought within the scope of the Bill, and, therefore, I move :

That the words "and the smelting of other ores of silver and gold" be inserted after the words "silver-lead smelting" in the fourth line, and that the words "and other ores of silver and gold" be inserted after the words "silver-lead ore" in the 8th line.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the hon. gentleman quite satisfied that a large portion of this bounty will not be absorbed in the smelting of ores, which is largely gold-producing, silver being a by-product ? His real object, I presume, is to promote the smelting of silver and the smelting of galena. I am only criticising his verbiage. It opens the door, I think, to disappointment. As long as the ore smelted is that which produces silver and gold, the proprietors would be entitled to claim the bounty. It is a particular kind of way that you want to describe and not the product of the ore.

Mr. MARA. Silver and lead, or what we call the galena ore, is undoubtedly the dominant ore. I believe smelters will be erected that will treat all three ores in one furnace, but it is just possible some smelting companies, or a collection of mining companies, may wish to erect a smelter at Toad Mountain where the ores are silver and copper, or at Trail Creek where the ore is chiefly gold ; and if they do, they will be excluded from the bounty under the Act as it now reads. There is more silver and lead ore in Kootenay than possibly any other ore. It is generally believed that the largest known bodies of galena silver in the world are located in West Kootenay, and the object is to encourage the silver and lead industry, but at the same time if people wish to erect smelters so as to prevent the other ores from being smelted in the United States, it is our duty to assist them.

Mr. MULOCK. The smelting is going on in other parts of Canada besides British Columbia. I believe that silver is found in the gold-bearing quartz. That industry is pursued to a very considerable extent in the maritime provinces and to some extent in central Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. Not by smelting.

Mr. MULOCK. I merely called the attention of the committee to the effect of the change, which admits to a claim to this bounty, smelting that may be almost wholly producing gold, but which would be entitled to claim a bounty if a quantity of silver, no matter how small, were also the result of the operation. It seems to me you should have a regulation giving some discretion in such a case.

Mr. FOSTER. It is true that a certain percentage of that ore would claim the bounty, and it is right that it should. For instance, these ores which my hon. friend has described, and which are called the dry ores, or silicious ores, certain portions of which are necessary for the proper composition of smelting. They are put in the same furnace as the silver-lead ores, are smelted in the same furnace, and the composition is called flux. I do not understand the scientific method by which it is done, but it is just as much to the interest of the country to develop the search for that kind of ore and the mining of that kind of ore on account of the consequent labour and development which will come from it, as it is to develop the mining of silver and lead ores or the galena ores in particular, but the Act does not take in any but the smelting ores. It does not take in the quartz ores which are reduced by crushing.

Mr. MARA. There are no smelters in any part of Canada but British Columbia. There are quartz mills which are inexpensive compared with smelters. A well equipped smelter will cost about $200,000, and before a smelter can be started in British Columbia the cost of establishing it and the capital required to purchase ores will run from a quarter to half a million dollars. In connection with silver-lead smelting, I believe that the men most closely connected with the mining industry in Kootenay would prefer to see the duty on lead increased to the same figure as in the United States rather than have the bounty. For this reason, although the United States produce more lead than any other country in the world, they purchase largely from Mexico in this way. The silver-lead bullion is shipped from Mexico to the United States in bond. The by-product is there desilvered, the silver being entered free for home consumption and the lead, instead of being entered for home consumption, is shipped in bond to Canada and Great Britain. Hence the great proportion of lead that comes to Canada comes from Mexico, where the miners' wages average 80 cents, whereas in British Columbia the miners are paid $3 per day, so that the British Columbia miner is brought into competition with the 80-cent per day labour of Mexico. Therefore they would rather see the duty increased to the same level as in the United States, but the Government preferring the bounty system as paid to the iron industry and adopted by the Ontario Government have introduced this measure.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed

NORTH-WEST IRRIGATION ACT.

Bill (No. 120) to amend the North-west Irrigation Act (Mr. Daly) was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are there any suits pending under the law as it is? For, if there are, this does not save them.

Mr. DALY. There has been no litigation whatever.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There has been great dissatisfaction, however.

Mr. DALY. Only amongst some people who are ambitious to make money and want the settlers to put up the necessary capital; and we are satisfying their wants by the——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood the dissatisfaction was among the settlers because of the appropriation of the water.

Mr. DALY. No; some speculators in Calgary are the only ones who are dissatisfied.

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

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 145) to authorize the Treasury Board to exempt certain societies from the operation of the Insurance Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does this mean?

Mr. FOSTER. The object is explained in the Bill itself. I think when the Bill was introduced I explained to the House shortly what it was meant to cover. The special case is this: The railway engineers trainmen and conductors have an insurance society for their own members. Of course, being engaged in a hazardous occupation, men of that class find it practically impossible to get insurance in the regular companies on account of the high rate which is charged; and so they have their own association confined entirely to their own members. Section 43 of the Insurance Act exempts friendly societies from the operation of the Act in so far as life insurance is concerned. This association, however, has this practice, that a small grant like a life insurance, which never goes, I believe, above $1,200, is given to trainmen, conductors, engineers and so on, for total disability, the same as for death, and so they are doing an accident or disability insurance, and are therefore not covered by that section 43, which lays them open to the penalties of the Act. Although there has been no abuse, and the department has taken no steps in reference to it, a certain man who has been trying to make an honest penny, if you may term it so, by making prosecutions, and gathering the penalties to himself, for violations of the Act, has come down upon this association, and subjected them to trials in

Toronto, Hamilton and other places, and bothers them in the courts, and they ask for relief. After referring the matter to the Superintendent of Insurance, and talking it over with him, he says that the whole matter of friendly societies needs legislation, and he is preparing, as Superintendent of Insurance, information and the like of that for use, which he believes must take place, and which he is going to recommend. He, however, reports, with reference to this association, that if a Bill like this were passed, allowing the Treasury Board to exempt these friendly societies, such, for instance :

Any society or organization for fraternal, benevolent, industrial or religious purposes, among which purposes is the granting of life, accident, sickness or disability insurance to members thereof exclusively.

They come before the Treasury Board and show the extra hazardous nature of their occupation, and upon that representation the Treasury Board may exempt them from section 43 of the Act. I think I said the other day that this treatment is afforded by the province of Ontario, and in exactly a similar way, to associations of that kind where insurance is confined entirely to the membership, and where the occupation is extra hazardous. No abuse is likely to arise from it. The Bill, I think, gives a necessary exemption to men of this class, and although it is in accordance with my own idea, it is altogether upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of Insurance that I ask for the legislation.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the legislation is quite proper and requisite. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that he is following the legislation of Ontario in regard to the Treasury Board ?

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly.

Mr. MULOCK. There is one feature of that clause 43 of which I think the Government ought to take cognizance. Under cover of a benevolent, fraternal, charitable object, I think a good deal of insurance is being done. Now the spirit of that section when adopted—for I happened to have taken some part in framing it at the time—was that the main object of the association was to be fraternal, benevolent, charitable, and so on, insurance being but an incident to the organization. Now, there is reason to believe that institutions are being organized for the purpose of carrying on an insurance business, and are insurance companies pure and simple, and having no object such as those set forth. But by some provision of being an organization having for their object one or other of those purposes, the company is exempt. Now, I think that the Government should add to this clause a further clause giving them the right, and casting upon them the duty, of ascertaining whether the companies claiming exemption, are or are not insurance companies in fact. I would suggest that you add something by which you may grant this exemption only where the principal object of the organization is one of those charitable purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is denominated in the Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was a case mentioned the other night, Regina vs. Stapleton, in the Ontario courts, where they practically applied the old section of the statutes, as it stands, to defeat the prosecution. There was merely a culpable evasion of the statute, and where the object was, as the hon. gentleman says, not religious, fraternal or charitable, but that of insurance, and they held the statute as it stands was sufficient to defeat that.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MULOCK. This Bill does not provide for such a case as that of Regina vs. Stapleton, and if you will let it stand till to-morrow, I will make an amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. That section 43 is the subject of a good deal of comment, as my hon. friend knows, and in it is bound up the whole matter of legislation with reference to friendly societies. The Superintendent of Insurance has been devoting a good deal of attention to that matter, and proposes a scheme of legislation with reference to it. I hope he will have it ready for our next session ; and he suggests that we adopt this Bill as a mere temporary measure.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 135) further to amend the Act respecting the North-west Territories.

Mr. DALY. I move that the amendments made by the Senate to clauses a, b and c, of section 2, be disagreed with for the reason that these enactments have been incorporated in an Act entitled the North-west Irrigation Act.

Amendment No. 1 disagreed to : No. 2 concurred in.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

That for the remainder of the session the House shall meet on Saturday, and there shall be two sittings on that day and other days, one from 10 a.m. to 1.30 p.m., the other from 3 p.m. to the

adjournment of the House; Government orders shall continue to have precedence on each day.

Motion agreed to.

SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 88) respecting the South Shore Railway of Nova Scotia.—(Mr. White, Shelburne.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. FORBES moved, in amendment:

Such persons as now are shareholders in the said company incorporated under said chapter 130 of the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia as aforesaid, or who may become shareholders in the company hereby incorporated, are hereby made and declared to be a body corporate and politic within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, and the company hereby incorporated shall be and continue to be entitled to and owner of all the property and assets of every kind of the said company incorporated under said chapter 130, and shall be subject to and liable for the debts and liabilities of said company, and the Railway Act of Canada shall apply to the company hereby incorporated and its undertakings instead of the said Act, cap. 130 of the said province of Nova Scotia and the Railway Act of the said province, provided that nothing in this Act shall affect any right acquired or claimed to be acquired or held by the said company or in the name of the said company incorporated under said Act, chapter 130, or any right, claim, demand or chose in action of any kind of any person or corporation or any indebtedness or liability of the said company incorporated under said chapter 130, or any action or suit now pending in any court or any matters in question in any action, suit or proceeding.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 2,

Mr. FORBES moved, as clause 2a, the following:—

As a further liability of the company hereby incorporated it is declared that the said company last named shall be answerable for all costs that may be awarded by the court to the plaintiff or relator in a certain action taken on or about the 4th of February, 1895, in the Supreme Court of the province of Nova Scotia, wherein the Attorney General, on the relation of one Alfred W. Potter, is plaintiff and the said company and others are defendants, in which, amongst other things, the status of the said company is called in question. It is further declared that the company hereby incorporated, notwithstanding any judgment or decision that may be given in said action at the suit of the Attorney General, shall be, and continue to be, duly incorporated under this Act.

Motion agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. FORBES moved to amend subsection 2 of section 4 by inserting after the word "into" in line 24, "Caledonia, in the county of Queen's."

Amendment agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Trans-Canadian Railway Company.—(Sir James Grant.)

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Shore Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Gillmor.)

Bill (No. 84) to amend the Act incorporating the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. Northrup.)

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Dominion of Canada Trusts Company.—(Mr. Smith, Ontario.)

Bill (No. 75) to revive and amend the Act respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Northrup.)

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Ottawa Land and Security Company.—(Mr. McKay.)

QUEBEC, MONTMORENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 98) respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company.—(Mr. Amyot.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FREMONT moved:

That subsection 3 of section 9 be amended by adding, after the words "or in the adjoining parishes," in the sixth line thereof, the following:—"on the north shore of the River St. Lawrence," and also by adding, at the end of the said subsection, the following words:—"Provided always that nothing in this Act shall be construed as conferring on this company the exclusive right to construct and operate lines of electric railway or tramways in the city of Quebec or in the neighbourhood thereof, or in the adjoining parishes."

He said: The object of the first part of the amendment is to prevent interference with the construction of tramways on the south shore of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. AMYOT. I accept that part of the amendment.

Mr. FREMONT. With regard to the second part, the object is to prevent the municipalities interested being at the mercy of the company, should they desire to have electric tramways. If the Act incorporating this company gives it the exclusive right of building tramways or electric railways in the municipalities interested, then these municipalities will be at the mercy of the company. According to the municipal law of Quebec, the municipalities have the privilege of granting to any company this exclusive right. But if the exclusive right is given by this Bill to this company, then the municipalities will be prejudiced.

Mr. HAGGART. This Bill does not give the company an exclusive right. The municipalities may make any agreement they like or no agreement with it.

Mr. FREMONT. Can they make an agreement with any other company.

Mr. HAGGART. Certainly.

Mr. FREMONT. This company has already been incorporated by the legislature of Quebec, and under that charter they pretend that they have the exclusive right. To my knowledge, they have protested different municipalities against granting any charter or privilege to other companies. This amendment will make the law clear and cannot injure the company in any way.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If my hon. friend reads the Bill, he will find that no exclusive rights are given to the company. I do not see what necessity there is for this amendment. The Bill is perfectly clear. It simply gives a charter to this company without any exclusive right.

Mr. MULOCK. Does it create a new company ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. The other company had the local rights and privileges. That has been done away with altogether, and it is a new company altogether.

Mr. MULOCK. Is not the old corporation merged into this one ?

Mr. HAGGART. Only so far as stated in the Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood the hon. gentleman from Quebec County (Mr. Frémont) to say that this company, incorporated by the legislature of Quebec, claims, under its charter, to have exclusive rights, and now we are confirming this charter. There was a doubt in my mind, with reference to the charter, in view of the notice we have given, whether we should be safe in passing the Act without limitation. If the charter itself gave them exclusive rights, I for one would be unwilling, without further consideration of the question, to assent to the perpetuation of that power. Has that Act been examined by the committee ?

Mr. AMYOT. There was the committee, and a sub-committee, and it took three days, I think, to examine and discuss the matter.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Quebec County tells me that the main committee did not see the original charter. I was on the committee when this Bill was under discussion, and I must say that I have no recollection of the charter having been gone into to see what we were perpetuating. It was not produced.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My recollection is that it was.

Mr. TARTE. The local charter does not give any exclusive right.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Quebec County says it does. The simplest way would be to negative such an assertion or examine the charter. I would be unwilling, for one, that the committee should endorse all the powers in another Act without knowing what those powers are.

Mr. BRYSON. During the time the sub-committee had this Bill under consideration, the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Frémont) was present and stated his objections to this clause. The matter was threshed out before the sub-committee, and it was thoroughly understood, I think, by the chairman and those present—I understood, for one—that they had no exclusive rights, that the charter did not interfere with the rights of the municipality. And the hon. gentleman who proposes the amendment was perfectly satisfied that no rights were interfered with, and that the present Bill gave the company no rights they did not have before. When the Bill came before the Railway Committee, this clause was allowed to go as it had been amended by the sub-committee, and it was said that no exclusive rights were given to the company seeking incorporation under Bill (No. 98).

Mr. FREMONT. If that is so, what objection is there to stating it in the Bill. It would prevent any misinterpretation, and I do not see what harm could follow.

Mr. HAGGART. It may be a dangerous limitation of the powers of the company. I do not know what would be the effect of giving them a charter containing a declaration that they have no exclusive rights. I do not think the hon. gentleman's interpretation is right, I think they acquire no right under this charter that they did not possess under the old charter.

Mr. FREMONT. I insist upon the first part of the amendment being inserted.

Mr. AMYOT. That is already stated in the Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. There is already a limitation in the clause, but, perhaps it does not cover what the hon. gentleman wants.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mills, Annapolis). It is proposed to amend subsection 3, of section 9, by inserting after the word "parishes" in the 26th line the words "on the north shore of the River St. Lawrence."

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

LINDSAY, HALIBURTON AND MATTAWA RAILWAY.

House proceeded to consider amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.

On second reading of amendment,

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved :

That it be resolved that said amendment be disagreed to, because it is expedient to leave the question of drainage rendered necessary by the construction of railways chartered by the Parliament of Canada, to be regulated in the manner provided by the Railway Act, and that a Message be sent to the Senate, to inform their Honours of the reason why the House has disagreed to their amendment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I believe that these Senate amendments are proper. I think when this Parliament incorporates a railway company that runs through any province, the company, as landholders in that province, as property holders, ought to be subject to the same rules with regard to municipal drainage as any other proprietor within the limits of the province. It seems to me that is a most just proposition. In the first place, I do not think this Parliament can, and I do not think it ought, to make any attempt to protect a railway company from being compelled to keep open a natural waterway, and to put no impediments in the way of drainage, just the same as any other private proprietor. I do not think a railway company ought to stand upon a different footing. The law of Ontario makes the railway companies that are incorporated by the province, subject to the drainage laws precisely the same as any other landholder in the country ; and they also declare, I think, in their Act—they certainly did some time ago—that the railway companies incorporated by the Dominion should be so subject, so far as the law would make them liable, leaving the question open, because there was some doubt as to the jurisdiction. I do not think there is doubt, but this Parliament at all events, ought to put in every railway charter where a company is incorporated, a provision that the company shall, like any other proprietor in the province, be subject to the laws relating to drainage. In many cases farmers have been well nigh ruined by impediments put in their way by the construction of railways, by the company, perhaps, making a high embankment, without any proper arrangement for drainage and back water, or where there is no natural waterway.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman is opening up a very large question, and a very important one, I admit. The view I take of it, expressing my own personal view, is that we have been legislating for railways which were built under charter obtained from the Parliament of Canada, and those railways are regulated by a Railway Act the making of which has caused a great deal of talk, and a great deal of labour, so as to make it as perfect as possible. The point I wish to make is this : I think the Railway Act should not be destroyed piecemeal. If it is considered necessary to make amendments to it, this should be done as we proceeded when we formulated that Act, and changes and amendments should be made with due consideration. If we begin piecemeal as cases come before Parliament to cut into the Railway Act, I think we will be proceeding without any system and it will be injurious to the legislation affecting railways. But I believe that these matters are controlled by the Railway Act. If Parliament in its wisdom considers that the Act should be changed, we should amend it, but I do not think it would be right or prudent now to cut into it.

Mr. BRYSON. The point taken by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is well taken, and from my own knowledge I have seen considerable trouble arise from the drainage question. Clause 3 reads as follows :—

The company may lay out, construct and operate a railway of the gauge of four feet eight and one-half inches, from a point in or near the village of Gelert, or the village of Haliburton, on the Midland division of the Grand Trunk Railway, to a point at or near the village of Mattawa, in the district of Nipissing, crossing the streams forming the Madawaska and Petawawa rivers, and near Great Opeongo Lake, with a branch line starting from or near the aforesaid village of Gelert towards the village of Minden, and onwards, via the village of Dorset or Colebridge, to a point at or near the village of Huntsville in Muskoka ; and with another branch from the main line at or near Great Opeongo Lake to the Ottawa River at a point between Deux Rivières and Rockliffe, in the county of Renfrew.

I desire to point out this : the Ontario Government legislated in the direction of making the railway companies responsible for the drainage because in most cases the lines of railway were running through settled portions of the country. Let me point out to the hon. gentleman who took objection that seven-eighths of the line now under consideration will be built through forests. So there will be no harm done by allowing the amendment of the hon. member for Annapolis to pass, and the hon. member for Bothwell might, as regards this road, which will be a very difficult one to build as it will cross several streams, allow the amendment to pass.

Mr. BOYLE. While I am not prepared to express any opinion as to the propriety or impropriety of the amendment of the hon. member for Annapolis, the regulations for drainage in the Dominion are very vexatious and annoying throughout the country generally. I am familiar with the system here, but I am not quite so familiar with the Ontario system. I hear on every hand praise given to the Ontario system of settling this question. The difficulty in regard to the Dominion Act is this, that a culvert cannot be extended or drainage facilitated without any application being made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. So soon as that requirement is thrust in the face of a municipality by a railway committee, the muni-

cipality subsides and accepts whatever terms it can make without going to that trouble. A Bill was passed through the Senate, initiated by Senator McCallum, dealing with this matter, and it was drawn substantially on the lines of the Ontario Railway Act, but when it came before the Railway Committee of this House it was thrown out. Promises were then made by the then Premier, Sir John Macdonald, that legislation would be introduced at a later date. A reform is certainly necessary in this direction, and it is high time that an amended Bill should be submitted to the House to remove the present difficulties.

Mr. CASEY. This is a subject in which my county is particularly interested. In consequence of that interest, I introduced a Bill on the subject this year, and the principle embodied in it is the only one on which we can deal with this matter. That principle is to subject the railway companies to the legislation that may be in force in the different provinces where the railways are in operation. I was glad to hear from the Minister of Railways on another motion moved by me concerning railways, that the position taken by me that matters concerning the running and management of railways came properly within the domain of the provincial legislatures was correct. I expressed the hope then, and I repeat it now, that the Minister will take the same view in regard to the legislation now under consideration. Ontario has a most admirable system provided by law for settling questions connected with drainage between railway companies and private parties. It contains special provisions to safeguard the interest of the railway companies in such a matter as drainage operations, and it provides that drainage operations shall be carried on so that they may not endanger the safety of the track; in all other respects, however, the railway company is treated as it should be, like any other owner of land. Such is the position that should be taken. I hope the slight discussion on the question which has taken place may open the way for legislation on a future occasion. I intend to re-introduce my Bill next session, and I hope to obtain the support of hon. members who take the same view as I do of the matter, as the law in its present shape leaves the farmer and any private landowner entirely at the mercy of the railway company.

Amendment disagreed to.

JAMES BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

House proceeded to consider amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the James' Bay Railway Company.

On second reading of amendment,

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved:

That the amendment be disagreed to, because it is expedient to leave the question of drainage necessary for the construction of railways chartered by the Parliament of Canada, to be regulated in the manner provided by the Railway Act.

Amendment disagreed to, on division.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 19th July, 1895.

Morning Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Ten o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE COMPANIES ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 138) to amend the Companies Act.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the nature of the Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. The simple purpose of the Bill is to make a change to bring the time for holding real estate into consistency with the legislation lately passed by Manitoba. It extends the time from seven years to twelve years.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to point out the difference between the law here and the provincial law as to the reversion of property. Under the Dominion law, if the real estate is not sold, it goes back to the original owner. There seems to be no reason for that. Why should the original owner be entitled to the land because the mortgage company does not dispose of it? The reason the legislature insists on the mortgage company disposing of real estate that comes into its hands is that it is against public policy that it should be tied up; but the original owner has forfeited all his rights to it, and there is no reason why it should revert to him.

Mr. OUIMET. To whom should it revert?

Mr. MARTIN. To the Crown. That is the provincial law, and that is the old law of England. This is similar to the mortmain laws which were passed for the purpose of preventing real estate being tied up in the hands of the church or any corporation. Even were there some arguments for the property reverting to the private owner, why should we attempt to make the company hold it in one way when the province provides another way? Is this not a wholly provincial matter?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is a matter that ought not to be dealt with here at all: it is a matter over which we have no jurisdiction. Nor can any legislation we can adopt alter the law in that respect. The only question that can arise in Manitoba is the question of escheats, and the Mercer case decided that where the title of the land was in the province, the escheat was to the Crown as represented by the province. But in Manitoba, where the title of the real estate is in the Dominion, and has never been in the province, if it were escheated, the reversion would be to the Crown as represented by the Dominion. There is that difference between Manitoba and the other provinces of the Dominion. But so far as the right to deal with real estate is concerned, the jurisdiction over that is in the province, and we ought not to meddle with it at all. We had better leave it where the law has put it, otherwise we shall simply provoke litigation.

Mr. OUIMET. It is rather late in the day to raise a debate on the constitutional question of the jurisdiction of the provincial and Dominion legislatures. The hon. gentleman knows very well that this Bill only relates to companies that are under the jurisdiction of this Parliament; and so far as these are concerned, this Parliament has authority to make laws to regulate their transactions, and especially their policy—to impose upon them certain restrictions in the public interest: and this is one of the most wholesome restrictions upon loan companies or other companies who have at their disposal the moneys of the public. It is well known that it is very bad policy to allow these companies to hold large quantities of real estate. It is better, in the public interest, that they should dispose of it. This Bill only deals with the penalty. Is it better that the penalty should benefit the Crown or the individual whose property has been taken away from him in order to pay his debts? I think ideas on such questions prevailing at this end of the nineteenth century are not the same as they were two or three hundred years ago. In those times everything reverted to the Crown, which was held to be the owner of everything in the possession of the subject.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose one of these companies had jurisdiction given by the state of New York to deal with real estate in the state of New York. Do you pretend to say that you should regulate their conduct there? And if you could not in the state of New York, how can you in the province of Manitoba?

Mr. OUIMET. This is a Government Act and concerns companies incorporated according to this Act. I am at a loss to see what the New York companies would have to do here that would not come under the operation of this Act.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You have incorporated the company to do business here. Supposing they apply to New York to do business there, you could not regulate the conduct of your company in New York. Take the matter of real estate in any of the provinces, each province decides questions connected with real estate for itself.

Mr. OUIMET. It has long been accepted that the creatures of this Parliament are responsible in every detail to this Parliament in the exercise of the powers which this Parliament confers on them. The larger power employs the smaller. In every instance where this Parliament has legislated—for instance in matters of insolvency—all the provisions which have been made here with regard to real estate and civil rights are held binding on the provinces under the Insolvency Act. It has been held by the courts that these are only a corollary power of that exercised by this Parliament when this Parliament had jurisdiction over the subject-matter legislated upon.

House divided on motion for second reading:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Kaulbach,
Bain (Soulanges),	LaRivière,
Baker,	Lippé,
Bergeron,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bergin,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bryson,	McGreevy,
Carpenter,	McInerney,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mara,
Coatsworth,	Masson,
Cochrane,	Mills (Annapolis),
Corbould,	Moncrieff,
Davin,	Ouimet,
Davis,	Prior,
Dyer,	Robillard,
Earle,	Ross (Lisgar),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Simard,
Foster,	Stairs,
Fréchette,	Taylor,
Gillies,	Temple,
Girouard (Jacques-Cartier),	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Tyrwhitt,
Guillet,	Wallace,
Haggart,	White (Cardwell),
Hutchins,	White (Shelburne), and
Ingram,	Wilmot.—50.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	Edwards,
Beith,	Frémont,
Bernier,	Guay,
Borden,	Laurier,
Boston,	Lavergne,
Brodeur,	Lister,
Brown,	Livingston,
Campbell,	McIsaac,
Carroll,	Martin,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Mills (Bothwell),
Choquette,	Mulock, and
Colter,	Sutherland.—24.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. Section ninety-four of The Companies Act, chapter 119 of the Revised Statutes, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"94. The company may hold such real estate as is necessary for the transaction of its business, not exceeding in yearly value the sum of ten thousand dollars, or such real estate as, being mortgaged or hypothecated to it, is acquired by it for the protection of its investments, —and may, from time to time, sell, mortgage, lease or otherwise dispose of the same;

"2. The company shall sell any real estate acquired in satisfaction of any debt within seven years after it has been so acquired, unless there is in force in the province or territory in which such real estate is situate an Act of such province or territory respecting the sale or disposition of lands so acquired and the provisions of such Act are inconsistent with those of this subsection, in which case the provisions of such Act shall apply;

"3. If real estate to which subsection two of this section applies is not sold within the time therein limited, it shall revert to the previous owner or to his heirs or assigns."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to know what is the strict effect of clause three. Does it destroy the debt? Can the owner obtain the reversion of this free from the debt which he had previously created?

Mr. FOSTER. No; this provision is now the law and has been the law for years with regard to this matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The third substance does not say it shall revert free from all claims or other charges.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If it reverts to the owner, there would be no sense in saying that it would revert to him unless divested of any claims the parties might have. It certainly cancels the debt. We cannot make a law here regulating the transfer and disposition of real estate in any province.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We do it every day in matters admittedly within our control.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is it that is within our jurisdiction?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The subject-matter of this legislation.

Mr. MULOCK. Not the exercise of powers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a nice question which has never been settled.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Parsons case decided that we might incorporate a company which wanted to do business all over the country and give them a certain franchise, but could not give them a franchise which would enable them to transact any business within the jurisdiction of a province unless the province itself chose to confer that power on the said company. You give power to deal with real estate in the province——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In any province.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You may give it that capacity according to the decisions, but if it wants to actually deal it must conform to the law of the province and must be enabled to deal by the law of the province. That being so, you cannot undertake to say what the company's rights shall be with respect to that estate; in doing so you are going beyond your power and are invading the powers of the province. The company must obtain from the province the power to deal with real estate and the province must decide upon what condition and in what manner that estate shall be dealt with. You interfere with the policy of the province when you undertake to legislate in this way, and the current of the decisions is thoroughly against the view upon which this legislation is based.

Mr. LISTER. I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) takes the correct ground as to the law. We have power under the law to incorporate a company, that is to say, we can give the same power to a company as any individual has throughout the country, to loan money and take land in satisfaction of the debt. But we cannot give a company power to deal with the land differently from the manner in which an individual may deal with it. I take it that that is perfectly clear. If we had power to give that right, we might practically abrogate any of the laws of the province in regard to real estate. This is dangerous legislation. Incorporation can only give power to deal with real estate according to the laws of the province governing real estate. I do not think there can be any doubt that we are exceeding our jurisdiction and encroaching upon the jurisdiction of the province, which is a dangerous thing, and, in this case, can only cause a conflict and uncertainty as to title.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. While I admit that the question raised is a very nice one, I think I am safe in saying that none of these points have been successfully raised in connection with federal legislation, and several Bills involving the same principle have been passed within my own time, notwithstanding the arguments advanced in the opposite direction. I may give the hon. gentleman a familiar case on which doubts have been expressed from time to time in Parliament, and yet the legislation has never been successfully attacked in the courts. Dealing with a subject admittedly within our rights, we proceed to say that certain documents shall be evidence on the trial

of matters in that connection, thus dealing with matters that fall within the exclusive power of the local legislature. But in that case we proceed upon the assumption that these powers and this procedure are necessary in order to make the main provision efficient. Then, in the matter of real property, we, for federal purposes, give power to effect a title in the province by means of expropriation—that is the usual term—or by any means deemed sufficient and adequate. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), discussing the principles that are involved and nice questions that are connected with the subject, gave, as an illustration, this Parliament attempting to deal with matters in a province which fall within the power of the provincial parliament. But it is only incidentally in this connection that these powers are given. The action is taken in each province, the action is taken under powers applicable to all the provinces and in connection with the general subject. This phase of the legislation, the hon. gentleman will remember, has been on the statute-book in this very case, as I am informed, for years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That does not matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The point I raised was that while the property might be transferred, it should be divested of incumbrance, that is, a party should not, by his own default defraud the company of its advance to him. A few words would make it clear and they ought to be added to prevent litigation. I do not object to the principle that companies should be allowed to hold and speculate in large quantities of land they have foreclosed, but we all know that in a number of cases, in spite of their exertions, they have been unable to dispose of that land in seven years. That has been notably the case in Manitoba, as anybody who has had experience will know. A few words added to clause 3 would make the meaning clear and prevent litigation, for instance: "Subject to repayment of the amount then due to the company." I do not object to the company being compelled to return the land, but I object to parties, by their own default, coming into property which, in certain circumstances, may be of great value.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With all deference, I do not think more apt language could be used to carry out the idea of the hon. gentleman than is already included in section 3. I do not think it admits of question, and I have no information that it has been at any time brought in question. This is merely as to the title and it does not in any sense pretend to affect any claim of encumbrance.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is assuming that the company has foreclosed a mortgage, but this clause is not limited to titles acquired by the company by foreclosure. It refers to land acquired in any way in satisfaction of a debt.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Under a judgment.

Mr. MULOCK. This Act deals with all classes of companies that may be incorporated under the Dominion Act, and that means every sort of corporation except railway companies, banks and insurance companies. And if the company takes over land, whether by foreclosure or by conveyance, if it is in satisfaction of a debt, the clause is to apply. Suppose a man owns property and is indebted to the company and he chooses to convey his land to the company, even supposing the company never had a mortgage, but simply gets the deed of the land.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; that is not it.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, it says, "in satisfaction of a debt."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The words are very broad.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All the cases the hon. gentleman has put are covered by the clause.

Mr. MULOCK. The clause declares that a company may hold "such real estate, as being mortgaged or hypothecated to it, is acquired by it for the protection of its investments." If a man mortgages his property, and chooses to convey the equity of redemption to the company in satisfaction of the debt, the mortgage is gone. The hon. gentleman says that at the end of seven years, the question of this clause is to re-convey the property, to revive the equity of redemption. Is that intended or not? Does the hon. gentleman say it follows as a matter of course?

Mr. DALY. No.

Mr. MULOCK. To refer to the argument of the Minister of Justice, I am surprised that in view of the decision, he should have expressed himself as he has done. There is nothing clearer now in the construction of provisional powers, than that this Parliament may create powers that may not be exercised at all. You have the illustrations given in the case of Parsons and the Citizens, which most clearly distinguishes between powers and the exercise of powers. The subject-matter, it is true, may be exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament, but it does not follow that the exercise of powers with respect to that matter is also within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. Take the case of Parsons and the Citizens, if I remember rightly, the illustration given in that case is that the Dominion Parliament may incorporate a company, and it may be necessary to carry on that company that it should acquire and hold lands in mortmain, yet there may not be a provincial law enabling the company to hold land in mortmain. So the creation of powers and the exercise of

powers are wholly different things. The creation of powers in respect to a subject-matter exclusively within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, necessarily belongs to this Parliament; but the exercise of those powers, being the exercise of civil rights, must be within the jurisdiction of provincial parliaments. The Minister of Justice will see that that very principle is recognized in the first part of this amendment. I would call his attention to this fact: this Bill deals with two things; the first section saying that a company shall sell within seven years unless there is some provincial law or territorial law to the contrary, in which case the provincial or territorial law shall govern. In the first clause you are recognizing the paramount jurisdiction of the provincial or territorial law. The same principle would apply to the second clause.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The second clause recognizes all the cases the hon. gentleman puts, that is all the encumbrances.

Mr. MULOCK. If the provincial law will override the Dominion law as to the time during which you may hold property, the like reasoning applies as to what may become of the property at the expiration of that time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We say it shall be done in accordance with provincial law.

Mr. MULOCK. Supposing the provincial law says that at the expiration of the time named the property shall escheat to the Crown for the benefit of the province, what becomes of these words?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the same question in another way. If the hon. gentleman is right in that he is right in everything.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a case that came before the Court of Appeals in the province of Quebec. It was with reference to an Act of incorporation. I dare say of some one of those very companies this Act will deal with, incorporated here for the purpose of dealing with real estate in the various provinces of the Dominion. That Act was held to be ultra vires by the Court of Appeals in the province of Quebec. It was so held, I think, by the Supreme Court here. It was taken to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, where it was argued, I think, by the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Girouard) on behalf of the parties who were resisting the validity of the incorporation. The judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was delivered by Sir Montague Smith, and he upheld the validity of the incorporation. He said the Act of incorporation was intra vires of the authority of this Parliament, but that the company could not deal with real estate in any one of the provinces except in accordance with the local law of the province, that we could not regulate the powers that a company were to get with reference to real estate in a province. That is a case strictly in point. I forget the name of the case, I dare say my hon. friend the Minister of Militia will remember it. In that case it was held that while we could incorporate a company doing business all over Canada, we could not enable it to transact business that arose within the jurisdiction of a province except in accordance with the law of the province.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS—REPRESENTATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA IN THE CABINET.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the House goes into Committee of Ways and Means, I beg to be allowed to make a few remarks. Although I know it is very late in the session, and that hon. gentlemen wish to get away, still I must ask their indulgence to say that I hoped that before the session closed I should have been able to obtain the returns I asked for in the beginning of the session, and thus have been able to give some interesting statistics to the House in regard to the revenue that is paid in by the different provinces, and also the expenditures that are made in the provinces. I find that it is impossible for these returns to be got out in time. They are far more voluminous than I had any idea of, and I would sooner not have them at all, than have them incorrect or incomplete. I shall therefore have to delay my remarks on that subject until next session; but I trust the Government will see that these returns are got out, and that I shall be allowed to see them as soon as possible after this House prorogues. There is another matter, however, I am bound to bring up before this session closes, and that is the universally expressed desire of the people of British Columbia for representation in the Dominion Cabinet. I think that after I have given some statistics, no hon. gentlemen present will think that the request made by the people of British Columbia is at all an unreasonable one. Situated as British Columbia is, geographically, lying, as she does so far from the capital of the country, it is perfectly impossible for the hon. gentlemen composing the Cabinet to visit that province sufficiently often, or for a sufficiently long time, to become thoroughly well acquainted with the wants and requirements of that country. There is no doubt that the troubles that have now and again occurred since confederation between the Government and that province, the friction that sometimes has occurred between the different departments and cer-

tain bodies of men in British Columbia would never have occurred had there been sitting in the Cabinet a gentleman who was thoroughly well acquainted with the wants and the requirements of the people of that country. At the present time we see there is only one hon. member in the Cabinet representing the vast area west of Port Arthur, and although I can say and say honestly, and not only do I voice my own feelings, but the feelings of the whole of the western members, that the hon. gentleman's opinion is looked up to with the greatest confidence, and we all know that he is a most indefatigable worker; still, no man, however intellectually and physically strong, can look after such a large area, and give that careful attention to it which the people of that district have a right to expect. Not only so, but the people of British Columbia think in all fairness that every province of the Dominion should have at least one representative in the Cabinet. We have seen lately Prince Edward Island, although possessing a very little larger population than British Columbia, situated much nearer the capital than she is, a province whose interests are not nearly so diversified as those of British Columbia, one which is in close touch with New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, that have four or five representatives in the Dominion Cabinet, receive representation in the Cabinet. I am told the Premier, in his usual hopeful manner, expressed the hope that the day is not far distant when the question of locality will have nothing to do with a member's qualifications for a portfolio. He also asserts, I am told, that the policy of the present Government is to do justice to all localities equally, but ignores the idea of the claims of any particular province whatever or locality having anything to do with a member's qualification for the appointment to the Cabinet. This is a most beautiful theory, it sounds well and breathes brotherly love in every direction, but it has not been carried out in practice. We all remember that year after year a member has been promoted to a Cabinet position, because he was a French-Canadian, or a representative Catholic, or a representative Protestant, or a representative Orangeman, or a representative Nova Scotian. All along the line that has been done, and I must say that I do not think the only qualification for gentlemeu being placed in those positions has been ability. We all recognize the ability of the members of the present Cabinet, and I do not think thirteen other gentlemen of equal ability could be found in the House, but, I repeat, that Cabinet appointments are not made on the sole ground of ability. If the appointments were made more by localities and provinces than is done to-day, the country would be better governed in many ways than it is at the present time. The one great argument against giving a Cabinet representative to British Columbia is, I am told, that the population is so small numerically. I think I can show the House that although there are fewer people in British Columbia, still she is as well worthy of representation in the Government as any other province in the Dominion. I have gone very carefully into some figures which I wish to present to the House, and I think they will be found to be perfectly correct. I hope I may not offend any hon. gentleman from any other portion of the Dominion in giving these comparisons, as it is far from my wish to belittle any other portion of the Dominion, but it is my duty as a representative of British Columbia to make out the best case I can for my own province by truthful figures and solid facts. I am sorry to say that some person or persons unknown, who have more sympathy with the feelings of the members of this House than I have, last night stole my notes and figures from my desk; so if I do not give them quite as glibly as otherwise might be the case, I beg to be excused. I happen, however, to have a few rough figures on hand. Before the position can be considered, it is desirable that I should give the population of the different provinces of the Dominion. I find as follows:—

British Columbia	98,173
Manitoba	152,506
North-west Territories	66,799
New Brunswick	321,263
Nova Scotia	450,396
Ontario	2,114,321
Prince Edward Island	109,078
Quebec	1,488,535
Unorganized Territory	32,168
	4,833,239

I have left out Manitoba and the North-west in considering this question, because they cannot possibly be classed with the other provinces, as they are entirely inland. I have, in making all these comparisons, taken the average of the figures of 1892-'93-'94, as I thought it more fair to do so than to select those belonging to one particular year. I find the average exports of the provinces in these years were as follows:—

	$	Per head of Population.
Quebec	56,378,631	or $37.87
Ontario	33,058,446	15.63
Nova Scotia	10,776,937	23.92
British Columbia	6,786,402	69.12
New Brunswick	6,690,718	20.82
P. E. Island	1,191,857	10.09

From this table we see that the exports of British Columbia were nearly twice as much per capita as any other province in the Dominion, and the total exports of all the other provinces only amounted to $24.10 per capita as against $69.12 per capita paid by British Columbia. Taking the average imports during the same period, we find:

Quebec	$57,567,349	or $38.67 per head.
Ontario	45,410,562	21.47 "
Nova Scotia	9,506,233	21.10 "
British Columbia.	5,515,587	56.08 "
New Brunswick	5,367,193	16.70 "
P. E. Island	520,496	4.77 "

So we find in this statement that the imports of British Columbia were 50 per cent more per capita than those of any other province, and our exports per capita are $56.08 against $26.40, the total average per capita of the provinces named. Now, Sir, in Customs duties collected—that is, customs duties alone, not including excise or any other duties—we find for the same period the following results :—

Ontario	$8,144,169	or $3.85	per capita.
Quebec	7,819,266	5.25	"
British Columbia.	1,274,271	12.99	"
Nova Scotia.....	1,240,750	2.75	"
New Brunswick..	1,027,359	3.19	"
P. E. Island.....	152,592	1.39	"

Therefore British Columbia paid in customs duties alone, nearly two and one-half times as much per capita as any other province in the Dominion. The average of the total revenue—that is the revenue from all sources, including customs duties, excise and every description of revenue,—for the different provinces for the same period was as follows :—

Ontario	$14,323,627	or $6.77	per capita.
Quebec	11,910,793	8.00	"
Nova Scotia.....	1,913,030	4.24	"
British Columbia	1,893,363	19.30	"
New Brunswick.	1,554,050	4.83	"
P. E Island.....	252,153	2.31	"

According to these figures, British Columbia pays nearly three times as much revenue per capita as Ontario and nearly two and a half times as much per capita as Quebec. Although she has less than one-quarter the population of Nova Scotia, she contributed within a very few thousand dollars the same total amount of revenue to the exchequer. Taking all the rest of Canada, and dividing the total revenue paid by population, we find that it gives an average of $6.68 per head, against $19.30 per head paid in British Columbia. I am fully aware, Sir, that some hon. gentlemen may say that these comparisons are not at all fair, especially with regard to the maritime provinces, owing to the fact that large quantities of the goods consumed in those provinces have paid duty in Quebec and Ontario. I admit that, but that fact holds equally good in the case of British Columbia. Large quantities of goods are consumed in British Columbia which are imported from Montreal and Toronto and other places in the east, which have been duty paid there. I can honestly say that not one cent of duty is charged and paid in British Columbia other than on goods that are consumed in that country. I, therefore, have made no allowance whatever on this account, but have taken the figures as I found them in the blue-books. It was impossible to tell what allowance to make on this account in favour of any particular portion of the Dominion, and, therefore, I think it is the fairer way to make none at all, and to take the original figures as published. I have shown conclusively, Mr. Speaker, that the people of British Columbia are the best revenue producers per capita in the Dominion, and on this account alone they are entitled to the very greatest consideration at the hands of the Government. Let us now see how the shipping in the different provinces compares during the year 1893-94. We will first take the sea-going tonnage for each province and, of course, in this return Ontario does not come in, as she has no sea-going vessels :

	Tons.
Nova Scotia	3,364,532
British Columbia	2,962,867
Quebec	2,906,852
New Brunswick	1,887,606
P. E. Island	158,628

From this we see that British Columbia comes second on the list and is even ahead of Quebec. In this connection I will compare the principal ports of the Dominion, and I believe that some hon. gentlemen present will be rather astonished when they see the result. Here is the comparison :

	Tons.
Montreal	1,682,887
Victoria, B.C.....	1,487,793
Halifax	1,329,677
Quebec	1,053,211
St. John, N.B.....	1,023,655
Nanaimo, B.C.....	682,614
Vancouver, B.C.....	608,911
Sydney, N.S. (including Glace Bay and North Sydney).....	523,169
Yarmouth, N.S.....	286,020

We will now take the coasting tonnage for 1893-94, which is as follows :—

	Tons.
Ontario	11,299,718
Quebec	5,681,694
Nova Scotia.....	4,403,014
British Columbia	2,931,298
Prince Edward Island.....	1,120,383
New Brunswick.....	1,118,787

I will give a statement now of the sea-going tonnage with cargo, that is, vessels arriving and departing with cargo, and not in ballast. This will give a better criterion of the trade done in the different provinces than I have yet given. I have got the figures for years 1874, 1884 and 1894, so that we can see how the trade of the different provinces has increased or diminished when a comparison is made of those different periods :

Quebec—	Tons.
1874	1,797,690
1884	2,231,356
1894	2,585,744

The advance of 1894 over 1874 was 43·8 and the advance of 1894 over 1884 was 15·8 :

Nova Scotia—	Tons.
1874	1,433,389
1884	2,141,936
1894	2,503,670

So that shipping of Nova Scotia advanced in 1894 over 1874, 73·9 per cent and over 1884, 16·8.

British Columbia—	Tons.
1874	247,040
1884	603,872
1894	1,979,969

The increase of 1894 over 1874 in the case of British Columbia was the enormous one of 701·4 per cent, and the increase of 1894 over 1884 was 227·07 per cent.

New Brunswick—	Tons.
1874	1,184,613
1884	1,210,815
1894	1,167,586

This shows a decrease of 1·43 per cent compared with 1874, and a decrease of 3·57 per cent as compared with 1884.

P. E. Island—	Tons.
1874	127,567
1884	100,248
1894	104,710

Showing a loss of 17·9 per cent in 1894 from 1874, and an advance of 4·4 per cent in 1894 over 1884. Of the total sea-going tonnage, with cargo, for 1894, as above stated, we find that the provinces contribute in the following proportions :—

	Per cent.	Tons per capita.
Quebec	31·00 and	1·73
Nova Scotia	30·00	5·55
British Columbia	23·75	20·18
New Brunswick	14·00	3·63
P. E. Island	1·25	·96

Now, Sir, I think I have given sufficient figures to tire the House, if not sufficient to convince the Government that British Columbia is entitled to a representative in the Cabinet, in view of her importance as a revenue producer and as a great commercial and shipping province. Her interests are entirely different from those of the North-west Territories and Manitoba. Theirs are almost entirely agricultural, whereas British Columbia's wealth lies in her boundless forests, her inexhaustible and incalculable mineral wealth, and her extensive fisheries. A country with such enormous resources, a country which in a few years will be teeming her golden and silver treasures into the lap of the civilized world in ten times the quantities she can do at present, can, I think, fairly demand a representative in the Cabinet, who knows by long experience what the wants and aspirations of her people are, and who may plead her cause whenever matters relating to her interests are under consideration.. I trust hon. gentlemen will pardon me for having brought this matter forward at such a late period of the session ; but it is one very dear to the hearts of the people of British Columbia, and I thought I would not have done my duty if I had gone home without saying anything about it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, I am very glad the hon. gentleman has had the opportunity, even though the session is in its last hours, to make so excellent a presentation of the case of his own province, and to spread upon "Hansard" the information which probably, when read, will be somewhat surprising to those who have not taken the trouble to look into the resources and development of the province of British Columbia, and who have had no idea of how great they were in proportion to the population of the province. So far the hon. gentleman has done his province a service. With reference to the question of representation in the Cabinet, that is rather a delicate matter for me to say anything about. In one way, I hold my own position on choice of the leader and head of the Government, and I would not like to make any positive promise in that respect in the position I myself occupy. Even if I were able to do so, I would feel a very great delicacy if the matter came to a practical issue. My hon. friend, whilst definite enough in the presentation of the claim, and definite enough in detailing the grounds of that claim, in the immense development and large resources of the province, did not exhibit the same definiteness when he came to the question as to which of the members who now represent British Columbia, and represent it so ably and well would become the choice.

Mr. PRIOR. Senator McInnes.

Mr. FOSTER. And between such excellent members in every respect, if I had anything to do with the selection, I, for my part, would feel that I had a task of very great magnitude in discriminating. I am afraid, however, that my hon. friend has almost read himself out of the competition by the unfortunate admission he made. He had some important documents—and the House has had something to say of late with reference to documents. Those documents were for the presentation of his own case in the House, and the hon. gentleman did not take sufficient care to prevent them being extracted from under his hand. So that his case was somewhat damaged by that inattention. Now, my hon. friend must prepare himself for an onslaught from Her Majesty's loyal Opposition ; for if he does not take care to keep his own documents of private importance from the hands of the abstractor, they will certainly urge against him that, with respect to the care of public documents of very great importance which would come under his hands, he has proved by this lapse for the moment that he is open for attack. With reference to the province of British Columbia not being represented, of course my hon. friend qualified that, and I think qualified it in very fitting terms. He alluded to the hon. Minister of the Interior who particularly represents that section of the country west of Lake Superior, including the province of British Columbia, and he alluded to him in terms which, I am sure, were well deserved. As

one of the colleagues of my hon. friend, I can bear testimony, and willing testimony, to the carefulness and attention which he gives to all matters connected with that large section of the country. I do agree with my hon. friend that the country is so large, and its interests are so varied, that it is very difficult for one member of the Cabinet to properly traverse the whole; but I take exception to the statement, or the implied statement, that my hon. colleague is the only one who represents that section of the Dominion; because, for my own part—and I think I can speak for the most of my colleagues, especially those of us who have had an opportunity of visiting that province and becoming to a certain extent acquainted with it—I can assure my hon. friend that we consider ourselves very much interested in its best development and as representing its best interests. My hon. friend has detailed the surprising statistics of that province with reference to its sea-going tonnage, and with reference to its payment of customs duties, indicating its large consumption of imported goods as well as excisable goods, and the large contribution it has thus made to the treasury of the Dominion, and also with reference to its immense fishing and mining resources. Well, although my hon. friend has not had the satisfaction of seeing his province directly represented in the Cabinet, he has yet had the satisfaction of knowing that all this has been a good deal aided by the policy of the Government. Take, for instance, the large development of trade and the large tonnage he is enabled to show. A certain proportion of that, and not an inconsiderable proportion, at present—and in the future that proportion will every year be enlarged—is due to the policy of the Government in laying the tracks of tradd across the Pacific, with Australia and China and Japan, thus opening to the sea-board provinces the wide field for commercial enterprise which lies in that part of the world,—in our own Australian colonies, peopled with a race like ourselves, and in the other countries densely peopled with a population which in the last ten years, we may say, has made immense strides towards modern life and modern requirements and modern commerce. It is impossible for the province of British Columbia, with its rich resources, to be placed face to face with those countries without in the future enjoying a very large and very profitable commerce, as between this country and those sections of the old world. It is, I suppose, an ideal that in a great country like this—in any country, in fact—a Cabinet should be made up of the very best minds of the country, irrespective of locality, of race or of creed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As at present.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad to have that hearty tribute from my hon. friend as to the status and condition of the members of the Cabinet. I say that it is the ideal, but I think I speak within the knowledge of all members of this House when I say that that ideal, as most ideals, must be tempered by other circumstances of the country. Our very wide extent, our different races, accentuated by the large populations belonging to them and other considerations, will always, I think, at least for our lifetime, greatly modify the ideal that you ought to make a Government irrespective of class or province.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a censure of the noble three.

Mr. FOSTER. Again my hon. friend, although he uses the word "censure," does justice to my colleagues at present and of the past by giving them the attribute which is justly due to them. He calls them the noble three, and of course they are. That ideal must be tempered by the questions I have referred to. If you take the history of the United States, I think you will find that the development beginning in the east, the wealth of the country first developing in the east, and the intellectual development of the nation being predominant in the east in the early periods of the United States history, the east practically dominated everything. It practically held the reins of the Government in its hands, but as the west gradually opened up, as the newer and younger, and in some respects stronger life there developed, the west got its hold on the governing and directing power of the country gradually, just as it gradually became more prominent in commercial and industrial interests, taking its revenge on the east in this way, and sending its strongest and best minds to government and absorbing a large share of the power of government. And this process will continue. My hon. friends have only to live long enough and to keep hopeful long enough to see the very same process in this country. The east must gradually lose its preponderant power as the great west opens up and is populated, and the west will gradually gain the preponderance, not altogether on the line of the march of population but on the lines of resources and production. I do not want to prolong the discussion, but merely make these remarks in reply to my hon. friend, thanking him for having brought the matter before this Parliament; and the head of the Government, no doubt, will read his remarks, when they are printed in "Hansard," and give them that careful consideration he always gives such matters, and I hope the time is not too far distant when all these reasonable aspirations of every section of the country will be amply met.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not know that my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Prior) intended bringing up this matter to-day, and regret he did not bring it up at an earlier period in the session when it could be more

fully discussed. At this period I do not rise to discuss the question ; but as a reference was made by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) to the North-west Territories, and as we have had a very lucid exposition of the merits of the case from the leader of the House, I can, without delaying the House, say all that probably it is necessary I should say. The leader of the House says very clearly that the true ideal to aim at is a ministry composed of absolutely the thirteen best minds in the Dominion. That is the true ideal he aims at, but the hon. gentleman qualified his statement afterwards by pointing out how difficult it was to attain that or any other ideal. Now, I entirely subscribe to the proposition that the Cabinet should be recruited, as it is in England, from men who carry the greatest weight in the House of Commons, that being the only way in which he can test the ability of which my hon. friend the leader of the House spoke. But the question is one that has to be qualified in a country as large as ours, and that being admitted, we have the second principle, namely, the principle of local representation. Now, Sir, I think it is not unreasonable to say that a province, or a territory for that matter, ought to have representation in the Cabinet qua province.

Mr. LAURIER. I heard that denied the other day by the leader of the House at the time of the crisis.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not want to go into those doleful memories of my hon. friend, and we need not refer to them ; but admitting the principle that a province, with a large section of country, should be represented in the Cabinet, no wise argument can be educed therefrom, that sections of a province shall be represented ; that, for instance, we shall have a western member for a given province and an eastern and a southern member. Nothing can be said, to my mind, for that kind of localism nor for the moral localism that unfortunately affects the selection of the Cabinet whichever party may happen to be in power. I agree with my hon. friend the leader of the House that we should have an ideal Cabinet, but qualifies that by saying that certain sections of the country should be almost necessarily represented. I think there is a good deal to be said for his statement of the case. I will make a reference, in the same spirit, if not exactly in the same language as my hon. friend used, to the Minister of the Interior. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, as I have said elsewhere—as I have said in speaking in a quasi-public place some years ago within the sound of my voice at present—to my mind is, with one exception, the most satisfactory Minister of the Interior we have ever had, and with regard to that one exception, I do not think he is in any way inferior. I never could wish for more attention to any business I bring before the Interior Department than I received from him. I believe that no man could be more interested in the welfare of the North-west Territories, Manitoba and British Columbia. But supposing you had three or four ministers joined into one, supposing you had the ability of three or four men conjoined in one, look at what you have to do. He has to attend to immigration and to the administration of the land and to our Indians, and I say that it is not possible that all those western interests can be attended to by one man. If you had only a Cabinet of seven or eight men,—eight as they have in the United States—it might be unreasonable to ask for representation from each province or territory ; but when, as pointed out by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior), we have two members from New Brunswick, which has about 27,000 square miles, and two from Nova Scotia, and one member without a portfolio from Prince Edward Island, which is about 2,000 miles square, the case is altogether different. And when we have five members in the Cabinet from these provinces by the sea, I think it is not unreasonable for the member of Victoria, nor would it be unreasonable for any member from the west to utter the thought we have heard to-day. The main interests of Canada are involved in the progress of Manitoba, the North-west and British Columbia. And, Sir, the sentiment of provincial representation does obtain. I remember very well, shortly after the Hon. Thomas White died, a gentleman who is now a distinguished member of this House coming to me and saying : Whom do you think ought to be appointed Minister of the Interior ? You know that is an Ontario portfolio. I find there is a strong sentiment in every province as to the number of members they are entitled to ; and I have no doubt whatever that one of the considerations that would affect the action of the Prime Minister or the leader of the House if they were called upon to deal with this question would be the pressure that would be brought to bear from the large as well as from the small provinces now in possession of a preponderant influence in the Cabinet. But the time will come, there can be no doubt. I agree with the leader of the House in everything contained in his lucid speech in answer to my hon. friend from Victoria, except one point. He said : Live in hope, grow old, let gray hairs mingle in those—well, I cannot say "curls"——

Mr. DALY. Locks.

Mr. DAVIN—and then we shall see what will happen. That is not a point that the Prime Minister or the Cabinet should consider. The real question is this—would Canada be better governed, would the Dominion be advanced, would Manitoba and British Columbia be developed more quickly and contribute more greatly to the progress of the country, if you had one, two or three minds to deal with the questions that have to be

dealt with, instead of having one mind to occupy itself with these stupendous problems which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has to deal with? Why, Sir, take the one question of immigration. I hold that that is the one great question for Canada at this hour. The statesman who can solve the problem which is constantly raised from the Opposition benches and which was raised from these same benches when the Conservative party were in opposition—the question of stopping the exodus, and the other part of the same question of bringing in of large numbers of immigrants to the North-west—will solve the greatest problem before the Dominion of Canada to-day. The administration of our lands, the administration of the Indians are also questions of the greatest magnitude. To-day the Minister of the Interior has more weighty problems presented to him for solution, I believe, than has any of his colleagues. There is another question, one which has been dealt with by men who could not possibly know anything about it, the question of the North-west mounted police. If we had always had the administration of the North-west mounted police in the hands of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior—and if it is under the control of any Minister it ought to be under his control,—I do not think we should have had the numbers of that force reduced. The hon. Minister has lived in that country from the first; he knows that country, he is in touch with it. But, Sir, we had another gentleman, a man, undoubtedly, of great ability, in charge of this subject when that policy was resolved upon. That gentleman made a trip to the North-west Territory; he consulted entirely with officials and not for one moment with members of Parliament as to what should be done. This policy was resolved upon without our knowing that it was to be followed. No North-west Minister would have attempted such a thing; he would not dare to do it. My hon. friend the leader of the Government is a man of great experience and great ability. But one requires to be brought face to face with the facts of a problem in order to be able to solve the problems that arise from those facts. And, unless the leader of the Government has an insight into questions not possessed by other men, he cannot possibly be sufficiently acquainted with the condition of the North-west or the work that the North-west mounted police have to do in order to form, as at first hand, an opinion on that subject. Sir, the two subjects of North-west mounted police and the administration of Indian Affairs are cognate subjects, but the subject of Indian Affairs has nothing to do with land or immigration. The poles are not further distant than these, materially or morally. The mounted police are there because the Indians are there, and the Indians are quiet and progressive partly because the North-west mounted police are there. On the other hand as I say there is an intimate relation between immigration and the administration of the land. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior can hold his own as to what should be done for his own province. As stated by the leader of the House he has presented in an able manner the position of that country and has placed interesting data on "Hansard." With all due respect to the resources of the province of my hon. friend from Victoria, believing as I do that its resources, its harbour, its contiguity to the ocean, must make it a power for Canada and the Empire, he has only to visit the North-west to be convinced that the North-west Territories and Manitoba are really as has been said from every quarter, the hope of Canada. There the great battle of our national future and independence will be fought out. The hon. gentleman did not move a resolution, and I was not aware that he was going to bring up this question. But I support the position he has taken, and I desire to do what I can to impress his views upon the Prime Minister. And let me impress upon the Prime Minister that the portfolio given to my hon. friend should be one not involving the care of many documents. I think my hon. friend the leader of the House is quite right about that. Either the documents should not be numerous, or a curator for the documents should be appointed. I contend that there should be a Minister for immigration and Dominion lands. There should be a Minister to take charge of the Indians and the North-west mounted police. I say that these things are related. I say it is not a thing to put off, if it should be done at all, because now is the time, when you are laying the foundation of the country, now is the time when errors of administration, which may come from having too many things to attend to, should be avoided. Under these circumstances I reiterate my dissent from just the one portion of the Minister of Finance's speech wherein he told my hon. friend from Victoria to live in hope and to look forward to the distant dawn.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to deal with the ideal aspects of the question further than to express my gratification with the facts which my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) brought forward with regard to his province, which, I beg to assure him, we all desire to see prosper to the utmost. But I may be pardoned for descending from the lofty heights which have been scaled by the Minister of Finance and his successor, to offer to my hon. friend a couple of prosaic and practical suggestions, and to say to my hon. friend and to the hon. members from British Columbia—there are six of them—that if they desire to attain their object, they must remember, as the last speaker has said, that now is the time; and they must recollect this also, that if they

want to make their powers felt, they must kick as a united body. There is a great deal of worldy wisdom as well as sound scriptural warrant in the doctrine that there is much more joy over one sinner, let alone six, that repent, than over ninety-nine just men that need no repentance. For the second practical suggestion, I would say to my hon. friend that if he desires, as I do not doubt he does, that the influence of British Columbia should be felt in the Cabinet, let me advise, after what we have seen in this House, that his object would probably be far better attained, not by attempting to secure for his province a Cabinet situation, but a controllership.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has said to the Government in effect, Don't listen to the hon. member from Victoria (Mr. Prior) in his demand for representation in the Cabinet for the country west of the Rockies, but bear in mind that Short is your friend and not Codlin. That is the point which the hon. gentleman has pressed with great vigour upon the attention of the Government, and what is more, he points out that he represents a very much larger territory, and therefore should be first considered rather than gentlemen who represent the more distant portions of the Dominion. But I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that the leader of the House, when discussing the subject of the ideal that the Government should aim at, also gave the reason why the Government was utterly unable to attain that ideal. He said that we ought to have the best men, that should be our aim, regardless of all other matters; the Government ought to be composed of the ablest and most influential men of the party. But, said the hon. gentleman, that is an ideal that is unattainable, because there are racial differences which compel us to have recourse to inferior men. We have been unable to attain that ideal, because of difference of race that had compelled us to take into the Cabinet men whom, under other circumstances, we would have been glad to pass over. Now, I do not agree with him as to the want of capacity on the part of the representatives in the Cabinet from the province of Quebec. I think the province of Quebec is very fairly represented, and I do not agree with the views of the hon. Minister in that respect. But in respect of the ideal which he says the Government should aim at, when I look over the Government benches I do not think that the Government is very much worse off with the Minister of Public Works and with the Postmaster General, than they would be with my brilliant friend from Assiniboia, and the eloquence and ability that he might bring to the support of the Government. So I think the hon. Minister was hardly fair to his colleagues in discussing this question as he did. I dare say that he was anxious to hold out hopes to the hon. member for Victoria and the hon. member for Assiniboia that he could not otherwise have done, unless he could have said: I will endeavour to be friends with both of you gentlemen if you have a little patience, but you know these other men stand in my way.

POST OFFICE AT LAURENTIDES.

Mr. LAVERGNE. If the discussion that has been introduced by the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Prior) is over, I must call the attention of the House to certain statements which were made on the floor of this House by the Minister of Public Works in regard to a certain post office. The hon. gentleman stated a few weeks ago, that on the 2nd of April last, he had leased a certain building in the town of Laurentides from a person called Ovide Brien, for a term of five years, at the rate of $300 per year. He also stated that it was his intention to spend during the year the sum of $350 to make this building suitable for a post office. Now, looking at the report of the Postmaster General, I see the amount of postal business done in that post office scarcely justifies this expenditure. The amount of revenue yielded by that post office to the Government is the small sum of $787.41. On general principles I think this expenditure is altogether unwarranted. But there is another reason which ought not to be lost sight of. The action of the department works a great injury to a man who does not deserve such treatment. The present postmaster supplies free of charge the present post office. In the villages or small towns, men who carry on a commercial business, are usually appointed to the office of postmaster. While this man carries on his commercial business, at the same time he keeps this post office. It is proposed by the hon. gentleman to lease, in fact he has leased a house at a distance of a few hundred rods from the actual place of business of the postmaster. What is the meaning of this? It simply means that this postmaster will have to resign his postmastership or engage an assistant to whom he will be obliged to pay about the amount of salary he receives. What are the reasons given by the Minister of Public Works for taking this action? He told the House that he would make an experiment. There are hundreds of post offices in the province of Quebec and other provinces where there is more revenue derived for the Government than from the Laurentides post office, and as a rule in these cases the postmaster furnishes the post office or the Government pays a small rent. I could quote a number of cases, but I do not want to enter into these details. The hon. Minister, when the case came before the House, gave another reason for his policy. At that time I did not know all the

facts of the case. He told the House that the leader of the Opposition should not quarrel with him for making this experiment as he was about to carry it out in the village that was the birthplace of the leader of the Opposition. I do not know whether that is considered a very material reason or not, at all events, if the hon. Minister is in possession of all the facts, this was simply adding irony to injury. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not know, when he said he was doing honour to the leader of the Opposition, that he was simply squeezing out of office a brother of the leader of the Opposition. I do not know if the hon. gentleman has thought this matter over, perhaps he has not.

Mr. OUIMET. I never knew it.

Mr. LAVERGNE. So much the better. But I should like to place these facts before the House, because I think it is a pretty small piece of business, a small job, and in private business it would be considered so objectionable that men would not do such an act. I consider it a pretty harsh way to treat an adversary. I am sure that the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte), who is probably the promoter of this scheme and who has supported it with a great deal of energy in this House, the spirit of chivalry is a dream which has never haunted him. I believe hon. members would pause before adopting such a policy. I do not want to use any word that is unparliamentary, but this is a very extraordinary proceeding. Members of the House are called upon to do honour to the leader of the Opposition by injuring one of his relatives. I am sure hon. members on this side of the House are not desirous of doing so, and I wish to bring the facts of the case before the House so that members approving this policy may know what they are doing. Who will profit by it? It is something unheard of, that in a village with a small population, furnishing a very small income to the Government, the Government should pay $300 a year rent for a building which has never before been rented for more than $3 or $4 a month. It is simply a job to favour some friend of the hon. member for L'Assomption, I cannot see that it is anything else; for the public are not going to benefit in any way, either the people of L'Assomption or the people of Laurentides. If the postmaster is not fulfilling the duties of his office properly, let the Government arraign him or dismiss him; but why injure him without cause and at the same time squander public money for no useful purpose? Are there any complaints against the postmaster? Not that we know of. If so, let the Government come out fairly and squarely and manly and state what charges there are against the postmaster, and try him or call upon him to resign his office. This is a very small matter to wealthy men, or to the country at large, perhaps, but to a man of small means it may be a very serious one. This postmaster was appointed in due course, no one was dismissed to make room for him. Why should he not be properly treated? The post office revenue in the shire town of my own county is more than double that at Laurentides, but we do not dare to ask the Government for a post office or ask it to spend $300 a year rent when at the present time only $5 per month is paid for a good and convenient building and one which is satisfactory to the public. There is no justification whatever in adopting the measure proposed, and for these reasons I move the following amendment:—

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"it appears by statements made by the Minister of Public Works on the floor of this House, that on the second of April last, he has leased from one Ovide Brien a certain building in the town of Laurentides, county of L'Assomption, for the term of five years, at the rate of three hundred dollars per year, with the view of placing the post office of the said town in the said building, and that he proposes to expend this year the sum of three hundred and fifty dollars of the moneys voted by Parliament for the general expenditure of the Department of Public Works to make the said building suitable as a post office;

"That the post office of Laurentides is now supplied free of charge to the public by the postmaster, and that the revenues of the said office are only $787.41;

"That in the opinion of this House there was no justifiable cause for the action of the Minister of Public Works; that it constitutes an unwarranted expenditure of public moneys, and is highly censurable."

Mr. OUIMET. It seems that in this matter there is a misunderstanding all round. The amount of $300 has been expended to establish a post office in the village of Laurentides, in a house rented for five years. What brought this about was the many petitions received from the people of Laurentides, and the petitions from the public bodies of that place, asking for a public building proportionate to that given to other towns of the same size. It must be remembered that the town of Laurentides is the terminus of a railway, a centre of manufacturing, and a distributing point for a large section of that prosperous country which lies west of the River L'Assomption along the River Mascouche. The revenue of the post office is not very large, I admit, but the village is an important one in a commercial sense.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. How does it compare with Woodstock?

Mr. OUIMET. I will not reopen the long discussion in reference to that matter which certainly has made my life miserable since I have been Minister of Public Works, while I have endeavoured to redeem pledges of my predecessors with reference to these public buildings.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. We will have to start it over again.

Mr. OUIMET. It is rather late in the session to go into that. The principal grievance of my hon. friend (Mr. Lavergne) is not precisely the expenditure of the $300, but the fact that an injustice may eventually be done to the present postmaster. This matter has been pressed on me for several years, and especially by the late member for L'Assomption, but never was such a grievance as that suggested to me, although it probably has been a public question in the locality. I have not visited St. Lin myself. The whole thing has been inquired into and reported on to me by my officers, and if I had known this amendment was to come up I would have produced these reports. I never suspected that the change would have the effect of injuring the present postmaster, and I am sure the hon. gentleman would say that it would not come to my mind for a moment to injure anybody, and still less anybody connected with distinguished members of this House, and especially with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. If I had acted under such a feeling, or if I had taken the step to attempt a kind of a job to favour my hon. friend from L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte), I would have made a very grave mistake. Such is not the case at all. It seems to me that of late that would not have been a very satisfactory arrangement, the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte) has shown lately that he is the last one to be influenced by any such favour. This expenditure has been made to fit up a good post office building without incurring the expenditure of a new building, and it is the result of a project that I had in mind before. Take a case in point. Here is the village of L'Assomption, an important place, asking postal accommodation. I have told the people of L'Assomption who have no town hall of any importance, that if they were to erect a public building themselves and give first-class accommodation in it for a post office, that the Government, instead of building a post office, would be very glad to pay a certain amount in the shape of a good rent to have public offices in a municipal building of that kind. By doing this we would save such large expenditures for public buildings as have taken place in the past. I have frankly advocated this scheme before this House on several previous occasions, and I am sure that the House and the country will uphold me in it on the ground of economy. Now that I have pretty well redeemed all the engagements that have been entered into, I must say that before any other public building is recommended by me to the Government, I will endeavour to devise a scheme by which our towns should be served in turn according to their importance. I intend to carry out that project bona fide, and I hope the country at large will sustain me in it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I can hardly suppose the Minister of Public Works has undertaken to deal with a matter which will affect the public policy of the postal department, without consulting the Postmaster General. Now, Sir, when you look at the facts, you find that a very large number of the postmasters in Canada are country merchants. In the small towns and rural districts, in order that the postmaster may be enabled to accommodate the community by keeping a post office with as little charge to the public revenue as possible, you permit him to carry on some other business in connection with his duties as postmaster. The Minister of Public Works has not indicated that he intends to make a new departure. But he intends, presumably with the consent of the Postmaster General, to adopt a policy which is to enormously increase the charges on the public revenue for the salaries of postmasters, by revolutionizing the former practice, and by insisting that postmasters in every instance shall be persons who shall engage in no other business, except their official duties in connection with the postal department. Sir, that is not the object. Listening to the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works, I hoped when he declared that he was ignorant of who the postmaster was, that he would at the same time have declared that he had been imposed upon, and that he would abandon the project in which he was engaged, and would permit the postmaster at that place to continue to discharge his duties hereafter as he had been doing heretofore. But that is not the position taken by the Minister. I do not know whether the Minister knows it or not, but I called upon a prominent supporter of the Government from the hon. gentleman's own province, who I believed would communicate the matter to him, and I told him who, at that place, the postmaster was, and what seemed to be the intention of the representative of that locality, if not the intention of the Minister himself. What are the facts? The building which the hon. gentleman has rented for $300 a year stands on the assessment roll of the village at $1,000. Here is a proposal to expend in rental 30 per cent of the assessed value of the building. But that is not all. The hon. gentleman intends to have appointed postmaster the proprietor of the building. That is the position the hon. gentleman occupies before this House. He may say that he did not intend to wound the feelings of the hon. leader of the Opposition; but, Sir, the facts connected with this case proclaim the matter louder than any words he can use. He knew the postmaster was the brother of my hon. friend who sits beside me; and, in order to drive him from his position, knowing that he could not abandon his business as a merchant, the hon. Minister undertakes to put the post office into the hands of another man, in a village where the revenue of the post office is less than $800 a year. I appeal to the hon. leader of the Government in this House whether he is going to permit, and I appeal to his colleagues whether they are

going to permit the offices of this country and the official duties devolving upon the Government to be used as instruments to make war on men on this side of the House. That is the position in which the matter stands, and there is no man outside of this House, on either side of politics, who is of so mean a disposition that he will give his countenance or support to the position the hon. gentleman has taken, if not on his own motion, at any rate on the motion of the representative of that constituency. What should the Postmaster General have done in this case, if he were approached by a representative with such a proposition? Why, Sir, he should have informed him that this House is composed of honourable men, that the warfare between parties in this House shall be an honourable warfare, and not a warfare undertaken with the view of wounding and annoying and degrading, as far as hon. gentlemen opposite can, the men who are politically opposed to them. I say the position taken by the hon. gentleman is a monstrous position, and I call upon the Postmaster General to stand up here and be an honourable man and repudiate the course proposed to be taken; to say that this money shall not be applied in the way proposed—that it has been voted under a misapprehension of the circumstances; and that the postmaster there, having no charge against him and having faithfully discharged his duties, having engaged in a calling in which five hundred postmasters in other parts of the country are engaged, shall not be marked out for destruction, and shall not be subjected to a demand which is not made upon other postmasters in like circumstances. I say the honour of the Government, the honour of public men in this country, and respect for party warfare, require the hon. gentleman to make that declaration in this House; and when we are assured that the postmaster shall not be disturbed, that this scheme shall not be carried out, that warfare of this kind shall not be engaged in, then the House may call upon my hon. friend to withdraw his motion: but unless such a declaration is made, the sense of this House ought to be expressed by hon. members voting for that motion, irrespective of party, with the view of maintaining the honour and protecting the dignity of this House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I mean to follow the advice given by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, so far as standing up and being an honourable man in reference to this transaction. Sir, I appeal to those who know my mode of fighting to say whether it is my habit to strike men in the public service because of their political views. When an appointment is to be made, I consider it my duty to take my recommendations from my friends and from those who support the Government. Outside of that, it has been my practise, not only in the department over which I preside at present, but in another department over which I formerly presided, in regard to men who were not appointed by me, but whom I found in office, not to inquire whether they belonged to one side of politics or the other. That is a matter which I consider I have not a right to look into or interfere with. This is my mode of fighting, and it is what I intend to do again. Now, I fully agree with what my hon. friend and colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Works, has said in reference to the growing importance of the town of Laurentides. It is fast becoming a railway centre and a distributing point of considerable importance. The citizens of that town sent in a numerously-signed petition, asking to have a public building for the accommodation of the public there. That will astonish no hon. gentleman on either side of this House. This progressive little town, like other towns, was anxious to have a building more extensive and better fitted for the convenience of the public as a post office; and why the hon. gentleman should show so much indignation, I do not see. I must point out to the hon. gentleman that the appointment or dismissal of any postmaster comes under the Postmaster General and not under any other department, and a change of building does not at all carry with it a change of the postmaster.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman suppose that a merchant can abandon his business and go into a separate building on a salary of $300 a year or less?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There again I am not able to follow the hon. gentleman. The fact of a man being a merchant and receiving $300 a year additional as postmaster, would not prevent him attending to his other business. He might have somebody else to look after the outside business. In any case, that is a matter for discussion, and it can be settled only by the postmaster himself, who decides what is best for him to do—whether to remain where he is and continue his commercial pursuits, or to be simply postmaster. I repeat that the change of the postmaster is not at all to be looked on as following the change of site. In stating that, I hope every hon. gentleman will understand that my intention is not to remove the postmaster. Public life is sufficiently disagreeable at times without adding to the ordinary warfare such means as the hon. gentleman has suggested and which he properly characterized. Cases have come to my notice where such a course was urged solely on political grounds, and I have invariably refused to interfere on that ground. Whether it be a mistake to have changed the post office or not, the removal of the postmaster had nothing whatever to do with it. The hon. gentleman says the property is valued on the assessment rolls at $1,000. Well, Sir, it is well known that in country municipalities, property is valued far below its real worth.

Mr. LAVERGNE. In a few cases, but not always.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It has always been so valued in the numerous cases that have come under my notice, both when acting professionally and since I became a member of the Government. The hon. gentleman's experience appears to have been different. However, that is a part of the case that I have not gone into, and I regret that this matter should have been brought up without preliminary notice having been given to me, as I would have been glad to put before the House the petition for a better building and other documents in connection with the matter. As I have said, this must not be considered as a dismissal of the postmaster.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. You force him to resign by making the change.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not see any reason why he should resign, but if he wishes to do so of course I cannot prevent him. Had notice been given to me of this motion, I would have had all the papers here, which would show that the change was made because of the petition to the Minister of Public Works from those interested in the community.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. Postmaster General who has just resumed his seat, told us that he is not in the habit of striking his opponents in the back; but if he concurs in a proceeding which is nothing more nor less than an attempt made to accomplish the dismissal or force the resignation of a political opponent, I think he is just as guilty as the Minister who bears the responsibility of the deed. However, after the explanation given by the hon. Postmaster General, I hope this change of post office and the whole transaction will be abandoned, for the very reason alleged in the amendment now before the House. The population of the town of Laurentides and its post office receipts do not warrant the expenditure of three hundred dollars a year rent for a building which stands on the assessment roll of the village at $1,000. In spite of all the fine words of the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Public Works, it is clear that this is a barefaced political job, prepared no doubt by the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Jeannotte), previously to his recent vote of want of confidence in the Government. The hon. member has no doubt recorded his vote with so much the more pleasure as he had redeemed the pledge given by him to his friend Brien, that this change of building would be made, not to mention the credit of having given a post office building to the town of Laurentides; and furthermore, as he enjoyed, in the eyes of the Liberal voters of his riding, the advantage of having recorded his vote against the Government, winning thereby the sympathy of certain voters. Therefore, it would answer no purpose to deny that this small piece of business is anything else than a job to favour a friend, Mr. Brien, in paying a rental of $300 a year for his house, which has never, up to now, been rented for more than sixty or seventy dollars a year, and then compelling the present postmaster to resign his position. It is impossible for a postmaster who is at the same time a merchant—a calling in which are engaged hundreds of postmasters in nearly all the parishes of the province of Quebec and in the Dominion—and who gives his whole attention to his business, with a small salary of $200 or $250 a year, to keep the post office outside of his house, otherwise he would be forced to pay to another person the salary he is paid as postmaster. I had the good fortune of paying a visit to the town of Laurentides last fall. It is a pretty little town, the birthplace of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I have found, however, with regret, that instead of progressing that town had lost in population, according to the census returns. Does it not strike us as a very extraordinary policy for a Government to increase the post office expenses, at the very time when there is a decrease in revenue. Such an expenditure cannot be accounted for, except that it is a job to favour some political friends and create trouble to a political opponent, such has been, no doubt, the purpose of the hon. member for L'Assomption. But I acquit of any personal intention in the matter the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Postmaster General. The hon. Minister of Public Works said that what brought about this decision, taken with regard to a city with so small a population and which yields only a small revenue, was the many petitions received from the people of the town of Laurentides and the petitions from the public bodies of that place. If that were true, how do the hon. Ministers account for the fact that, as yet, no decision has been arrived at, with regard to the petitions sent to the Government, these ten years asking for a public building for the town of Montmagny; and in spite of the fact that the population of that town and its postal revenue are more than double those of the town of Laurentides; how is it that those petitions have created no impression on the minds of the Ministers? The citizens of the town of Montmagny, through their municipal council and their representatives, have asked the Government these ten years, either by request, or by resolution, to build a post office for the accommodation of the public there. Up to a quite recent date, the post office was kept in a small room measuring hardly ten feet square; the office was sadly neglected, and the public did not find any accommodation suitable to a town of such importance. Now, if the petition of the people of the town of Laurentides carried with it such weight, why does not the Government yield to that influence, in

the same way as they did, when the town of Laurentides was at stake? This discrimination arises simply from the fact that the former is represented on the floor of this House by a Liberal, while the latter is represented by a Conservative. There can be found no other ground for this discrimination, as the hon. member is favourably disposed towards all the localities which have a claim to his favours. No doubt the hon. member, who has achieved such success, wishes to fortify his position by extolling the favours distributed by the Government. Therefore, I am ready to support the amendment of my hon. friend the member for Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) on the ground that the Government are doing an injustice to the town of Montmagny. I am disposed to vote in favour of the amendment, because the policy which the Minister of Public Works intends to pursue in the future is, as I said a little while ago, in the matter of public buildings, to serve in turn the different towns according to the importance of their population and the postal revenue they yield,—a policy which should have been carried out long ago in the case of the town of Montmagny,—and furthermore, because the Government, while granting favours, as in this instance, to small localities to the detriment of more important towns render it impossible for themselves to do justice to every one. Although I wish to see the town of Laurentides make rapid strides towards progress, and in spite of all my regret at seeing her decreasing in population, still, I cannot help censuring the Government on the ground of that useless expenditure. Then, as a corollary of what I have said, I blame the Government for having undertaken to pay $300 a year rent for that building, which had never before been rented for more than $60 or $70 a year. I arraign also the Government on the ground that their action is equivalent to an attempt to force the resignation of the postmaster, or oblige him to pay to a clerk the salary he gets as postmaster.

Mr. McMULLEN. In looking over the Postmaster General's report, I have taken note of some of the places, the revenue of which is far in excess of the revenue of this post office and the rents of which are far lower. They are, for instance:

	Postal Revenue.	Rent, Fuel and Light.
Amherstburg, Essex....	$ 1,630 00	$ 40
Beamsville, Lincoln.....	1,377 97	60
Beaverton, Ontario.....	1,630 97	40
Bobcaygeon, Victoria...	1,505 25	60
Bolton, Peel.....	1,301 05	60
Bracebridge, Muskoka..	3,035 88	120

Take the places in my own riding, where there is a larger amount of receipts:

	Postal Revenue.	Rent, Fuel and Light.
Palmerston, Wellington.	$ 2,272 00	$ 120
Mount Forest.....	4,270 00	180
Harriston, Wellington..	3,344 00	140

These facts go to show that this is nothing but a barefaced political job—the renting of this building at $300. I defy the Minister of Public Works or the Postmaster General to point out a singe case in the whole Dominion where the rent paid for post office accommodation is so completely out of proportion to the amount collected for postal revenue. Not one-half the rent is paid in any other place where the receipts are only $800, as is paid in this place where $300 is paid for post office accommodation. Again, we find the Minister says that the Government are anxious to utilize public buildings, such as town halls, for the post offices and pay a reasonable rent for accommodation. But in Prescott where there was a good public building and a post office in it, they took the post office out and built a new one, directly in opposition to the principle laid down by the Minister of Public Works. If the statement of the Minister of Public Works be true, it is evident that he has been deceived in this matter. This postmaster will have to resign, because he cannot run a post office in a building distant from his ordinary place of business, and at the same time run his business without increasing very largely his hands, and the remuneration would not justify him in so doing. The scheme has been prepared in an effort to accomplish the dismissal or force the resignation of the present postmaster. I hope that the hon. Postmaster General, after getting to the bottom of these facts, will show that he is not to be made a tool of and that he will manifest his displeasure with the people who led him into this trap by refusing to carry out their scheme. If this proposal to pay $300 rent for a post office in a place where the receipts are only $740 were carried throughout the Dominion, the Post Office Department would pay three times what they are paying to-day for post office accommodation. Take, for instance, the town of Woodstock. The receipts there are about $16,000 a year, and the rental paid for the post office is only $300. No doubt there is some favourite to be rewarded by giving him three times as much as would be a fair rental for his premises. The assessed value of this property is $1,000, so that this rental represents a return of 30 per cent upon the assessed value of the property. The hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Public Works should try to steer clear of this little piece of political manipulation, which will undoubtedly tell against them before the public. He says this place is an important railway centre. How many places are there throughout this country of which that may be said yet which have no public building. Take, for instance, Palmerston in my own riding. It is a very important railway centre and the post office receipts are $2,500. There are many other places throughout the west which are important railway centres where the rent paid for post office accommodation

is $60 or $80 a year. This appears to be on a par with the vote for a post office in Marysville. I do not know whether it is because the Postmaster General is ashamed to put in his reports the receipts from Marysville, but you will look in vain for the record of it in this report of the Postmaster General. A grant of $8,000 was made three or four years ago to build a post office there and that has been revived this year.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think the post office at Marysville has nothing to do with the question under discussion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have said all I wish to say about the Marysville post office. As to the case we are discussing, its character appears upon its face. There is no other case in the Dominion where $300 is paid for post office accommodation where the post office receipts are only $740. I challenge the Postmaster General, or any other representative of the Government, to cite a case where even half that sum is paid where the receipts are so small. If they can show such a case, I will admit that there is half an excuse for this proposal. The proof is clear that this is a piece of political trickery.

Mr. TARTE. The Minister of Public Works has stated that he did not know the facts of this case. I am quite prepared to accept that statement; but I am also prepared to say that he should have known the facts; they are very clear. The building in question has never been rented for more than $60 or $70, and during many years it has not been rented at all. It is valued to-day at $1,000. The hon. Minister tells us that he has a report from his department. Surely that report should have stated the value of the building and also the name of the postmaster.

Mr. OUIMET. If the hon. gentleman wants me to explain, I may say that that $300 includes the cost of heating, lighting and repairs, and everything in connection with the keeping of the post office.

Mr. TARTE. We now have in St. Lin a perfectly suitable place. My hon. friend knows that I lived in St. Lin in times past, and I know the place well. The building in which the post office now is is a suitable building and is well situated in the centre of the town, while the one to be rented is outside the business part of the town. I do not accuse the hon. Minister of having willingly done what he is accused of doing, but I think that now that the facts are before him he should recede from the position he has taken. The hon. Minister says that this $300 includes the cost of heating. But the present post office building is heated at the expense of the postmaster and we have not a cent to pay. The facts are clear, and I think the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches should find some other means of striking at my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I do not want to dwell long upon this phase of the case. I think the proposal is just about the size of the people who are responsible for it. It is according to their size and to their aspirations. After having said so much, I am sorry not to be in a position to vote, because I am paired.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I have pointed out before, this is only an example of the vicious system that has been adopted by this Government in spending public money without any rule or principle, and it is likely to go on from bad to worse. If there is no principle governing the expenditure of public money according to the revenues received, or for present purposes, we cannot but expect that where one constituency receives consideration such as has been pointed out in this case, the same thing is occurring in other places. To my mind this is simply another scandal in connection with the expenditure of public money. I say it is disgraceful for any member of this House to have to acknowledge that public money is expended on partisan and political considerations. Now, if this is not true, let some hon. member rise and point out that it is not true. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne), it does not seem to be a very manly and chivalrous manner of disposing of a political opponent, if the statement he makes is correct, and we will know in a few months whether it is or not.

Mr. OUIMET. I may state at once that if this was the fact, or if it had been intended, I would have abandoned the whole thing. But I am not aware of it, and I have every reason to believe that such was not the case. I would not like to appear before the public as capable of conducting such a kind of warfare against any of my opponents.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I could hardly believe myself that it was possible that the hon. gentleman, whom I have known so long and so well, would have been a party to any such transaction.

Mr. OUIMET. I shall inquire into the facts.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. According to the facts brought before the House by the hon. member for Arthabaska, it would look very much as if this was true. However, I am glad to know that no such purpose was intended, and I trust that no such scheme will be carried out. But I wish especially to point out at the present time that if the Government of Canada are going to proceed on such a bad system in the expenditure of public money, worse than this must result, and I think the time has come when the Government ought to take this matter into consideration, and to agree upon some prin-

ciple according to which public money shall be expended in accordance with the amount of revenue received at such place.

Mr. FOSTER. As this charge against the department concerning the treatment of this postmaster, has been explicitly and frankly denied, I suppose my hon. friend would have no objection to withdraw his motion.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the policy of the Government is all wrong, according to the statement of the Minister of Public Works. In a town of the size of Laurentides, which gives a revenue of only $700. you hire a special building for a post office when the building at present is supplied by the postmaster himself, free of charge, with light, fuel, &c. I think the principle is wrong, and I challenge the action of the Government upon that. Now, I am ready to acquit my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works of any personal intention in this matter. I do not charge him with that. But I point out this to him, that in a case like that where a postmaster receives a salary of only $250 a year, it is impossible for him to carry on his business in a separate building except by means of his outside commercial business. To compel a merchant who is a postmaster and who serves the public at a salary of $250 a year, and who can only do both businesses with the aid of clerks, to go and hire a special building to carry on the business, is equivalent to compelling him to resign his position.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before he is compelled to resign, I shall have an opportunity of dealing with the matter from a departmental standpoint.

Amendment (Mr. Lavergne) negatived.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before you leave the Chair, even at this late hour in the session, I wish to occupy a very few minutes in refuting a statement that I see in the "Canada Farmers' Sun." Not many weeks ago I made a few observations in the House, and this is the first opportunity I have had since to refer to the charge that has been preferred against me and other members in this House, in which that paper called us cowards. I want that paper, or any other paper in this country, to understand that so far as I myself am concerned, I am not a coward, either in this House or outside of it; and I am prepared to give the editor of that paper, or any other person representing him, an opportunity of discussing that question on any platform in this country. What I said a few days ago is reported as follows in the "Hansard:"—

> Like the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I have never favoured employing convict labour to compete with free labour. But at the time the manufacture of binder twine at the Kingston penitentiary was established, the cry among the farmers that they were being ground down by a huge monopoly, the Canada Cordage Company, convinced me that if such a thing existed and it could be broken up by the employment of prison labour, the sooner that could be done the better. The same thing would follow to-day if prison labour were not employed making binding twine for the benefit of the Canadian farmer, for I am credibly informed, and am satisfied I can prove if a commission were granted, that a combine exists to-day between the Patrons of Industry binder-twine manufactory and the Canadian Cordage Company, so that our farmers would pay much more if it were not for the work of the Kingston penitentiary. I understand that the prison article to the farmers was 6½ to 7 cents per pound, while I know that the other is sold and delivered at a much less price. For that reason, I am quite willing that the penitentiary should continue to turn out binding twine for the purpose of keeping the combine between the Patrons of Industry and the Cordage Company from overcharging the farmers, as they certainly did to a certain extent this year, and would do to a very much larger extent were it not for the industry at Kingston.

After having made these remarks in the House, the "Farmer's Sun" copied an article from the Toronto "World." I hope if the "Canada Farmer's Sun" is not always supplied with the debates of this House, as I think it is, a special copy should be sent to it on the following day after the debate occurs so that it may fairly and truly represent any statement made in this House, because it published a garbled report of what I said, and of what other hon. members said, and, after publishing such report, it printed an editorial article on the question. Here is a portion of the article dealing with my speech:

> The Tory member Taylor asserts his ability to prove that a combine exists between the Farmers' Binder Twine Company at Brantford and the Canadian Cordage Company, if a commission is granted.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. If the hon. member proposes to quote from a newspaper any article commenting on any proceeding in the House or the action of any member of the House, I am afraid I shall have to rule that he is out of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am reading an editorial article on the binding twine discussion.

Mr SPEAKER. I will read the rule, and the hon. member can determine for himself as to whether he will be in order in reading the article he proposes to read. The rule in regard to reading extracts from newspapers is as follows:—

> It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or other communications, whether printed or written, emanating from persons outside of the House, and referring to or commenting on, or denying, anything said by a member, or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am quite within the rules, I think, in reading this article.

Why should he need a commission ? Let him tell his story and we give him our assurance that if anything is proven against the management of the Brantford Company the Patron Order will denounce the wrong-doing a good deal more vigorously than Mr. Taylor or any other M.P. can do. Let us have facts and not insinuations.

I did not make any insinuation at the time, I stated the plain facts. The article goes on to say :

Grit member McMillan took the part of a lawyer admirably to fasten the charge upon the Patrons. Mr. Tupper had a badly befuddled idea in his head, and Mr. McMillan helped him to bring it out.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member is clearly out of order in reading this article. It certainly comments on the action of members in this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then I will not read the article further in that regard, but I will quote that portion of it which refers to myself :

"There was a letter addressed to some person," said Mr. McMillan. "I believe so," said Minister Tupper. "That is all I want to know —the Patrons addressing the Government here wanting to enter a combine with the Cordage Company and the Government to put up the price," said Mr. McMillan. "And we would not do it," was the concluding words of Mr. Tupper.

Did you ever hear a lawyer help his witness to get out some important evidence ? Not less anxious was Mr. McMillan to help Mr. Tupper to say something that would damage the Patrons.

But the Patrons refuse to be injured by the assault of the cowardly M.P.'s. Mr. Beith, M.P., is a director of the Brantford Company. Why did not they go to him for information ? Where was he when the debate took place ? Mr. Ballantyne, ex-M.P.P., was in Ottawa last week, and he is also a director of the Brantford Company. Why was he not interviewed and some substantial facts secured ? We demand the facts. Who was the writer of this letter spoken of ?

In the discussion that took place in which I referred to the matter, there was reference made to the letter read by the Minister of Justice, and this editorial asks, where is that letter ? I know nothing about it, but I do know that as a representative in this House I do not want to be classed among the members, if we have any, and I do not believe we have, as cowardly and as willing at all hazards to justify the position taken on this or any other question. For myself, I have no complaint to make against the Patrons or the Patrons' company, but, according to a letter of the president of the company, they do not claim to be a Patron institution, but a farmers' cordage company, although there are some stockholders who belong to the Patrons. But they claim credit throughout the country for running a Patrons' binding twine company, and they claim all the credit for having reduced the price. So far as regards the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Beith), I understand he is not a Patron, but he is a director in that company, and the article asks, where this gentleman was when the discussion came on ? The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) is president of the Canada Cordage Company. He is also a member of this House, and both of those gentlemen heard my statement ; neither contradicted it, nor have they done so since. I am prepared to submit the facts. Before I made that statement, the president of the Brantford Cordage Company met me on the grounds in front of the buildings one day, and inquired if I knew Mr. Stairs. I asked him if he was one of Mr. Stairs' constituents. He said : No ; I am from Brantford. Then we opened up a discussion as to the Patrons' binding twine factory. He said he was connected with the Farmers' Binding Twine Company, and was president of it, and he asked me if I could find Mr. Stairs for him. I replied that I thought he was out of the city, but that his colleague from Halifax was here, and I would find him. I found him, and the result was a telegram to Montreal to have the member for Halifax, who is president of the Canada Cordage Company, come up. He did so, and they had a discussion, and the result was that the prices of binding twine sold by the Brantford concern and by the Canada Cordage Company have been the same throughout the season—call it a combine, or what you like. I said if a commission was appointed I could establish that there was a combine, and the prices were from three-quarters of a cent to one cent per pound more than for binding twine made at the Kingston penitentiary. The letter which the Minister of Justice read that night was a letter I knew nothing about ; but I understand that letters have been received, asking the Government whether they were going to raise the price to that charged by those companies. I do not intend to ask for a commission, but I make this statement, that when the Public Accounts Committee is investigating the accounts of the Kingston penitentiary and the price charged for binding twine, I propose to have summoned before that commission the president of the Brantford concern, with his books and his letters that have been sent out, and I will then be prepared to establish that arrangements were made that the prices should be kept up, although there is a sweeping advertisement published in the newspapers, and a letter from the president, which I could read, but I do not desire to occupy the time of the House. I repeat that next year, when the Public Accounts Committee is in session, I will establish my position, and I throw out the challenge to the "Farmer's Sun" or to anybody who wishes to go into the matter sooner, that I am prepared to make good the position I took, that an arrangement was made between these two concerns to keep up the price, and make the farmers

pay more than they were being charged by the Kingston penitentiary.

COAL CONTRACT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. LISTER. Yesterday, in answer to a question on the paper affecting the Department of Public Works, the Minister informed the House that the contract for coal supplied to the departmental buildings in Ottawa during the present year had been let to J. W. McRae & Co., without tender, on the basis of last year's contract, namely, $4.75 per ton, the quantity of coal to be furnished to the departments being 18,500 tons.

Mr. OUIMET. I can inform the hon. gentleman that it is not over 2,400 tons.

Mr. LISTER. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman when he made his statement. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that there are other coal dealers in Ottawa besides J. W. McRae & Co., who, if they are prepared to furnish coal to the Government at a less price than J. W. McRae & Co., have a perfect right to get the contract. I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. T. G. Brigham, a coal dealer in this city, in which he says that he has been prepared to furnish coal, and is prepared to furnish coal to the Government for use in the public buildings at Ottawa at $4.45 per ton. The contract let to J. W. McRae & Co. is at $4.70 per ton, upon the basis of last year's contract. It is hardly fair to the coal dealers in the city of Ottawa to let these contracts without giving them an opportunity of competing. Everybody knows that anthracite coal this year is much cheaper than last year. For example, the gas works in Toronto are buying their coal this year at $3.90 per ton, and the Government in Ottawa are paying $4.70. Mr. Brigham says in his letter:

> I was prepared to deliver this coal for the sum of $4.45 a ton, and should the Government feel like reconsidering their award, I am prepared to accept the contract on that basis.

Mr. Brigham in his letter goes on to condemn the system of letting these contracts without tender.

Mr. OUIMET. In the city of Ottawa, as in almost every other large city in Canada, there has been a combine existing by which we had to submit to fixed prices for coal, and these prices apparently could not be broken down. Last year, after having asked for public tenders, we got a tender from Mr. McRae much lower than the others, and we accepted the price at $4.70 per ton. I thought that I had certainly made a saving of something like $2,000 in closing the transaction. Probably the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) does not know that not later than a month ago, the city of Ottawa advertised by public tender for coal, and the contract was awarded at a price of $6.10 per ton whereas we get it for $4.70. In view of this, and not having been communicated with by any one, and being informed by my officers that I could not get it cheaper than from Mr. McRae at $4.70 per ton, I thought I was making very good terms in continuing the contract for this year at that price. Last year's contract was known to everybody, and if Mr. Brigham had been willing to cut down his price to $4.40 a ton, I would be glad to know it.

Mr. LISTER. How could he know when you did not advertise for tenders?

Mr. OUIMET. These gentlemen know very well when is the time to make these contracts. If he thought that he could sell coal for lower than $4.70 per ton, he might have given himself the trouble to come to the office and make the inquiry when there was a matter of 2,500 tons concerned. I thought I made the very best bargain, and I did so on the report of my officers. The whole thing was submitted to Council according to law, and I believe we got the coal as cheap as we could. Every business man knows that after a daughter has been married she can always find a husband, and so, every time a contract is awarded by the Government there are people always willing to undercut the price, especially when those people think they may gain something by so doing. I myself paid last year $6 a ton for coal in the city of Ottawa, and I was told the other day by a dealer that it would be the same price this year.

Mr. TARTE. He knew you were a Minister.

Mr. OUIMET. I have always found since I became a Minister that I have to pay more for anything I get than I did before.

Mr. TARTE. That is what I say.

Mr. OUIMET. That is not the usual contention of gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. They state that a Minister gets everything at half price, if not for nothing. My experience is the very reverse of that, and I find I have to pay more than anybody else. It is just as well that the public should know that, because we have been described as boodlers for so long. As the Minister of Public Works, I buy for the Government 2,480 tons of coal and I pay $4.70 per ton for it. If that gentleman were generous he might come and say to me at least you won't have to pay more for your own coal than you pay for the department. Well, that is not the case, and I do not expect that that offer would be made, nor of course would I accept it, but as it happens I buy my coal from another firm. I give that as an example that Ministers never get their own business mixed up with the business of the Government, and we never profit by anything of that kind. This contract for coal is not only justifiable but laudable, and the result of it has been to make a saving to the country.

Mr. CORBOULD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.30 p.m.

Afternoon Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WINNIPEG GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the House do, at its next sitting, resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient, in order to enable the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company to construct so much of their railway to Hudson Bay as reaches from Winnipeg to the Saskatchewan River, to authorize the Governor in Council to enter into a contract with the said company for the transport of men, supplies, materials and mails for twenty years, and to pay for such services during the said term $80,000 per annum, as follows : One-half of the said sum annually, commencing from the date of the completion of one-half of the company's line between Winnipeg and the Saskatchewan River, or of the completion of a line from Portage la Prairie northerly to a point of intersection with the company's main line where the latter is located through Township 13, or from Gladstone and to the Saskatchewan River, and the other half of the said sum annually, commencing from the date of the completion of the remaining half of the company's line between Winnipeg and the Saskatchewan River ; and that in the event of the said company not complying with the conditions to be made in relation to the construction of the first half of the company's line, the Governor in Council may transfer the $40,000 per annum applicable to such first half to a company authorized to construct a line from Portage la Prairie or Gladstone to Lake Dauphin or thereabouts.

Mr. LAURIER. I desire simply to inquire as to the question of procedure in this case, which may create a precedent, whether the notice is sufficient. The notice was given only yesterday.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is, as I presume the hon. leader of the Opposition contends, that two days' notice must be given of any motion proposed to be moved in Parliament. My own opinion is that when the House has decided that two sittings are to be held in one day, those two sittings constitute two parliamentary days within the meaning of the rule.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster :

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. OUIMET.

Mr. CORBOULD. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I wish to make a statement as to a charge that has been made against me by the late deputy warden of the British Columbia penitentiary in a statement filed by him in the Department of Justice. I think that in justice to myself I should take this opportunity of denying that charge. Last year a royal commission was appointed for the purpose of investigating the affairs of the British Columbia penitentiary, and on the report of the commissioner the deputy warden was dismissed. It now appears from the papers which have been brought down, that the deputy warden has filed a statement in the Department of Justice accusing me of having some personal motive for his removal, and alleging that I was one of a syndicate who wished the removal of the penitentiary to a site owned by myself and my friends. I will read the part of his statement to which I refer. It is dated the 21st of December last, and in it the deputy warden says :

It would appear Mr. Corbould, the member for New Westminster is at the bottom of the opposition to my either holding office or being appointed to a post in the institution ; and the reason is this. Some two years ago Mr. Corbould undertook to engineer a scheme for the removal of the penitentiary to a site on the opposite side of the Fraser River, which site is, I am informed, owned by himself and a syndicate of friends.

Now, Sir, the late inspector of penitentiaries, in his report, which is embodied in the report of the Minister of Justice for 1894, also refers to the matter in these words :

The part the deputy warden took in defeating the scheme for the change of the penitentiary site accounts for the desire of some one outside the penitentiary to witness his removal. I have no doubt, if the commissioner had been aware of the interests and motives at work against the deputy warden, he would have made a different report.

I say here, as a member of this House, that the statements I have just read are utterly false. I have never owned, nor have I any interest, directly or indirectly, in one inch of the property referred to, nor, to the best of my knowledge, have any of my friends. The late deputy warden and the late inspector knew perfectly well, when they made those statements, that they were false. Certainly, the deputy warden could have ascertained that they were, in five minutes, by applying at the land registry office in the city of New Westminster, but he sheltered himself under the words, "I am informed," and did not take the trouble to give his authority or find out whether what he said was true or false. The only motive I can imagine which actuated the deputy warden or inspector in making those statements was to draw public attention from his misconduct, and utter incapacity.

I will briefly state the facts as they are. In 1891 and 1892, the city of New Westminster made very rapid strides. A village sprung up called Sapperton, which lies to east and north of the penitentiary ground, dividing the village from the present site. The then mayor, and several aldermen, asked me to use my influence to have an arrangement made for removing the penitentiary site from where it is now to the opposite side of the river, where the Government own a large tract of land. When I came here in 1892, I met the late Hon. John Robinson, then Premier of British Columbia, and he mentioned this matter to me. I asked him whether he would join myself in interviewing the then Minister of Justice on the subject. We did so, and gave our reasons for desiring the removal of the penitentiary. As I have said, the city was then growing very large, and the present site of the building could have been sold for as much as would rebuild a penitentiary on the other side of the river. I also mentioned that a small site would have to be purchased over and above that owned by the Government, some twenty-eight acres. Sir John Thompson then asked me whether I would write to some person in British Columbia and find out whether this property could be bonded or held until the Government decided whether or not to remove the penitentiary. I at once wrote and heard nothing more until I returned to my own province, when the gentleman to whom I had written explained that he could not get the refusal of the property, as it had been subdivided into city lots, and a number of these lots sold, and he did not know where the owners lived. Since then, nothing has been done and the matter dropped. I am not aware that either the deputy warden or the inspector had anything whatever to do with the proposed removal or in any way prevented its removal. The mere fact of the land not being secured, and also the fact that land values had decreased very much, so that perhaps the present site could not be sold for sufficient to build a new penitentiary, was the cause of the matter being dropped. I am glad to have this opportunity of denying those statements, as they were altogether without foundation, and were made, evidently to injure myself for some purpose.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sure the House is sufficiently acquainted with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken to accept his statement. I desire, as promptly as possible, to express my great regret that the observations to which he has called attention should have appeared, and to explain how they did appear. The hon. gentleman has referred to the report of the Minister of Justice, but, of course, he has reference to the report of the late inspector of penitentiaries, which was covered by the formal report of the Minister of Justice. Far be it from me to annoy any hon. gentleman by bringing forward even insinuations against the character of any hon. gentleman in this Parliament. The inspector, however, after his superannuation, made the report to which attention has been called, and it seemed to me to be my duty to present that report in its entirety. I do not think the House will consider that in presenting that report as the inspector's report, I endorsed for a moment any of his statements. The inspector, of course, is allowed, in the interests of the public service, to exercise considerable freedom, in his criticisms of the various matters concerning the administration of the penitentiary. The hon. gentleman also refers to the papers that I brought down on his own motion. Of course, in the motion that he made, the Government could exercise no control, and those papers, when brought down, disclosed what the hon. gentleman has properly characterized as an insinuation and not as a statement made upon the knowledge of the officer. I may add to what the hon. gentleman has said that, after these papers were brought down and my attention was properly called to the matter, I looked up the reports of the Department of Justice and saw the hon. member himself, who promptly called upon me; and I am bound, in justice to him, and in every sense, to show that, so far as the reports of the department are concerned, there is not a single element to confirm the insinuation made against him, and I myself personally have no doubt whatever as to the perfect accuracy of his statement. But I am also bound to say that the deputy warden, who made the insinuation, may, perhaps, have been goaded into making it by the position in which he was placed by what he believed to be a combined attack made upon him and upon his honour. He may have gone too far, and, undoubtedly, I think, in this case, he went too far in making the insinuations he did against an hon. member of this House, without strong ground for its support; but, nevertheless, he was in the position of being attacked, and, as I have said, incorrectly, no doubt, supposed that that attack was directed against him by the hon. gentleman. He is now endeavouring to vindicate his character in the courts, having taken a suit for libel against a certain paper which reproduced these charges. Therefore, while the Department of Justice is of the same opinion which, no doubt, every hon. member entertains with regard to the integrity of character of the hon. member for New Westminster, the explanation I have just made I thought it necessary to make in order to account for the appearance of the statement in the report of the late inspector, which was made after his superannuation, and the statement in the return which has been brought down.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask what was done in the case. I have seen various reports in regard to the matter of the inquiry of Mr. Justice Drake into the management of the penitentiary, the result of which was the dismissal of deputy warden Fitzsimmons and also of the warden. I understand that the Government have reappointed the deputy warden, Mr. Fitzsimmons, and I have understood that some objection was made to that by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Corbould) and by the British Columbia members generally. I have also heard or seen it stated, I do not know exactly where, that the Government had either again dismissed the deputy warden or intended to do so. I would like to get some information on these points.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If I may be permitted to speak again, I may say that Mr. Fitzsimmons was not dismissed in the technical sense of the word. But, on account of the irregularities which were shown to have existed, he was punished by dismissal for five months. In the report recommending this course, the action was taken without prejudice to Mr. Fitzsimmons' reinstatement. Acting upon the information of my officers as to what my predecessor considered necessary, I reinstated Mr. Fitzsimmons. It is quite true that it was not specifically stated in the recommendation of the late Minister that Mr. Fitzsimmons should be put back into the same penitentiary. But as his punishment was recommended to be without prejudice to his reinstatement in the penitentiaries, after examining the report of the evidence, which was very voluminous, and Judge Drake's report as well, I was at a loss, when the application came before me, as to the means by which I could carry out my predecessor's decision unless I reinstated Mr. Fitzsimmons in the penitentiary at New Westminister. I reinstated him there. I am bound to say that, bowing to the almost universal sentiment of the province of British Columbia, it did not seem to me well if we could otherwise arrange, to retain the deputy warden in that penitentiary. All the evidence before me outside of the report of the commission justified the opinion that the public there, fairly or unfairly, had not that confidence in the deputy warden that it was desirable that an officer holding that important position should enjoy. Holding the opinion of my predecessor to be well founded that this officer had been severely punished—he had had 37 years of penitentiary service as an officer without one black mark upon his record—I did not feel justified in taking extreme measures. Finally the Government arrived at the conclusion that we would put Mr. Fitzsimmons in some other position in the service; but first we would give him the opportunity of defending his character in the courts. He has been pushing unceasingly the action I have referred to. We have now reorganized the service in the penitentiary at New Westminster. The officers there will be Mr. Moresby, who was recently the head of the provincial jail in British Columbia, Mr. Burke, who was deputy warden in Manitoba, and Mr. Harvey as accountant. These officers are on probation, with the universal approval, I believe, of the people of British Columbia. Consequently Mr. Fitzsimmons will not be further connected with the penitentiary at New Westminster. If the trial which is about to take place in British Columbia develops further information in regard to the character of Mr. Fitzsimmons, the Government will consider further what action should be taken with regard to him. In the meantime he is given two months leave of absence to prosecute with all celerity, the action he has instituted.

Mr. MARTIN. Action against a newspaper?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, against one of the newspapers which charged him practically with crime, and the crime that has been suspected on his part. Under the circumstances it would, perhaps, be as well for me to say nothing further than that we abide the result of the case before we decide further what shall be done with the deputy warden.

Mr. MARTIN. Has Mr. Burke's place been filled?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Mr. MARTIN. Is there any idea of sending Mr. Fitzsimmons there—possibly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Possibly—yes.

SHIPMENT OF BUTTER TO ENGLAND.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) As the hon. Minister of Public Works, who is at the same time Minister of Agriculture, is in his seat, I wish to call his attention to the unfavourable position in which shippers of butter from the district of Quebec actually find themselves. It is well known that shipments of butter are made to Great Britain as an experiment, as far as the district of Quebec is concerned. I have received a letter which I forthwith handed over to the hon. Minister, and the answer is as follows:—

I beg to inform you that our arrangements for the year for experiments have been made with a view to shipments from the port of Montreal alone. The freight on goods shipped to England is 10 shillings a ton lower, starting from the port of Montreal than from that of Quebec.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that these shipments in question, even when made by the Government as an experiment, should be surrounded with all the necessary precautions to secure in favour of the district of Quebec

as great facilities as those afforded to the district of Montreal. I think the shippers from the district of Quebec should not be made to pay any freight on their goods up to Montreal, while they run also the risks of railway transportation, which is always sure to deteriorate this article. It seems to me that the Government should not have discriminated against the shippers of the district of Quebec in favour of those of the district of Montreal. There is a considerable quantity of butter shipped from the district of Quebec. At the time when the Quebec shippers undertook to ship their butter to Great Britain, they were told by the agents of the Atlantic lines that the boats would stop at Quebec and they could load their butter there. The trouble was that when once the boat had stopped at Quebec, these same agents informed the shippers that they could not open the cold storage compartments, because that might deteriorate the goods already stored therein, by letting in the heat from outside. Therefore, these shippers, in order to avail themselves of the facilities offered by the Government, find themselves under the necessity of shipping their butter from Montreal, at their own cost. I feel it my duty to protest against this unjust arrangement which is so damageable to the district of Quebec. Furthermore, the Montreal shippers enjoy a considerable advantage over all the others, in so far as, being on the spot, they are enabled to secure the best places in the cold storage compartments, leaving to the other shippers the rest of the space. I would like the Government to give directions so as to secure a fair treatment in favour of the shippers from Quebec and other places. In the actual state of things, it is impossible to ship from Quebec the quantity of butter that could otherwise be shipped. The disadvantage under which they labour is still more intensified from the fact that there exists a keen competition between the Montreal and the Quebec shippers. I hope the Government will do right and remedy the grievance complained of, by making arrangements more favourable to the district of Quebec, and having the cold storage compartment opened when the ship enters the port of Quebec, to take in its cargo of butter for shipment to Great Britain : and having also a sufficient space reserved in the compartments. The reason alleged against opening the cold storage compartments at the arrival of the ship at Quebec was that the perishable goods would be deteriorated, on account of the heat penetrating into the compartments. I take no stock in such a statement that the fact of opening the cold storage compartment during an hour or an hour and a half could injure butter to such an extent as they pretend it would. At all events, the butter would be less injured than that shipped from Quebec on board the cars. The Quebec farmers and shippers have to pay just as much as those from Montreal for the experiment which the Government is now making, and I do not think there should be any discrimination between them. Therefore, I cannot subscribe to the argument offered in the letter I have just read, and I hope the next shipment—and by the way I may well express the wish that the next shipment may be more of a success than the last one.

Mr. OUIMET, (Translation.) Oh ! that butter fetched a good price.

Mr. CHOQUETTE, (Translation.) If it sold well, it was owing, I presume, to the fact that the cargo had been insured for its full value. I hope, at all events, that the next shipment will be made in better condition for the shippers from the district of Quebec. I would also draw the attention of my hon. colleagues to the fact that an injustice is being done to the detriment of the people whom they represent here, and I hope they will all back up my demand to the Government to the effect that, in the future, all the arrangements may be so made as to place every one on a footing of equality.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) In reply to a question put by my hon. friend, the member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), I may say this : that the city of Quebec has promoted a society known as the ship labourers' society. This society has wrecked the harbour of Quebec, and driven away from it all the shipping ; and now, we see every day from the ramparts the ships which used to load and unload at Quebec, pass by and take in their cargo along the St. Lawrence. If, to-day, the mercantile marine of Quebec is ruined, that city cannot lay blame on any one else but itself ; and even now, that society still lords it over Quebec. The Government are in no way responsible for that state of affairs. I understand that the Government has been attempting an experiment. With a view to that experiment, they had to select a starting point which offered better facilities for shipment and at a less cost ; Montreal was chosen as starting point. It is not fair to attempt rousing local prejudices against the Government, because they have selected Montreal as their shipping port, rather than Quebec or St. Thomas de Montmagny, or Rimouski or London, Ont. They have made choice of the port affording the greatest facilities to shippers. They acted wisely in selecting the best available port, and Quebec has no more right to complain than any other city in the Dominion. We ought to be grateful to the Government for having adopted and carried out that policy which cannot but result beneficially to the farming community ; and as I stand here, one of the humble representatives of that class, I think it my duty, in their behalf, to give thanks to the Government for what they have done in that line so far.

Mr. OUIMET. The arrangement made by the department is simply this : it has undertaken with the steamship company to pay the difference between the ordinary freight upon such goods as butter and the freight in cold storage. The steamship companies have Montreal as a starting port. Nothing prevents them from stopping at Quebec and opening these cold storage compartments. But, on inquiry, I find that the difference between the ordinary freight from Montreal to Liverpool and from Quebec to Liverpool is ten shillings a ton on this special class of goods. That was the reason why no arrangement could be made for shipment from Quebec. After many conferences and communications between the exporters of butter in Montmagny and other places in the Quebec district and the department, it was agreed that it would be better and cheaper for these exporters to send their butter to Montreal so as to avoid the extra ten shillings a ton freight. Perhaps my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has given the true reason why, apparently against all rule, the freight from Quebec, which is 180 miles nearer Liverpool than Montreal, is higher than freight from Montreal. It is impossible for the Government to go further than to pay the difference in freight so as to secure the shipment by cold storage. No injustice was intended, and I think no injustice actuallly resulted from the action of the department. Although the first experiment has resulted unfortunately, we must remember that many things that have a bad commencement show very good results in the end. I am sure that the farmers will appreciate the zeal shown by the Department of Agriculture in protecting their interests.

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS AND THE TARIFF.

Mr. BORDEN. I desire to call the attention of the House and the Government, for a very few minutes, to what I think is an anomalous condition of things existing in that part of the tariff which refers to agricultural implements. I refer particularly to item 294 of the tariff, and more particularly in that item, to seed drills. I will read the whole paragraph :

> Mowing machines, self-binding harvesters, harvesters without binders, binding attachments, reapers, sulky and walking ploughs, harrows, cultivators, seed drills and horse-rakes, 20 per cent ad valorem.

This was modified during the last session of Parliament in the interests of the agriculturists of this country, so as to admit the agricultural implements mentioned there, at the rate of 20 per cent, instead of 35 per cent, which was the rate of duty existing before that time. In the list of articles admitted under that item, there is seed drills, and I wish to point out to the Government that under that paragraph of the tariff, seed drills, which are potato planters, when introduced into this country, have been charged 35 per cent, and I wish to ask whether it is possible that the Government intended to discriminate between seed drills used by the farmers who plant corn, turnips, and grain of various kinds, and the farmers who plant potatoes ? Within a few years a machine has been invented which is manufactured in the United States, and manufactured there only, which saves an enormous amount of labour, and therefore expense, to the farmer engaged in growing potatoes. Last year one of those same machines was introduced into my constituency for the first time, and upon that machine the Government collected a duty of 20 per cent. Following that example, this year a very much larger number of those machines was imported, and this year the Government have decided that they must pay 35 per cent, instead of 20 per cent which they charged last year. Now, I have here some correspondence with reference to that, of which I will read an extract. It is a letter from the manufacturer of those implements in the United States, in which he says :

> We make shipments into the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, North-west Territories, &c., and we understood they only collected 20 per cent duty * * * According to the revised classification——

That is, of our tariff in this country.

> —seed drills are to be admitted into Canada at 20 per cent duty. At least, that is our understanding, and our agent in Windsor, Ont., looked the matter up carefully when getting his goods.

Now, as to the character of these machines I will read further the statement of the manufacturers themselves :

> Our planter is certainly a seed drill, if any implement is. We plant seed potatoes, corn, peas, beans and ensilage with it in drills, and do not check-row.

Now, I am sure the Government do not desire to discriminate against people who use this seed-planting machine to plant potatoes, in favour of those who use seed drills to plant turnips, or corn or other grain. I wish to ask the Government if they will do one of two things, either to put a liberal construction upon this paragraph, the same construction they put upon their tariff a year ago when they admitted these machines at 20 per cent, or introduce into the tariff an amendment, after the word "drill," adding the word "planter." If they will do that, it will make the tariff in that respect similar to the like clause in the United States tariff. I find in the United States tariff that "agricultural drills and planters" is the phrase used ; and I would ask the Government, as there certainly cannot be any intention to discriminate, to make this obvious change in the tariff, or to declare that, putting the most liberal construction upon this phrase, they will admit potato-planters as seed drills. I should like to hear from the Controller of Customs some explanation as to how it is that he can construe a potato planter, an implement used for planting potatoes, as not being

properly a seed-planting machine, when the same machine, as I have read here from the manufacturer, precisely the same implement, is used to plant potatoes, corn, peas, beans and ensilage. Now, I think there is another important point here. If my correspondents who are making these complaints that they are charged 35 per cent this year, when they were charged 20 per cent last year, had entered these articles as seed drills and not as potato planters, probably the customs authority would only have charged them 20 per cent. Here you see the door is open to unfair treatment. People who import these machines, may enter them as seed drills in one place, upon which they would only be charged 20 per cent; while in another place they might be entered as potato planters, and under the construction put upon the Act by the Commissioner of Customs, they would be charged 35 per cent, a manifest injustice. I think that the class of farmers in this country who are engaged in growing potatoes, are quite as much entitled to the consideration of this Government, and I believe the Government intended that they should receive the same consideration, as any other class. They have to compete with people in the United States who grow potatoes, and who buy their machines without any tax being imposed upon them, because agricultural implements there are free. The only markets our people have for potatoes are the West Indies and the United States. In the West Indies they have to compete with the potatoes sent from the United States where farmers have the advantage of using these machines free of duty; and when they send their potatoes to the United States, they meet a hostile tariff of 15 cents per bushel, and also the competition which arises from the use of these labour-saving machines, which are much cheaper in the United States than they are with us. I hope it is only necessary to call attention to this anomalous condition of things, to have it remedied. Some time ago I gave notice that I would move that section 294 of schedule "A" of the Customs Act be amended by inserting the word "planters" after the word "drills" in said section. I suppose that will come up more properly when the House is in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as the Government are concerned, we are making no changes in the tariff this year except those which arise out of the changes made in whisky and sugar, for the sake of raising a revenue. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has made an appeal for a change which has reasonableness in it, I daresay. At least I should be very glad to give most careful consideration to what he has brought forward if we were making general changes in the tariff, but he occupies the same ground as hundreds of others who have asked changes and who have been refused, and refused for the reason I have given.

Mr. BORDEN. The change I ask for is to make clear the obvious meaning.

Mr. FOSTER. The change suggested would reduce the duty 10 or 15 per cent. In that way it is obviously a change in the rate, whether it is obtained by the introduction of a word or by fixing a rate. With respect to the other point of discussion, as to whether the article had been fairly rated, as to whether its name has had something to do with the rate, and whether the Government could not give most favourable consideration in the interpretation of the tariff in that particular, I have no hesitation in saying that it will give the most liberal interpretation that it can possibly give, but we are limited by the verbiage of the item and opinions given, after consultation, by the Justice Department. That portion of the subject, I am very glad to inform the hon. gentleman, will be looked into; the other portion I shall have to decline on the consistent ground that we have made no tariff changes except for revenue purposes, and accordingly this part of the subject will have to lie over till another session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I fancy this is a matter which would come fairly under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Board.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not necessarily referred to the Minister of Justice. The Treasury Board, I think, has power to make modifications and reductions, though, of course, it cannot add to the burdens of the people.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is right; but the Minister of Justice sits on the Treasury Board, and that board is guided by his judicial opinion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope he sits with it and on it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, the Auditor General tries to sit on the Treasury Board.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So to the Minister of Justice we must address this plea. I trust, on the broad question of equality to his Irish fellow-countrymen, he is not going to impose any restriction on the growing of potatoes, and that he will consider the potato as a seed, and will not impose a duty on a machine for planting a potato seed any more than any other seed. There is the strongest possible ground for giving this item consideration, and I hope that Justice and Finance for once will agree.

CATTLE SHIPMENTS TO BELGIUM.

Mr. LACHAPELLE. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance if it is true that the Belgian Government has removed the embargo on Canadian cattle?

Mr. FOSTER. I have received a note which I intend to read to the House, that will answer the question asked by the hon. gentleman. It is as follows:—

(Cable from Sir Charles Tupper.)

London, 19th July, 1895.

Bowell, Ottawa.

Informed by Van Bruyssel, Belgian Government instructing Consul Ottawa by mail they will permit experimental shipments Canadian cattle Belgian ports October, November, December, and will remove embargo altogether if no pleuro discovered.

TUPPER.

The gist of that is that the Belgian Government will allow our cattle entrance from now until the close of the season, and if no pleuro-pneumonia develops, the embargo will be removed.

CATTLE EMBARGO BY GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to draw the attention of the House to a matter that is also connected with cattle embargo. I am sure the House will rejoice at the information furnished by the Finance Minister. Last session I dealt with the matter respecting the embargo established by Great Britain in 1892, and I will briefly run over some of the circumstances that have occurred since the embargo was established. That embargo was established because the experts in the service of the British Government had found, according to their judgment, pleuro-pneumonia to exist in certain animals. Thereupon vigorous correspondence took place between the Canadian and Imperial authorities calling in question the correctness of the finding. However, it was at the close of the fiscal year 1892, and a change would not have been specially beneficial to the country. The spring of 1893 arrived, and the controversy still continued. Unfortunately during the early part of 1893, in fact at several dates in that year, according to official reports laid on the Table of the House by the Government, several other cases of pleuro-pneumonia were alleged by the British authorities to have been discovered in Canadian cattle. The report states that in May one case was found in connection with an animal on board the steamer "Brazilian," two on board the "Lake Winnipeg," and one on board the steamer "Huronian." During the whole of 1893 the controversy between the Canadian Government through its representative and the British Government continued, there being no change whatever in the condition of affairs. But in 1894 the British Government, in order to put an end to the controversy, determined to employ more thorough means in order to discover the state of health of Canadian cattle. The steps they took were to require Canadian cattle to be slaughtered on entering Great Britain, their lungs to be examined by experts and upon the result of that finding the removal or continuance of the embargo was to depend. It has been said that Lord Ripon, in 1894, decided to admit Canadian cattle free from the embargo; but I would say in reply that Lord Ripon had nothing whatever to do with the matter, he being simply Colonial Secretary. The Board of Agriculture of Great Britain is the board that has to deal with the matter. Lord Ripon, as Colonial Secretary, had a favourable opinion, and he expressed the hope and wish that the Board of Agriculture might see their way to remove the embargo, but he received a very emphatic reply from the board declining to do so. That letter I have in my hand, dated 16th April, 1894. So much for any statement that at any period of time there was not official or other communication, representative of the English opinions as to the removal of the embargo. In this letter, for example, from the Board of Agriculture to the Colonial Office, the Board of Agriculture, replying to Lord Ripon, said: That whilst they regret that they cannot acquiesce in the request, they propose to adopt a course of procedure in order to deal with the matter. The course which they determined was the one to which I alluded, namely, to issue an order for the slaughter of Canadian cattle for the examination of their lungs, and then a verdict was to be rendered according to the result of that examination. I read now from the letter in question, which appears in the return laid upon the Table of this House, page 79:

As the Marquis of Ripon is aware, the question which it is necessary for the board to determine is, whether with respect to Canada the circumstances are such as "to afford reasonable security against the importation therefrom of diseased animals." If the board are satisfied that such reasonable security exists, then they are bound to allow such animals brought from Canada to be landed without being subject to slaughter. If, on the other hand, the board are not so satisfied, then the provisions set forth in the fifth schedule to the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act of 1878 apply, and animals imported from Canada cannot be allowed to be moved alive out of the wharf at which they are landed.

This letter proceeds to deal very clearly with the matter to which I have alluded, and sets forth the cases of pleuro-pneumonia which the English authorities say they have found in Canadian cattle. The letter goes on to say, page 80:

If the opinion pronounced by the veterinary officers of this department were unchallenged, it is obvious that with these facts before them, the board would have no alternative but to conclude that, owing either to the insufficiency of the frontier arrangements or to the presence of contagious pleuro-pneumonia in the Dominion, the reasonable security required by the statute was not afforded at the present time.

That was the attitude of the Board of Agriculture of England on the 16th April, 1894, and they proceed at page 83 in this lengthy document, to say, that they desire to have the examination made to which I have alluded, and the letter proceeds in these words:

With this object in view the board proposed to make arrangements under improved conditions, if possible, for a further special examination of the lungs of the animals imported from

Canada for slaughter at the ports so soon as the trade has fairly recommenced.

Accordingly, an Imperial order, issued on the 7th of May, 1894, providing for the examination, and that an examination took place, as appears by the records of the Board of Agriculture of England, and it extended over a period beginning on the 7th of May, and resulted in the order of the Imperial Government of the 13th August, 1894. It appears from a letter dated 16th June, 1894, from the Board of Agriculture to the Colonial Office, which commences on page 10 of the printed report of the proceedings of the board, communicated to this Government, and by this Government communicated to the House. It appears from this letter that the test began in connection with the lungs of an animal landed at Liverpool on the 20th May, by the steamer "Toronto," from the city of Montreal. The lungs of this animal were subjected to the examination of certain experts, a list of whom appear on page 11. The veterinary officers of the department in England had pronounced upon the case, finding adversely to our contention, and their opinion was submitted to a number of other gentlemen, high up, I presume, in the profession. As a result of that inquiry, the board concluded not to be governed by the finding of their board alone, but to take the opinions of other experts under the most favourable circumstances, in order to prevent any possible mistake or injustice. And so the English Government opened a court, in fact, for the elucidation of the truth; that the board might not in a perfunctory way, come to an erroneous conclusion. You will find, on page 11 of the last document that I have read, these words:

The board are glad to state that they have been fortunate enough to secure for the purpose they have in view, the co-operation of the Rt. Hon. Sir Henry James, Q.C., M.P., and Dr. J. Burdon Sanderson, F.R.S., Waynflete, professor of physiology in the University of Oxford, who have consented to attend the inquiry and to assist the president as legal and pathological assessors respectively. The board would also wish, if possible, to have the assistance which might be afforded by the attendance at the inquiry of a representative of the Colonial Office, with a view to his addressing to the various gentlemen examined any questions which he may consider calculated to throw light on the question which the board have to determine, and the board would be glad if the Secretary of State would nominate some suitable member of his department for the purpose.

This letter concludes:

It only remains for the board to add, that it was with much regret that they received the intelligence which they now officially communicate to the Secretary of State, inasmuch as it confirms the fear which the board have previously expressed as to the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia into the Dominion without the knowledge of the authorities there. The matter is a grave one from every point of view, and the board venture to hope that the investigation now to be commenced will have the effect of providing common ground upon which the action both of the Canadian Government and of the board can alike be based.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the inquiry so foreshadowed, took place, and the result of that inquiry appears on page 34 of the official records. This document, after again reciting the circumstances, sets forth on page 36 the names of the gentlemen who were invited to give evidence before the board. At page 36, the report says:

The lungs of this animal were declared by the inspector, Mr. William Smart, to present the characteristic appearances of pleuro-pneumonia. These lungs were forwarded to London, and on examination, the opinion of Mr. Smart was confirmed by Messrs. Cope and Deguid.

That opinion of the veterinarians was subjected to further tests on the part of the following gentlemen: Prof. John F. McFadyean, Prof. William Williams, F. R. Ingersoll, S. J. Rayment, Dr. Francis Vacher, Dr. H. D. Littlejohn, Dr. G. Sims Woodhead, Wm. Hunting and Clement Stephenson and others. There is a large list here of persons who seem to have taken part in this inquiry, furnishing experts and evidence for the guidance of the board. Unfortunately, during the inquiry, the report says, other cases of pleuro-pneumonia arrived. At page 16 one case and at page 36 five other cases are reported to have been discovered, and on the 13th day of August the board rendered their verdict—I read from page 58, as follows:—

It appears to the board, upon a review of the evidence above summarized, that the result of their inquiry has been to confirm and support the diagnosis made by their professional officers to a degree even beyond that which might have been expected. The position of those officers differs very materially from that of the non-official witnesses who were good enough to give evidence before the board, by reason of the fact that the former are compelled to come to a distinct and definite conclusion in every case submitted to them, and upon that conclusion the administrative action of the board must necessarily depend. It is, therefore, in the highest degree satisfactory to the board to find that so much evidence corroborative of the verdict of their officers have been forthcoming from gentlemen occupying, it is true, a much less onerous and responsible position than the veterinary officers of the board, but who were nevertheless well qualified to form a judgment on the question at issue. In no single instance did any of the witnesses examined find themselves in a position to assert, without qualification, that either the "Toronto" or the "Mongolian" case was not one of contagious pleuro-pneumonia, whilst on the other hand, the verdict of the professional officers of the board was absolutely and unreservedly confirmed in many instances.

At page 61 the report further says:

In the institution of the inquiry the board were animated by a two-fold desire. In the first place, doubts had been freely and publicly expressed as to the accuracy of the diagnosis of the board's professional officers, and the board were anxious to acquaint themselves with the ground

upon which those doubts had been based. In the second place, the board desired, in the event of that diagnosis being confirmed and supported, as it has been by unofficial professional opinion, to place Canadian veterinarians in possession of a complete statement of the views of experts in this country, since it is with the members of the veterinary profession of the Dominion that, in the opinion of the board, the next step rests. It is beyond question that a disease occurs in the lungs of Canadian cattle imported into this country, which, in the opinion of many of the most experienced and best qualified veterinarians in this country, is contagious pleuro-pneumonia.

They conclude as follows :—

They have no alternative but to act on the assumption that the disease found in the Canadian animals was in fact contagious pleuro-pneumonia, and in view of the fact they must maintain in force the normal security provided by the statute against the introduction of disease by means of imported animals, viz., by their slaughter at the first port of landing.

This briefly closes this chapter of the matter, and shows how the board came to the conclusion to which I have alluded. I now desire particularly to ascertain from the Government why they have not taken the steps that the Imperial authorities in the month of July, 1893, asked them to take in connection with this matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What steps were those ?

Mr. MULOCK. On the 21st of July, 1893, within a year after the establishment of the embargo, the Board of Agriculture wrote to the Canadian Government. I have here a copy of the letter, which went through the usual channels. It is found in the return laid on the Table, at page 39. That letter asked the Canadian Government to adopt certain precautions, and to do certain things. It suggests, if I may summarize it for brevity, that the Canadian Government should transmit to the board copies of the statutes now in force, and detailed information as to the machinery by which the requirements of the statute are complied with. The statutes and machinery alludede to are our own Animals' Contagious Disease Act, and the precautions which the Government have adopted to protect Canadian cattle from the importation of disease. The letter further asks that the Dominion Government should be able to state that arrangements exist to secure the submission of diseased animals to veterinary officers. It is a very lengthy document, setting forth in great detail what the Canadian Government ought, in the judgment of the Imperial authorities, to do. It is not a question for our Government to determine whether the English Government was reasonable or not. They are in command of the situation. We have to comply with what they deem their rights if we expect to get relief ; and what I am unable to understand up to this moment is why their demand was not complied with. On the 15th of August, the Board of Agriculture writes a letter to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to be submitted to Sir Charles Tupper, to be forwarded to the Canadian Government, as follows :—

The board have already indicated some of the measures, by means of which the Canadian Government can go far to secure evidence before the board materially upon the question of the restoration of the privilege of free entry which they wish to obtain, and which the board wish to be in the position to confer.

The board would venture to press most strongly upon the Canadian Government the adoption of vigorous and really effective measures such as those they have already indicated, in order to ascertain whether by any mischance the disease has found a foothold in the Dominion.

Well, two months elapsed, and the information appears not to have been communicated to the Imperial authorities, for, on the 17th October, 1895, the Board of Agriculture, then wrote as follows :—

With regard to the future the board cannot say anything further until they are in possession of the views of the Canadian Government on the various matters specified in their letter of 21st July last. In that letter the board indicated in detail the various measures which, in their opinion, the Canadian Government might with advantage take, with a view to afford more complete evidence with regard to the various matters which the board are required by statute to consider before waiving the normal requirement of slaughter at the ports where live animals are landed in this country, and the board hope before long to learn that the suggestions they venture to make have commended themselves to the Canadian Government, and also to receive information on the matters mentioned in the letter in question.

The next communication, dated the 2nd November, 1893, from the English Board of Agriculture, contains the following words :

I may add that the discovery of this further case of pleuro-pneumonia in an animal brought from Canada appears to the board to emphasize the desirability of further action by the Canadian Government in the direction indicated in the board's letter of 21st July last.

Thus, up to the 2nd November, the Government had omitted to act upon the advice of the English Government. On the 7th November, 1893, Mr. Colmer of the High Commissioner's office in England cabled, as follows, to the Canadian Government :

Board of Agriculture in official advice, "Hurona" case, emphasizes desirability further action Canadian Government ; directions indicated board's letter July 21.

That cablegram, no doubt, reached Canada the same day, but we find that it was not answered until the 14th November. On that date the Canadian Deputy Minister of Agriculture wrote, as follows, to the office of the High Commissioner :—

You request an answer to the letter of the board of July 21st last. Notes of an answer were prepared and were gone over by Mr. Angers, the Minister, before he left for the West with

Mr. Foster, some weeks ago, but he then decided that the answer should be deferred until his return and until we receive a full report of some investigations which were then being made by Professor McEachran relating to the health of animals in the North-west.

I may say to you further that Mr. Angers found some of the requirements specified in the letter of the board, to be unreasonable in view of the facts, and he did not feel by any means sure that he would take the responsibility of asking his colleagues to sanction a report embodying them. The Minister is, however, expected back to-morrow, and within a short time a full report of the case of the department in answer to the board, will be sent forward.

The next document I have on the subject, dated 29th November, 1893, is a letter from the High Commissioner to the Colonial Secretary :

You will observe it is stated in the letter from the Board of Agriculture, dated the 17th ult., that, "with regard to the future" the board cannot say anything further until they are in possession of the views of the Canadian Government on the various matters specified in their letter of the 21st July last. In that letter the board indicated in detail various measures which in their opinion, the Canadian Government might with advantage take with a view to afford more complete evidence with regard to the various matters which the board are required by statute to consider, before waiving the normal requirements of slaughter at the ports where live animals are landed in this country, and the board hope before long to learn that the suggestions they ventured to make have commended themselves to the Canadian Government, and also to receive information on the matters mentioned in the letter in question.

I have no doubt that a full answer to the communication of the Board of Agriculture to which reference is made will be received in a short time, as indicated in a recent letter from Mr. Lowe.

There we have it, under the hand of the High Commissioner, dated 29th November, 1893, that up to that date the Government here had not answered the requisition of the Imperial Government of the 21st July previous. On the 14th December, 1893, the Canadian Government wrote to Sir Charles Tupper, as follows :—

I may say to you in reference to the letter of the Board of Agriculture of July 21st last, it is proposed shortly to send a particular reply thereto in the form of a report of Council containing a full statement of the Canadian case.

It was thought better to wait for full reports of the veterinary investigations in the North-west, which had been commenced when that letter was received, and further, when the more recent cases arose forming the subject of your correspondence, to wait until the close of the season before sending the Canadian reply.

Thus matters stood up to the 14th December, 1893. On the 29th January, 1894, the English Board of Agriculture again ventured to send a memo. in order to awaken the energies of the Canadian Government. They wrote, as follows, to the Colonial Office :—

I am directed by the Board of Agriculture to state for the information of the Marquis of Ripon, that the period is now approaching when the board may expect to receive inquiries as to the conditions under which the importation of cattle from Canada is to be carried on during the coming season, and they would be glad to be placed as early as possible in possession of the views of the Canadian Government with regard to the matter set out in the board's letter of the 21st July last.

That was on the 29th January, 1894, when the English Government again called on the Canadian Government to answer its letter of the 21st July previous. Well, an answer was sent, I presume a lengthy document, more or less covering the case, but you will observe from the letter of the Deputy Minister, Mr. Lowe, that Mr. Angers had taken the ground that he thought a part of the request of the English Government was unreasonable, and it probably may have been for that reason that the Canadian Government did not meet the requirements of the situation. However that may be, whatever the reason for it was, the summer appears to have gone by, and Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, speaking in Dundee in November, 1894, criticised the action of the Imperial Government in connection with this matter. This brought forth from the Right Hon. Herbert Gardner, President of the Board of Agriculture, a letter in answer, dated 24th November, 1894—sixteen months after the 21st July, 1893. His letter is directed to Sir John Leng. It appears that Sir John Leng wrote to Mr. Gardner in reference to the embargo and Mr. Gardner replied to Sir John Leng in his letter of 24th November, 1894. This is a lengthy document reviewing many things that had taken place, referring to Sir Charles Tupper's apparent lack of information on the subject, and concludes with the following words :—

As regards the future——

That means, of course, as to the removal or maintenance of the embargo——

——I can only say that the matter rests mainly with the Canadian Government. If that Government would adopt the suggestions made by this board as far back as July, 1893, and make efficient arrangements for securing the notification of suspicious cases of lung disease to expert officers, by whom post mortem examinations could be made, exact records of the appearances presented being kept, valuable evidence as to the sanitary condition of animals within the Dominion would, after a sufficient interval, be available, and it would be seen whether the result was to corroborate by views expressed by Sir Charles Tupper as to the absence of pleuro-pneumonia in that country. Up to the present, however, the action of the Dominion Government, so far as the board are informed respecting it, has unfortunately not been such as the board themselves would have felt it their duty to take if there had been similar grounds for suspecting the existence of pleuro-pneumonia in this country.

I can only hope that some alteration of the position in this respect may speedily take place, so that the prospect of my finding myself in a position to remove the existing restrictions may be increased.

I am, etc.,
HERBERT GARDNER.

Sir John Leng, M.P.

Now, you will observe, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Gardner thought that if our Canadian Government would only adopt the suggestions made by the Board of Agriculture as long ago as the 21st July, 1893, there might be some change. Now, I want to know why the requisition of the English Government in this matter set forth in their communication of 21st July, 1893, was not complied with for the period of sixteen months, and why it has not been complied with yet to the satisfaction of the Imperial authorities. It must be borne in mind that we are not in a position to dictate; that they are in command of the situation. Whether their request is reasonable or unreasonable, we should endeavour to comply with it as far as the situation will allow. Failure to do prejudices our position. And when I look through this correspondence and see that several times the Imperial Government have endeavoured to awaken our Canadian Government to activity upon this all important question, I think the time has arrived when the Government should give an official answer as to whether the requisition of the Imperial Government has been complied with. I regret to be obliged to bring this matter up at such a late period of the session. I intended to bring it up earlier and mentioned that fact to the Minister of Finance and Secretary of State, and we had decided, subject to the rules of the House, to have it brought up on concurrence. But concurrence has not yet been reached, and, in conversation with Mr. Speaker just now, I find that, according to the rules, concurrence would not afford me to deal with the question generally as I have desired to do, and for that reason I have to take this as the only opportunity remaining during the session of discussing the question.

SALMON FISHING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MULOCK. There was one other matter I wished to refer to before I sit down—circumstances connected with the fisheries in British Columbia. I have received communications from persons interested, and was sorry that the members from British Columbia, when advocating the giving of a portfolio to a member from that province did not happen, for the moment, to advocate the interest of a great industry such as the salmon fishing. I sympathize much with the claim of the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)—he did not distinctly nominate himself as the Minister for the North-west Indians and mounted police, though he nearly did so, nor did the member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) pay a like attention to his own merits—but I was surprised when the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Corbould) rose to deal with a personal grievance of his own that it did not occur to him to allude to the grievances of a great class of people in that district, the fishermen, and those interested in the canning of salmon on the Fraser River. Last season, owing, apparently, to lack of knowledge as to the details of the fishing industry, regulations were issued by the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries which seriously injured the fishing season last year. As I heard the hon. member for Victoria, British Columbia, advocating the assignment of a portfolio to British Columbia, it did appear to me to be a matter in the public interest and a most important matter that some person from that province should be appointed in some way to bring to the knowledge of the members of the Government matters such as these with which they appear to be unfamiliar. I am told that the salmon do not always come up the river at the same time; there is a difference in the time of their arrival. So that if you fix a time arbitrarily within which fishing may begin and must terminate without reference to the movements of the fish, you are not proceeding wisely. In this particular case, my informant assures me, the regulations fixed the time for concluding the fishing when it had hardly begun. Application was made to the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries to extend the time, which, apparently, he refused to do, thereupon the men engaged in canning dismissed their fishermen and other employees. But after these had become scattered and it was impossible to get them together again, the order refusing to extend the time was countermanded. Thus relief came when too late. Serious injury was done to the salmon fishing interest, not only to the employers but to the employees. I am sorry I have to refer to the matter in the absence of any of the members from British Columbia, as the reference to it might more properly have come from them. But I can understand the supporters of the Government not feeling free to criticise in the House any case of maladministration or any mistake on the part of the Government. However, the very request of the hon. member for Victoria that a portfolio should be assigned to British Columbia was in itself a mild rebuke by him against certain acts, known and unknown on the part of the administration against the people of British Columbia. I am sorry the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not in the House, but I may say that I expressed the hope this year that he would see that there was no repetition of the mistake in question.

CATTLE QUARANTINE.

Mr. MONTAGUE. At this time, when we believe we are in the last hours of the ses-

sion, I shall not pay my hon. friend the compliment of going over the whole ground that he has taken upon the question of cattle quarantine; and, of course, I shall not refer at all to the other matter which he has referred to in his address. I am glad, however, that the hon. gentleman did bring this phase of the cattle question to the attention of the House, because there is one point upon which I wish to say a word or two. But before I refer to that point, I wish to say that the Government are pleased that the hon. gentlemen in these later days, have discovered that the privilege which we enjoyed, and which was refused to other countries, in the ports of Great Britain, under an arrangement which we had made with Great Britain, was such an important privilege, because I remember time after time when we discussed the question on various platforms in the country, that members of the party represented by the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, declared that the privilege which we then secured was of no value whatever to Canadian cattle raisers. I think my hon. friend made the mistake this year, which he has made in other years, of beginning at the wrong end of this case. He has dealt with the question from the position of one more hostile than friendly to the Canadian cattle trade. Not only that, but he should have begun by first showing that there was some ground for the charge which had been made by the British Board of Agriculture, that Canadian cattle were unhealthy, that they were affected with pleuro-pneumonia. If that point is established, the hon. gentleman need not read all the documents he has read, he need not refer to this long correspondence which has taken place; and I submit that he is unfair to the Canadian cattle case, while admitting tacitly, as the hon. gentleman must admit, that Canadian cattle are healthy, and as would be asserted by hon. gentlemen behind him, if they were here. The hon. gentleman, by establishing that, would be giving his approval to the statements made by the British Board of Agriculture, who, for reasons best known to themselves, and we think well known to us, have kept up the cattle embargo against Canadian cattle.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you say that report is all a fraud?

Mr. MONTAGUE. In a moment I shall deal with that phase of the question to which my hon. friend referred. The main question is this: Are Canadian cattle healthy or not? If Canadian cattle are not free from that disease, then we admit that the British Board of Agriculture had a perfect right to keep up the embargo against Canadian cattle; if, on the other hand, Canadian cattle are healthy, if it cannot be shown that in any of our herds pleuro-pneumonia exists, then I say, and this House will agree with me, and the hon. gentleman will agree with me, that the British Board of Agriculture have not one single leg to stand upon in connection with their case. Now, the hon. gentleman has changed his ground since last year. Last year he made a very elaborate attack upon the Government because, as he said, they had not carried out strictly the regulations which were made in 1879 as regards the transit of American cattle through Canada. The hon. gentleman then said that we had failed to secure the removal of the embargo because we were careless in connection with these regulations. The hon. gentleman now has changed his ground, has changed his point of attack, and seems to think that the ground upon which the British Government have refused to remove that embargo is because we had not sufficiently answered the letters and the requirements made in those letters sent by the British Board of Agriculture.

Mr. MULOCK. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But he left that to be inferred, because he declared that we had not answered the correspondence, that we had not met the requirements of that board. Now, so far as the regulations are concerned, and the manner in which we have observed them, the hon. gentleman has not touched that point this afternoon. But I want to say just one word upon it, because it has been declared time after time in the country that we made a specific arrangement, that an arrangement was made by my hon. friend the late Minister of Public Works and the British Board of Agriculture as regards this transit trade, and the charge has been made upon every platform, that we did not keep that arrangement. I say that these regulations were made in an Order in Council in 1879, that that Order in Council was submitted to the British Board of Agriculture, and they approved of its provisions. I say still further, that the Canadian Government have lived up to the requirements of that Order in Council, and that the British Government have no reason whatever to find fault with us, and furthermore, the British Board of Agriculture have never found fault with us for not carrying out the regulations made in that Order in Council. Now, as regards the point to which the hon. gentleman has referred, namely, that in July, 1894, I think he said——

Mr. MULOCK. If you are referring to the board, I did not say 1894, it was 1893.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am referring to the despatch asking for certain particulars, and asking for the appointment of veterinarians, with still further inspection by this Government, and that kind of thing. I may say to the House that the point has never been raised that we have not given the British Board of Agriculture sufficient evidence, more than that, in every reasonable particular we have met their request. Their

request was, mainly, that we should appoint a great number of Canadian veterinarians to inspect our herds in the beginning of the year, and to send them the evidence. There was certain evidence that could be collected by the Department of Agriculture, and that evidence was collected, although it took some time to collect it. The evidence was finally forwarded to the British Board of Agriculture, but instead of appointing Canadian veterinarians, or an increased number of them, for the purpose of inspecting our herds, we said this to the British Board of Agriculture, as contained in the offer of the Canadian Minister of Agriculture: We fear that if we appoint our own veterinarians you may think they are biased in favour of the Canadian side of the case. We would rather that you appoint British veterinarians, we would rather that you appoint the very best men you possibly can for that purpose, and to show our good faith, and to show how thoroughly safe we are, and to show how thoroughly convinced we are that our Canadian herds are healthy, we are willing to pay the expenses of the experts that you appoint, and willing to lend them every facility that they may require, or that you may require, for the purpose of investigating the condition of our herds. Now, was that a fair offer or not? The hon. gentleman insinuates that we were afraid of our case, that we were not willing to give that information. I say again, that offer is still open, the Government are pledged to pay the expenses of any men the British Government may send here for the purpose of inspecting our cattle; and if they can find one single case of pleuro-pneumonia within the bounds of Canada, we won't ask for the embargo to be removed. But what we contend is this: that if we can show that our herds are absolutely healthy, that our quarantine regulations have been carried out, that we have kept our herds pure, and show that upon the evidence of British experts, we say then that we claim it as a right as well as a privilege that the cattle embargo should be removed. I do not think that any one having a single atom of reason in him would ask the Canadian Government to go further than they have gone in that regard, and certainly I am sure my hon. friend believes that we have treated them fairly in connection with that matter. I do not intend to say more, the subject will be discussed, no doubt, next year. A new condition of affairs has arisen in the old country, and as Acting Minister of Agriculture, has declared that the Government are opening up negotiations again, and I assure the hon. gentleman and the House that no stone will be left unturned to secure that desired object, if possible.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite sure the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in paying attention so closely and well to the consideration of this question from session to session, and handling it so ably in the House deserves the everlasting gratitude of the agriculturists of this country. If there is any question that deserves and requires the active, earnest, and close attention of every one interested in agriculture, and especially the head of the department, it is that of our cattle trade with Great Britain. The Secretary of State, owing to the fact that he has but recently assumed the responsibilities of his position as representing the Agriculture Department, cannot be expected to give that pointed and complete answer to the serious and grave charges which my hon. friend has made this afternoon in connection with the whole case. The hon. gentleman has attempted to evade the direct charge of Government responsibility for the condition that exists, but if he will closely examine the records connected with the imposition of the embargo he will find that great looseness has characterized the action of the department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think before the hon. gentleman makes that charge he should submit some evidence.

Mr. McMULLEN. It has all been printed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, it never has.

Mr. McMULLEN. The evidence has been printed as regards the quarantine arrangements between the United States and Canada, and as to the way they have been carried out, and the Government must be willing or unwilling to bear its share of the responsibility connected with the present condition of affairs.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is not a tittle of evidence to prove your statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not going to hold the hon. gentleman personally responsble, because many things happened before he assumed the position he now occupies, and for which he cannot be held personally responsible. But the Government is responsible. Take the experience we had as regards cattle admitted from the United States in to Canada. The Secretary of State will not challenge the statement that from time to time application was made by the railway companies for some change or relaxation of the provisions of the arrangement with Great Britain. In those regulations it was clearly understood that cattle were to be unloaded on one side, to be inspected, then to be reloaded, carried to the point in the United States from which they would be shipped.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You are all wrong in your statement.

Mr. McMULLEN The hon. gentleman will not deny that parts of the arrangements were violated, because the records of Parliament clearly show that applica-

tions were made by the railway companies first, to have the cattle inspected on board, next, to be inspected at night, and that certain concessions were made by the department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman will show one single case or any time in which the British Government found fault with the way in which the Government were carrying out the regulations, then I will admit the hon. gentleman is right. There is not a tittle of evidence, however, to show it.

Mr. McMULLEN. The fact is the British Government were not made aware of it until a considerable time after it occurred.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is begging the question now.

Mr. McMULLEN. Evidence has been produced to show looseness as regards the way the quarantine regulations were carried out. A statement to that effect was published in an English paper. If the statement was untrue, why did the Government not place the writer under arrest? It may be pleaded that he had removed from Canada; but perjury is certainly an offence for which a man can be extradited.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is on the evidence of that statement all these charges have been made.

Mr. McMULLEN. Why did not the Government bring him back. He was just across the river, and if the department was anxious to prove a charge against him he could have been extradited.

An hon. MEMBER. What date was that?

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot give the date, but every hon. member who takes an interest in the cattle question can easily find the date of the publication of the statement, because it was published in some paper in London, under the writer's signature. I deeply regret that the whole question regarding our cattle and the removal of the embargo has not been handled in that vigorous and able manner which such an important question demands at the hands of the Government of the day. Evidently, the Minister of Agriculture was prepared on different occasions to challenge the steps taken by the British Government. The Secretary of State says the Government have asked the British Government to send out experts to examine our cattle. Why did not Sir Charles Tupper secure the services of two or three eminent experts whose opinions would be accepted by the British Government? The Secretary of State replied that the Government wanted the British Government to appoint them. That Government, however, has enough to do without paying attention as to details connected with the embargo on Canadian cattle. All would have been well if we had followed the lines indicated by the British Government some time ago. If the department had attended actively and closely to the communications sent we should have occupied a different position to-day. Unfortunately, the Department of Agriculture has been handled in such a way as not to secure the efficient and intelligent treatment of this important question. The Minister of Agriculture has not been a man to give care and attention to matters connected with the Agriculture Department.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. members may laugh. At this particular juncture in Canada we require a man of ability, experience and knowledge who is prepared to devote his whole time and attention to this subject, and relieve Canada from the unfortunate plight in which it now stands in regard to the cattle trade. Since that department is vacant, I hope that a competent man will be appointed so that the unfortunate blunders that have been made in the past will not be repeated. We know that the Deputy Minister of that department is very advanced in years and is almost in his dotage. This is the man who has had charge of the Agricultural Department, together with Mr. Angers, the late Minister, who knew no more about practical agriculture than he knows about astronomy, if as much. This question deserves the serious attention of the Government. The people of the country have suffered seriously in the past. I myself feel sad to think that our cattle trade has been nearly ruined for want of activity and earnestness on the part of the Government, and because of their neglect to keep the covenant entered into with Great Britain in regard to quarantine. Cases have been pointed out where pleuro-pneumonia existed, at all events to the satisfaction of the veterinary surgeons in the old country. Prof. McEachran is paid in Canada to make a careful inspection of all our cattle exported, and I should like to know how it happened that he allowed those cattle to leave the country, if he was attending to his duty. If the Government are anxious to secure our cattle against embargo they should arrange for some prominent veterinarian in the old country to look after our interests there from a Canadian standpoint. The object of the English officials is to discharge their duty from a British standpoint and in the interests of the trade in England. We should see that some competent person should be on the other side to ensure that justice is done to the Canadians in the matter of inspection. If it is left to the British officers, we may possibly suffer wrong in certain cases. This question has been neglected by our officers in England. We know that when we asked for samples of the diseased lungs, the staff of Sir Charles Tupper's office managed the matter in such a way as to bungle the whole thing. Only

about an inch square of the diseased lung was sent out and it was so badly sealed that when it arrived here it was in a decomposed state and of no value for the purposes for which it was required. This is a matter of very great moment to the agriculturists of the Dominion. If the frequent efforts put forth by my esteemed friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) will secure the active and prompt attention of the Government and make them wake up so as to obtain the removal of the embargo, my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) will deserve the lasting gratitude of the farmers of the country, and I believe he will get it.

Mr. MULOCK. It would be out of order for me to make any further remarks, but I wish to say, that if the session were not at this advanced stage, I might deem it my duty to reply to some of the inaccuracies in the remarks of the Secretary of State. I will not do so now, further than to say that I cannot allow the inference to be drawn, that by my silence I assented to many of his contentions, which I could disprove in a very short time. My main object has been to point out to the Secretary of State—if he is acting Minister of Agriculture, and if he is not, to whoever is the acting Minister—the attitude of the English Government, so that no further delay may take place, and that even if their demand is unreasonable, that it is our duty to endeavour to deal with it to the fullest extent.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret, Sir, that I was unavoidably absent from the House during this discussion. If there ever was a time when the Government should take some action in this matter it is this year. In western Ontario we have any amount of good cattle, such cattle as the English and Scotch farmers would like to finish, and we have very little feed to take them over the winter. Therefore, I think it is the duty of our Government to make an extra effort now to secure the free entry of our cattle into the British market this year. If they do so, it will be a great benefit to the farmers of Ontario. I do not wish to enlarge upon this question at this late hour of the session. I simply express my opinion, for I feel that if the Government take hold of the matter energetically they might probably get our stockers into the English market next fall.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee on the following resolutions :—

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend Section 130 of Chapter 34 of the Act 49 Victoria (the Inland Revenue Act), as amended by Section 4 of Chapter 46 of the Act 54-55 Victoria, by repealing such Section and substituting in lieu thereof, as follows :—

130. There shall be imposed, levied and collected on all spirits distilled, the following duties of excise, which shall be paid to the collector of Inland Revenue, as herein provided, that is to say :—

(a.) When the material used in the manufacture thereof consists of not less than ninety per cent by weight, of raw or unmalted grain—on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength than the strenth of proof, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and seventy cents ;

(b.) When manufactured exclusively from malted barley, taken to the distillery in bond, and on which no duty of customs or excise has been paid, or when manufactured from raw or unmalted grain, used in combination, in such proportions as the Department of Inland Revenue prescribes, with malted barley taken to the distillery in bond and on which no duty of customs or of excise has been paid—on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and seventy-two cents ;

(c.) When manufactured exclusively from molasses, syrup, sugar, or other saccharine matter, taken to the distillery in bond and on which no duty of customs has been paid—on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and seventy-three cents.

2. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Act 57-58 Victoria, Chapter 33, "An Act to consolidate and amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs" by repealing the following mentioned items of the Schedule "A" to the said Act, viz. : Nos. 7, 31, 32, 55, 80, 81, 82, 152, 392, 393, 394, 396 and 397, and No. 708 of the Schedule "B" to the said Act, and substituting the following in lieu thereof :—

7. Spirituous or alcoholic liquors, distilled from any material, or containing or compounded from or with distilled spirits of any kind, and any mixture thereof with water, for every gallon thereof of the strength of proof, and when of a greater strength than that of proof, at the same rate on the increased quantity that there would be if the liquors were reduced to the strength of proof. When the liquors are of a less strength than that of proof, the duty shall be at a rate herein provided, but computed on a reduced quantity of the liquors in proportion to the lesser degree of strength ; provided, however, that no reduction in quantity shall be computed or made on any liquors below the strength of fifteen per cent under proof, as follows :—

(a.) Ethyl alcohol, or the substance commonly known as alcohol, hydrated oxide of ethyl or spirits of wine ; gin of all kinds, n.e.s. ; rum, whisky and all spirituous or alcoholic liquors, n.o.p. ; amyl alcohol or fusel oil, or any substance known as potato spirit or potato oil ; methyl alcohol, wood alcohol, wood naphtha, pyroxlic spirit or any substance known as wood spirit or methylated spirits, absinthe, arrack or palm spirit, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy ; cordials and liqueurs of all kinds, n.e.s. ; mescal, pulque, rum shrub, schiedam and other schnapps ; tafia, angostura and similar alcoholic bitters or beverages, two dollars and twenty-five cents per gallon.

(b.) Spirits and strong waters of any kind, mixed with any ingredient or ingredients as being or known or designated as anodynes, elixirs, essences, extracts, lotions, tinctures or medicines, n.e.s., two dollars and twenty-five cents per gallon and thirty per cent ad valorem.

(c.) Alcoholic perfumes and perfumed spirits, bay rum, cologne and lavender waters, hair, tooth and skin washes, and other toilet preparations containing spirits of any kind, when in bottles or flasks containing not more than four ounces each, two dollars and twenty-five cents per gallon and forty per cent ad valorem.

(d.) Nitrous ether, sweet spirits of nitre and aromatic spirits of ammonia, two dollars and twenty-five cents per gallon and thirty per cent ad valorem.

(e.) Vermouth containing not more than thirty per cent, and ginger wine containing not more than twenty-six per cent of proof spirits, eighty cents per gallon ; if containing more than these percentages, respectively, of proof spirits, two dollars and twenty-five cents per gallon.

31. Condensed milk, three and one-quarter cents per pound.

32. Condensed coffee, condensed coffee with milk, milk foods and all similar preparations, thirty per cent ad valorem.

55. Biscuits of all kinds not sweetened, twenty-five per cent ad valorem ; biscuits of all kinds sweetened, twenty-seven and one-half per cent ad valorem.

79. Fruits in air-tight cans or other packages, two and one-quarter cents per pound, the weight on which duty shall be payable to include the weight of the cans or other packages.

80. Fruits preserved in brandy, or preserved in other spirits, two dollars per gallon.

82. Jellies, jams and preserves, n.e.s., three and one-quarter cents per pound.

152. Paints and colours, ground in spirits, and all spirit varnishes and lacquers, one dollar and twelve and a half cents per gallon.

392. All sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, one cent and fourteen hundredths of one cent per pound ; sugar, n.e.s., not above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings, or pumpings drained into transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms and sugar concrete, one-half cent per pound ; the usual packages in which imported to be free.

393. Glucose or grape sugar, glucose syrup and corn syrup, or any syrups containing any admixture thereof, one and one-quarter cents per pound.

394. Sugar candy, brown or white, and confectionery, including sweetened gums, candied peels, and pop-corn, one-half cent per pound and thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

396. Syrups and molasses of all kinds, n.o.p., the product of the sugar cane or beet root, n.e.s., and all imitations thereof or substitutes therefor, three-quarters of a cent per pound.

397. Molasses produced in the process of the manufacture of cane sugar from the juice of the cane, when imported in the original packages, from the district where produced, in the country where the cane was grown, and which has not been subject to any process of treating or mixture after leaving the country from which originally shipped, the packages in which imported, when of wood, to be free—

(a.) Testing by polariscope, forty degrees or over, one and three-quarter cents per gallon.

(b.) When testing by polariscope less than forty degrees and not less than thirty-five degrees, one and three-quarter cents per gallon, and in addition thereto, one cent per gallon for each degree or fraction of a degree less than forty degrees.

3. Resolved, That it is expedient so to amend the Act 54-55 Victoria, Chapter 31, as amended by the Act 55-56 Victoria, Chapter 8, so as to provide that under such regulations and restrictions as may be made by the Governor in Council there may be paid to the producers of any beet-root sugar produced in Canada wholly from beets grown therein between the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five and the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, a bounty equal to seventy-five cents per one hundred pounds, and in addition thereto one cent per one hundred pounds for each degree or fraction of a degree of test by polariscope over seventy degrees, such bounty in no case, however, to exceed in the aggregate one dollar per one hundred pounds.

4. Resolved, That is expedient to provide that the foregoing resolutions and the alterations thereby made in the Duties of Customs and of Excise on the articles therein mentioned, shall take effect on and after the third day of May instant.

5. Resolved, That it is expedient to further amend the Act 57-58 Victoria, Chapter 33, intituled : "An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs," by adding the following items to the schedule "A" to the said Act, viz. :—

199a. Salmon, fresh, n.e.s., one-half cent per pound, provided that such salmon may be imported free of duty upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that fresh salmon may be imported into the United States free of duty.

362a. Sawed boards, planks and deals planed or dressed on one or both sides, when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued and grooved, twenty-five per cent ad valorem, provided that such lumber may be imported free of duty upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar lumber from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty.

Mr. EDWARDS. The last item, sawed boards, was discussed, I think, last session. At that time, if I remember rightly, lumber tongued and grooved was put on the free list, because it was considered desirable in the interest of the settlers in the North-west that it should come in free. I do not think that condition has since changed, and I see no reason whatever why the duty should now be imposed because of the construction the Americans have placed upon their tariff in this respect. The United States customs authorities have recently so construed their Tariff Act that tongued and grooved lumber going from Canada into the United States is required to pay a duty of 25 per cent. Because the United States impose a duty which is injurious to the consumers of that country I do not see that that is any reason why we should punish our people in the same way, and I, for one, wish to record my dissent from this proposed change. It is true, I am myself a manufacturer of sawn lumber. I regret very much that the authorities of the United States have construed their Tariff Act in the way they have done, but this principle I hold, not only in this matter, but in all matters, and simply because it affects the interest in which I am

myself concerned, I am not going to depart from the principle which I hold in a general way. I hold that it is for the advantage of the consumers of lumber in Manitoba and the North-west Territories that tongued and grooved lumber from the United States should come in free of duty. The arguments that were used last session were in favour of lumber planed on one side or on two sides coming in free of duty, but not lumber tongued and grooved. It is true, the importer makes a small gain from the less amount of freight he pays when he imports that class of lumber; but the lumber, after it comes to this country, has to be sent to a planing mill to be tongued and grooved, and it costs the consumer about as much to have it tongued and grooved as to have it planed and tongued and grooved also. That was the reason I contended that tongued and grooved lumber should be put upon the free list.

Mr. SPEAKER. I frankly confess that I am not so disinterested as my hon. friend from the county of Russell (Mr. Edwards), in respect to this matter. I am not quite sure whether or not the decision that has been given by the Board of Appraisers of the state of New York has been confirmed by the Treasury Department at Washington, but if it has been, then what we supposed would go into the United States free under their tariff, will hereafter be charged with a duty of 25 per cent. That is to say, under the ruling recently made by the Board of Appraisers of the state of New York, although dressed lumber appears by the United States tariff to be made free of duty, lumber that is dressed upon the edges—and lumber that is tongued and grooved—has been construed to be a manufactured article, and, therefore, subject to a duty of 25 per cent. If that is the case, I do not see any good reason why the manufacturers of lumber in the United States should be put in any better position, in relation to the consumers in the North-west Territories, or in any other portion of Canada, than the Canadian manufacturer of lumber. Therefore, I approve of the action of the Government in adopting the course which they propose to the committee to-day. I venture to hope that it may result in reciprocity between the two countries in this article, and that the Government and the customs authorities of the United States may come to the conclusion that it is in the interest of the people of that country to admit, free of duty, the kind of lumber that is here spoken of, in return for the free admission of the same class of lumber into this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me, Sir, that the people of the North-west ought to be considered a little in this matter, as well as my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, or any other parties who are engaged in the manufacture of lumber, and the view taken by my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) is both more politic and more generous. We have spent enormous sums of money to promote settlement in the North-west, and everybody knows that this will only be taken advantage of practically for the benefit of the settlers in Manitoba and the North-west, where lumber is or used to be sold at a very heavy price. I doubt extremely whether any revenue will be derived from it, and I also doubt the wisdom of bringing in any alterations in the tariff at this period of the session.

Resolved, That it is expedient to further amend the Act 57-58 Victoria, chapter 33, intituled: "An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the duties of Customs," by adding the following item to the schedule "A" to the said Act, viz.:—

199a. Salmon, fresh, n.e.s., one-half cent per pound, provided that such salmon may be imported free of duty upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that fresh salmon may be imported into the United States from Canada free of duty ½ cent per pound.

362a. Sawed boards, planks and deals planed or dressed on one or both sides, when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued and grooved, 25 per cent ad valorem, provided that such lumber may be imported free of duty upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar lumber from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, 25 per cent.

The Minister refused, just now, and had some reason for his refusal, to consider any proposition in the way of altering the tariff: and yet he himself comes down now, when I hope we are within twenty-four hours of the end of the session, and proposes to make an alteration which can only result, so far as I can see, in putting some further impediment unnecessarily in the way of promoting settlement in the North-west.

Mr. FOSTER. In speaking this afternoon, before we went into committee, I had these two instances in my mind—and meant to have included them in the remarks I made—in which we have made changes on what you may call international ground. With regard to the item concerning salmon, which we have just passed, these salmon which are dutiable at present under our tariff, but just as in the case of lumber, the United States general appraisers ruled that fresh salmon could come in free. In the interests of that reciprocity in these large staples which we favoured in our tariff of last year, it was thought well to make an exception in that case, and put our salmon as well on the free list of reciprocity in accord with the ruling of the United States appraisers, to remain free so long as they remain free in the United States. With reference to lumber, the discussion will show—and in the preparation of the tariff we had that in view—that what we were anxious to do last year was to meet the United States in respect of all articles just as far as we

possibly could in reciprocity of tariffs. Where they made articles free, and it was at all possible for us to make them free as well, we did so, especially with reference to the article of lumber. It has been for a number of years a point on which we all are agreed, that if we were to have free lumber between the two countries, it would be a wise thing. We went, therefore, to the full extent of the Bill which became law in 1894 in the United States, and whilst we had in view the fact that it might have the effect of making lumber cheaper in certain sections of the country, we also had in view the fact that it was going on the line of reciprocity. In the United States this restriction which they had not expressly in their tariff seems to have been brought into it by the decision of the appraisers, and it has now the force of law, and certainly we would not have gone any further last year than the United States had gone with reference to this article. Therefore, we are not now on a basis of reciprocity with the United States with reference to lumber. The United States lumber merchant brings his lumber into this market and sells it, so far as this item is concerned, on a better basis, compared with his competitor, the Canadian maker of lumber when the latter takes his wares into the United States. We think that is unfair. While we want to make the articles of living as cheap as possible, we also have a tariff on protective lines—protective lines which, in these industries, are moderated by the principle of reciprocity with our neighbours to the south. That consideration brings us back to the action we propose to take here. Sawn boards, planks, deals, and other lumber undressed, or dressed on one side only, are free, and will remain free in the Canadian tariff. It is only when the United States appraisers have decided that lumber tongued and grooved is not free that we propose to put on just the exact duty the United States charges. I am not certain whether this position of the case is final or whether the decision of the appraisers is open to review. Certainly, I think it is subject to appeal. I know that in other cases there have been appeals from the decision of the general appraisers. I know of a case that was appealed and in which the appellants were Canadians, and the appeal succeeded. That was in the case of British Columbia cedar, which is now admitted, under the judgment of the Court of Appeal, free into the United States, although formerly 25 per cent was charged upon it.

Mr. BERGIN. They still impose a duty on the cedar for furniture.

Mr. FOSTER. That is cabinet wood. This cedar exported from British Columbia —and it is on that ground the court gave its decision—is not a wood which takes a high polish, and which can be used for cabinet purposes. I have not the slightest doubt that there will be an appeal upon this decision of the general appraisers, and the action which is taken here will be notified at once to the authorities at Washington with the intimation that just so soon as it is made free there, it will be made free again in this country, which, I think, would be a friendly inducement to a fair consideration of the case, and, I hope, a friendly settlement.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sorry that the Finance Minister is going to put 25 per cent on planks and deals, plain or dressed on one or both sides.

Mr. FOSTER. We put nothing on those.

Mr. DAVIN. When the deals are joined or tongued and grooved, will not that apply to the ordinary lumber we use for building ?

Mr. FOSTER. That lets in all what you may call the rough lumber for rough purposes. It lets in the great majority.

Mr. DAVIN. We always held it a great hardship in the North-west that a duty should be imposed on lumber. We have no timber there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You have the Rocky Mountain timber.

Mr. DAVIN. That is a long distance off. It affects the price of the lumber we use.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It encourages a home industry.

Mr. DAVIN. Certainly, and I am ready to encourage home industries, but I believe in scientific protection.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is a good thing for everybody else, but not for you.

Mr. DAVIN. If the hon. gentleman likes, he may say to me that I am in the position of those Liberals who, when the particular industry they favour is affected, rise here and protest against reduction in the tariff. They are then the staunchest protectionists, and I may be open to the taunt of speaking as a free trader.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You are on the right track.

Mr. DAVIN. I may be asked if I am not speaking as a free trader, but my answer is this, and it is a triumphant answer: That those of us who take such a view of protection as is scientific——

Mr. GILLMOR. How do you explain scientific ?

Mr. DAVIN. It is too late in the session to explain it now. Next session, if I am here, I will do my best to enlighten my friend from the Atlantic coast. What I would say is this: Here you have a vast line of territory where we cannot grow lumber ourselves, and we have either to import lumber from the United States, or get

it from Rat Portage or British Columbia. Now, Sir, we always felt this duty of 25 per cent to be a hardship too. As early as 1882 or 1883, I pointed out that where a man built a house costing $1,000 the amount paid in duty to the Government was $250.

Mr. MULOCK. Was not that all right?

Mr. DAVIN. I will not reply to these interruptions, because it is very easy to show there are cases where it is the truest protection to the community not to protect the individual article.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Always.

Mr. DAVIN. There are cases of that kind, and one of those cases we have here. We in the North-west Territories, all, gentle and simple, farmer and not farmer, have to buy our timber from outside. We found that a combine existed in Manitoba, and this lumber combine at once received a blow from my hon. friend the Finance Minister in his revision of the tariff, took the duty off lumber planed on one side and tongued and grooved. I certainly would express—I shall not move but I will state my opinion—that in the interests of the North-west Territories and Manitoba this should not be persevered in or if it be persevered in, the most strenuous efforts should be put forward to get the United States to act in a way that will once more give us the boon that we have enjoyed.

Mr. FOSTER. That will certainly be done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) can be a free trader when it is to the interest of the people whom he represents. He sees with a good deal of clearness, for a protectionist, that free trade is best in the interests of the people in this section. The hon. gentleman says they have no timber growing in that section of the country and therefore, they do not manufacture. Well, Sir, the farmers of Canada are not manufacturing cotton, they are not manufacturing many other things, yet the hon. gentleman is willing to take them as a class. There is no difference between a tax that affects people according to their geographical position and a tax that affects those that are diffused among the rest of the population. It is in the interest of the millmen in the vicinity of Rat Portage and on the west side of the Rocky Mountains that this tax should be imposed. And why does the hon. gentleman complain? We in Ontario are compelled to pay taxes on our coal. Our coal is in the immediate vicinity of our section of the country on the other side of the border, but we must pay heavy taxes upon it in the interest of men who reside in Nova Scotia and Vancouver Island. I do not see that the hon. gentleman, from his own point of view, has anything to complain of.

Mr. HASLAM. The effect of the position taken by the Americans with regard to lumber, so far as British Columbia is concerned is this—lumber that was worth last year $14 a thousand feet at the mill is to-day worth $10.50 a thousand feet. I do not think it will affect the price of lumber in the North-west, because the price has been kept down by competition between the Lake of the Woods mills and the British Columbia mills.

Mr. MULOCK. Would not the lumber that is now $10.50 be cheaper to the people of the North-west if there was no duty on American lumber?

Mr. HASLAM. I question if it will effect the price of lumber in the North-west at all.

Mr. MULOCK. Or in British Columbia?

Mr. HASLAM. We are exporting largely to San Francisco,—flooring especially. And it is in that that the price has fallen as I said. As to the point mentioned by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that a house costing $1,000 paid duty to the amount of $250 I think the hon. gentleman is a little out in his calculations. A house costing $1,000 would have lumber in it only of value $300, and the duty on that would be only $75 at most, or if you reduce the duty to half you have only $35 duty, paid on a house worth $1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that far the larger number of the items in this schedule are not affected, but are still admitted free. And there is the further consideration, as stated by the hon. member for Vancouver Island, that the competition between Rat Portage and the British Columbia manufacturers has the effect of keeping down the prices of lumber in the North-west.

Condensed milk, condensed coffee with milk, milk food and all similar preparations, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER. Read that 30 per cent.

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing resolutions and the alterations thereby made in the duties of Customs and of Excise on articles therein mentioned, shall take effect on and after the third day of May instant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was a point raised in connection with that particular resolution, whether the customs were entitled to collect on articles that had been taken out of bond before the hon. gentleman had made his statement. I desire to know what conclusion has been come to on that question, because, looking at our invariable custom on previous occasions, it appears to me it would be rather a high-handed and unfair proceeding to catch a man who had taken out any articles which had been in bond a few hours before, while another man who had taken them out the day before, is not disturbed.

Mr. FOSTER. That arbitrary line must always be drawn. Whenever a tariff comes into force, you will always be able to say that it seems unfair to make one man pay so much, while another man who is fortunate enough to get his goods out a few hours before, had to pay so much less, or vice versa. That is a discrimination between the two, but the arbitrary line must come somewhere. Now, with reference to this matter, I am following exactly the same lines as were followed in the general revision of the tariff last year. If my hon. friend will look at the last clause of it, he will see that the duties took place and had force from and through the day upon which the resolutions were introduced into the House, and practically had the force of law. I am not making any innovation at all from the practice which obtained at the general revision of the tariff. It is only frank to say that on previous occasions there was a variation from that rule, when the new tariff rates took place on the day succeeding the day of the introduction of the resolution, and all entries that were made on the day the resolutions were brought down, went free. There are some considerations which I think it is fair to take into account, which have weight with me, and I think they will have weight with the House. We must recollect that this year the tariff was with reference to two items, and an increase in both. These tariff changes were made for the purpose of aiding the revenues of the country. The country therefore whose revenues were to be aided, had, I think, a perfect right to everything which could accrue from the putting on of those duties. It is well understood; there has been some discussion of it in this House, that for months before, in the falling state of the revenue, and from the monthly statements; that changes would be made, it was known to all, and the question was canvassed as to what the Government was going to do. Whilst a great majority of the people thought the Government would simply run it through without trying to make an equilibrium between expense and income, by adding to the tariff, and so giving more revenue, the most of people thought that no extra duties would be put on, but that we would go on and borrow in order to make up the deficiency. But a good many people did not think that would be done, and so the matter was discussed through the press, and some people came to the pretty shrewd guess that if any duties were put on, they would be put on to those two articles of sugar and whisky, or both. Now, this other consideration comes in. A man who had a cargo of sugar in the customs-house, or in port, six hours before the extra duty was placed, found, by that duty being placed on the next morning when he awoke, that he had gained just so much as was indicated by the rise in duty on the extra price which he could charge to the public, and that he gained that benefit without the expenditure of an atom of energy, physical or mental. Now, I say that a man has no right to complain if the Government takes what the Government intended to take, what the revenues require, the gain that was put upon it in the shape of added taxation, the object for which we brought down the resolution, the object for which the rate was raised. I think that consideration ought to be taken into account. We are taking nothing out of any man's pocket, we are taking nothing from any man that he has gained by an expenditure of his own energy, or his own vigour. I know exactly the line my hon. friend will take in answering me, but he cannot diminish in the least from what I think is the due weight that ought to be accorded to the argument I have made, backed up by the fact that we are pursuing exactly the same course as we did in the general revision of the tariff in 1894, and the conclusion come to is expressed in this section.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Had the hon. gentleman done his duty, or shown any business capacity in carrying out the principle he has just enunciated, there would be some excuse for it. But while he perfectly sees his duty, as his own remarks show, he did not exercise the slightest business capacity so as to prevent several of his own friends from using their business ingenuity, but not their own energy, in order to make a speculation at the public expense, at the expense of the consumer, out of the importation of the article of sugar, when nearly three-quarters of a million were lost to the revenue which might have been saved, had the hon. gentleman had the courage and ability to apply the principle he has laid down, and to prevent the duties on sugar from being lost to an enormous extent. He has allowed a grievance to be made, and he has at the same time allowed the better part of a million to be taken out of the public, and out of the public revenue, which might have been saved if he had understood how to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very good as an assertion, but I think my hon. friend will find it a very difficult thing to prove on a practical basis.

Mr. McMULLEN. In this matter of the sugar duty, I would like to inquire whether a considerable importation of beet root sugar was made by the Montreal Sugar Refining Co., over which Mr. Drummond presides, and whether it was permitted to come in free, or whether it paid duty. It arrived just about the time that the duty was imposed; I fancy that it would be in the St. Lawrence by that time. I understand a question has been in dispute as to whether the company should be called upon to pay duty on that importation. I would like to know whether that matter has been settled

between the Refining Company and the Government, and when the duty has been paid on that importation.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can say to my hon. friend is that every man has been treated alike, that upon all sugar which was not taken out from the customs before that day, duty is demanded, and duty is expected. If there be any particular considerations which entitle a man, as he thinks, to claim that his goods were not dutiable, under the Customs Act he has a perfect right to put in that claim. Just what the Government does is to abide by the law, and when the claims are put in and the information is gathered, the question is decided by the Treasury Board on report of the Department of Justice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has been done ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know exactly what has been done. The matter has been put into shape for making a claim, and if I mistake not it is before the Department of Justice.

Mr. LAURIER. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the line of argument laid down by him would make the date apply to the day on which the Budget speech was delivered, on 3rd May, and that would be most unfair to importers. The hon. gentleman occupied five or six hours in delivering the speech and the country then knew that the duties had been imposed. Up to that moment there had been no date fixed. Nobody could take advantage of the tariff until the following morning, but up to the time the custom-house was open for business and there was no reason why importers who went there to pass entries and pay the duties should not have been able to do so, and there was no power to call for duty beyond that required by law. The hon. gentleman says he acted for the benefit of the revenue. But importers on 2nd May had the good fortune to pass their entries at the old rates, whereas others on 4th May could not pass entries except by paying increased duties. But why should not the same rule apply to men who entered the custom-house at 10 or 11 on the morning of 3rd May or at any time before the Budget speech was delivered and before the will of the legislature was known, as well as the men who passed entries on the 2nd.

Mr. FOSTER. I will endeavour to show the hon. gentleman. The same rule applies for the very same reason. The hon. gentleman might ask why on the 3rd an importer should get in sugar free and yet had to pay half a cent per pound duty on the 4th. The reason was because the law said so. The law says so by implication when the resolution was brought down, according to the practice of Parliament, and it says so by positive enactment when the House passes it.

Mr. LAURIER. That then is the only reason—because the law says so. The hon. gentleman makes the law.

Mr. FOSTER. Parliament makes the law.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman had in view the object of obtaining an increased revenue when he made that law applicable on 3rd May, he could by making it retroactive to 3rd January have placed even a larger sum of money in the treasury.

Mr. FOSTER. I will answer that. You must be limited by practicability. I should like the hon. gentleman to suggest any scheme by which the Government could go back and collect duties on sugar not only which had been taken out by importers but which had gone into the general market and had been consumed and digested.

Mr. LAURIER. It might be done by an excise duty, and three millions more might be added to the treasury. The hon. gentleman says that is the law. But he makes the law, and if he can make it retroactive for one day, he can make it so for one week, one month or three months. The injustice in each case is the same. In many cases to make it retroactive for one day would do injury to importers.

Mr. FOSTER. I grant you that.

Mr. LAURIER. Then let the duty be collected as heretofere, from the time it was proclaimed on the floor of Parliament. The hon. gentleman says that this practice was followed last year. It was a most vicious practice he introduced. By all the rules of justice and equity which should guide us when we make laws, the hon. gentleman is just as wrong when he compels men who were in the custom-house at 11 o'clock on 3rd of May to pass their entries to pay increased duties as if he made the date retroactive to 3rd April. The hon. gentleman has no more right to so act in the one case than in the other. If the hon. gentleman will leave the high handed view he takes at this moment and come back to the plain dictates of justice and fairness he must agree that the time when the duties should be enforced is at the moment they are proclaimed in Parliament, and not before.

Mr. FOSTER. The authority for exacting duties does not depend on when the duty proposition is brought down, but when the law is passed by Parliament, and what are the conditions of that law. The hon. gentleman is inconsistent. I am hauled over the coals because I did not protect the revenue to the extent of a million dollars, which it is alleged went into the pockets of my friends among the business men by making legislation retroactive and inquisitive. Then the leader of the Opposition hauls me over the coals because I did not let my friends make three quarters of a million or a million more by not making it retroactive even for a day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, but because this is the first time the law has been made retroactive.

Mr. FOSTER. Not the first time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was no addition but a reduction, and the Government could not do any harm in that case, but even then it was an objectionable proceeding.

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

After Recess.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means were read the second time and concurred in.

CUSTOMS ACT.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 146) to amend the Customs Tariff, 1894.

Bill read the first time.

CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Amount required to pay the Allan Steamship Company for Ocean Mail Service between Great Britain and Canada $126,533.33

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to amend that by striking out the words "the Allan Steamship Company" after the word "pay." Then it will read, "Amount required to pay for ocean mail service between Great Britain and Canada." The reason of that is that one or two ships of the Dominion Line, the best vessels, are also employed, but they do not now belong to that company, that is they are altogether apart from it, and if we keep the words "Allan Steamship Company," it will cause difficulty.

Amendment agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 147) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Bill (No. 148) respecting the bounty on beet-root sugar.—(Mr. Foster.)

ORDERS DISCHARGED.

Second reading of Bill (No. 102) further to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.—(Mr. Foster.)

Second reading Bill (No. 118) to amend the Fisheries Act as respects the Salmon Fishery.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution: "That it is expedient to provide that instead of the deduction provided for by section 6 of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, a deduction shall be made from the salary of every person to whom the said Act applies, at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum on such salary if it is $600 or upwards, and of 3 per cent per annum thereon if it is less than $600.—(Mr. Foster.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 9.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 20th July, 1895.

Morning Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Ten o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION.

Mr. MARTIN asked, Whether Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper received payment from the British Government for his services in connection with the Behring Sea Arbitration, and if so, how much and when?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I received no payment from the British or any other government in connection with my services on the Behring Sea Arbitration. I may say that Sir John Thompson and myself were the only ones connected with the commission or the only officers connected with the British or Canadian Governments who did not receive compensation. All the arbitrators except Sir John Thompson received £1,000 sterling for their services, and the Attorney General of the British Government received the usual professional fees for his services, over and above his salary as Attorney General, and the officers of the British and Canadian Governments connected with that work were also paid compensation, in addition to their ordinary salary. Sir John Thompson and I received nothing but our expenses. I may add incidentally that Sir John Thompson lost a large portion of his sessional allowance, and I lost the whole of mine. The Canadian Government paid the expenses of Sir John Thompson and myself.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of cer-

tain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1896, the sum of $20,605,459.80 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 149), for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the fiancial year ending the 30th June, 1896, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 146) to amend the Customs Tariff, 1894.—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 147) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 148) respecting the bounty on Beetroot Sugar.

QUEBEC, MONTMORENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. AMYOT moved concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 98) respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the amendment ?

Mr. AMYOT. It is to embody in the Bill an agreement with the Electric Light Company of Quebec, which was overlooked after the discussion upon the amendment moved by the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Frémont). The effect of the amendment is to restrict the powers given to Mr. Beemer so as to authorize him to sell the surplus of electricity only on condition that he is to buy power from the Electric Company in Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. The agreement has been made between the promoter of the company and the Electric Company ?

Mr. AMYOT. Yes, and the matter was overlooked when the Bill was before the House on the last occasion.

Amendment concurred in.

WINNIPEG GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (p. 4819) respecting the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope that some explanations will be given.

Mr. HAGGART. The resolution is intended as the basis for a Bill to enable what was the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company to change the starting point of their line, and to begin from Gladstone or Portage la Prairie and build northerly to the Saskatchewan. They had power under their charter—I think there is no doubt about that—to build the line of railway from Winnipeg to Gladstone or Portage la Prairie, but by doing so they would be paralleling the line of the Canadian Pacific or a line of the Northern Pacific, which is manifestly undesirable. The object of the Bill is to allow the company to earn $40,000 a year upon the completion of half their road from Gladstone or Portage la Prairie to the Saskatchewan. Another power the Government propose to take under the Bill is this : In the event of the company not being able or not showing sufficient energy in pushing the road or not making manifest the probability of completing the road, the Government may enter into arrangements with another company for the purpose of building that portion of the line between Gladstone, or Arden or Portage la Prairie, whichever may be the starting point, in the direction of the Saskatchewan. It interferes with no security which is at present on the road. The only interference to be avoided is in this direction : the company has already built forty miles of the road from Winnipeg northerly upon which work they have issued bonds—to what extent I do not know. The bondholders may say and contend that they advanced on that particular part of the road on the faith of the undertaking. The bondholders will have the same security if the present company build the road from Gladstone north as they had before.

Mr. MARTIN. I think we are entitled to more complete explanation as to why the company desire to build west of Lake Manitoba rather than to complete their undertaking from the end of the forty miles already built. This is called the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway and was always understood to be a railway from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay. Now, by the amendment the company propose to abandon Winnipeg as their starting point and commence at Portage la Prairie or Gladstone. It does seem to me that the company should be bound to give some explanation to Parliament why it is necessary to the object they have to attain to abandon forty miles which they have already constructed, throwing that away and starting from a point western, like Portage la Prairie or Gladstone. The hon. minister has not given us the slightest reason for the change. He did tell us that the company desired to run from Winnipeg around the southern end and up the west side of Lake Manitoba to the Saskatchewan, but he gave no reason for that.

I would not oppose any objections to their going on the west side of Lake Manitoba ; I do not think it is a matter of very great importance to my constituents. But it is a matter of very serious importance to my constituents that this company should abandon Winnipeg as a starting point and start from a point like Portage la Prairie or Gladstone. I have heard no reason suggested why that should be done. The hon. Minister of Railways said that the Government would not be prepared to allow the company to fill in the link between Winnipeg and the proposed starting point, because there are two railways covering that territory already. I do not dissent from the position taken by the Government in regard to that matter, but that seems to be another reason why the company should not be allowed, without very good reason, to make this change. It is contended, and it seems to me reasonable, that the company have no right, under their present charter to build from any point except Winnipeg, and that they must build from Winnipeg northerly, and so that would have no right under their present charter to go westerly around the southern end of Lake Manitoba and then north to the Saskatchewan, because that would not be building northerly from Winnipeg toward Hudson Bay. Of course, in the Bill that is to follow this resolution, the authority will be given to make this change ; but, as I say, I think some reason should be given.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) I do not see any ground for the statement made by the Minister of Railways that the present charter will permit the company to begin at Gladstone, or some other point than the one which would be a continuation of the road already begun from Winnipeg. I notice in the Act of last year the assumption is that the railway company will continue the construction of the present line. It says :

> The deficiency shall form a lien on one-third of the land grant which may be earned by the company on the line between the end of the 40 miles of said railway as now constructed, and the Saskatchewan River.

It is therefore perfectly clear that the assumption is that the road is to be continued from the extremity of the road which is now constructed, and that it is to be extended thence north from the Saskatchewan River. I have had placed in my hands a telegram from the solicitors of Mackenzie & Mann, who say they have the first lien upon this road for the sum of £80,000 sterling, and they desire that there shall be no legislation which would deprive them of the rights which they now hold. If this road is begun at another point instead of being a continuation of the line upon which these bonds are given as a lien, it will be practically the construction of a new road, and would discharge the obligations of the company to those parties, and it would in all probability seriously affect the security which the parties hold, if the road was completed on the plan as proposed. Then I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to another matter. A Bill was carried through last year, the legal effect of which, I think, was not very clearly apprehended by the House ; and in looking over the Bill which is now under consideration, I do not think there is any improvement in this particular. I will mention it for the information of the Minister, and I shall be glad to know what he intends to do in the matter. I find that under this grant to the company of $80,000 per annum for a period of 20 years, the public services mentioned in the Bill may be pledged by the company for the purpose of raising money for the construction of the road. I also conclude, from a careful examination of the statutes, that if that is done, no matter whether the road is ever operated or not, the Government will be liable for the payment of this $80,000 a year, or $40,000, as the case may be, to the parties who have advanced money upon this annual grant as a security. In looking over the Act of last year it seems to me that the intention of the draughtsman, and of the Government at whose instance the law was so drawn, was that this should be the case, that the Government intended the country shall take the risk of losing the moneys which it so expends, because the law provides that the country shall secure itself in another way for the means which are so expended. Now I am anxious to point out to the Minister that that security cannot be of any value to the country at all, because the land is granted upon the assumption that the road will be constructed and operated, and if the road is not constructed and operated, these parties would really not be entitled to that grant ; and if the grant is made, the lands practically belong to the Government, and ought not to be handed over to the company except upon the actual construction of the road. As I read this statute, and as I read this Bill—assuming that the Government undertake to carry it through Parliament and it becomes law—these parties to whom this charter is given may pledge this annual subsidy to capitalists in the United States or in England, and may raise money to the amount of the present value of that annual subsidy, and may never complete a mile of the road, and yet the country would be liable to pay.

Mr. HAGGART. No. If there is any doubt on that point at all, we will remove it. They will only be entitled to any portion of it after the road is constructed and equipped. We will make that clear if there is any doubt.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) But the hon. gentleman will see that before the road is constructed, these parties will desire to pledge this grant as a security to the parties who advance their money. That advance must

take place before the road is built, and those parties look to the Government for the payment of this sum of money in consequence of that advance. This statute as it stands compels the Government, in point of honour and of law, to meet that obligation and compels them to look to the land security for the moneys which they have advanced.

Mr. HAGGART. I may be excused for saying a few words more to the hon. gentlemen, and especially the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) who spoke first. He says that the terminus of the road was intended to be at Winnipeg. It is, under the present Bill. One of the duties of the Government, before entering into a contract, would be to ascertain the probability of a connection being made between Winnipeg and the point of starting. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council have power do that. They can change the running powers or freight rates over either of the roads that are already built; so that part of the objection is removed. Then the hon. gentleman makes another objection, that the grant may be paid out before the construction of the road. It is true, these parties get this security and put it upon the market. The party who buys the security does it on the faith of the construction of the road, and one of the first things that he will look into will be to see that the company have entered into arrangements with a competent and responsible contractor that the road will be finished, and that the grant will be paid out only on progress estimates as the road proceeds. The Government do not advance one cent of money until after the construction of the road. After the road is constructed, under the old charter, the $80,000 a year became liable to be paid to the company; but under the new one, $40,000 a year. The reason of the change from one side of the lake to the other which the Government take power to make in entering into a contract, is because for the first 100 miles, it passes throught the finest portions of the North-west Territories, that is, this part of it west of Lake Manitoba. The hon. gentleman must be aware that it is not for the purpose of building a road to the Hudson Bay that we are assisting this railway. When the Bill was introduced year before last providing for the construction of a road to the Saskatchewan, it was stated to be merely a colonization road. The Government were in no way pledged to a terminus further off than the Saskatchewan River. They do not commit themselves at all to the Hudson Bay Company's scheme; they commit themselves solely to the assistance of a colonization road which runs in the direction of the Saskatchewan River. This eventually might be a part of the Hudson Bay scheme, but it is not a part of the Hudson Bay scheme at present, as has been stated in this House and in the Senate. It is only for the purpose of assisting a road whose terminus shall be the Saskatchewan River. We are making no new application. The company at present has a contract with the Government, that on the completion of the road to the Saskatchewan River, they shall receive $80,000 a year, and this contract expires next year. The obligation we incur now is not to a greater extent than it was before: it is simply dividing the obligation into two payments, $40,000 a year being paid when one-half the road is built.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it would be preferable if the Minister of Railways would be wholly frank instead of being half frank with the House. It would have been better if the hon. gentleman had said that this was not a link of the Hudson Bay Railway, if ever such a road is to be built, but it is a colonization road. It cannot be a road to Hudson Bay, for it goes towards the Pacific Ocean if it goes any direction at all.

Mr. DALY. As regards this being a road of a colonization character, the hon. gentleman is correct, but it is also a link in what we hope to be the end of the Hudson Bay road, because the same company that is to build this road has power to build the Hudson Bay road, and this will eventually become part of the scheme towards which our people have been looking so long. In reply to the hon. member for Bothwell, I may say that in 1891, at the time the $80,000 a year subsidy was granted, it was stated by Mr. Dewdney and myself in the course of the discussion, and we had a map on the table, that when the route was changed from the east side of Lake Manitoba to the west it was to go through the Dauphin country, and was to serve the people there as a colonization road. That was the reason for the change of the route to the west of Lake Manitoba. As the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) stated in connection with another charter, these people want a line of railway from Gladstone westward.

Mr. MARTIN. This road will not go through the Dauphin country.

Mr. DALY. I am satisfied it will serve the settlers there; the country is well settled from Gladstone to Dauphin Lake.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. Minister is entirely wrong.

Mr. DALY. The company has laid out the route, and the right of way agent has made his report, it is in the hands of the company, and it shows the country thickly settled from Gladstone for the first hundred miles, and for that distance the road goes practically through a wheat field. That is the report I have from the president of the road, and it is based on the reports I have seen. As to the question raised by the hon. member for Bothwell in regard to the possibility of the promoters of the road hypothecating the $80,000 and not building a yard of the road, section 81 of the Act of 1891 provides that the money will only be paid on the con-

struction of the railway, and that such payment is to be computed from the completion of the railway ; and the people to whom the $80,000 in securities were hypothecated would be obliged to look after the contracts being carried out and the road built, otherwise their securities would be of no value. So there would be no question about the build- of the road if the bonds were hypothecated, because the holders of the securities would have to construct and complete the road before they received one dollar from the Government. In regard to the remarks made about Mackenzie & Mann, I saw a telegram from the solicitor of Mackenzie & Mann to the effect that they understood legislation was to be passed by which certain creditors would be excluded, and that bonding powers were to be included in this Bill. There are no bonding powers included in the Bill, and the judgment creditors of the railway stand exactly in the same position today as they did previously, and this Bill does not affect them, because the judgment is good against the franchise and all securities and assets of the line, whether built to the end of the first forty miles or in the direction laid down by the Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). A question of identity might come up as to whether this was the same road or not.

Mr. DALY. When the name of the company was changed that was provided for. As to the position of the local government, there is an agreement filed between the company and the provincial government providing that on the land grant being earned the lien of the local government shall be removed ; in fact, an equitable arrangement has been made between the company and the local government, whereby the Government's security will remain unimpaired. The only change, as has been already stated by the Minister of Railways, is that we are dividing the subsidy, giving the company one-half the amount after half the railway has been constructed, the other half becoming available afterwards.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I should like to ask the Minister of Railways whether in regard to the $40,000 a year to be paid as a subsidy for the first section of the railway to be built north, any provision has been made for the continuous operating of the road during the twenty years in which the money is payable ?

Mr. HAGGART. No ; nor is there any such provision in the old contract. The only condition is the forfeiture of the land grant. The undertaking of the company is to build the road in twenty years, but we have no practical or real lien except one-third of the land grant, and in this respect we have followed exactly the words of the original contract.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.) What occurred to me in that connection was this : This Government might, I fear, have an experience similar to that which may occur to them in connection with another road for which a similar subsidy was given, an experience of an unfortunate and not a very satisfactory character with respect to the road from Regina to Prince Albert. I fear there is a danger that, after the construction of the railway, there may a difficulty occur in the operating of the road ; and the position would be this, that the Government would be paying out an annual subsidy of $40,000 a year to a road not in operation. Now, for a distance of 125 miles of a colonization road—which I understand this railway is now to be considered—for that 125 miles of colonization road from Gladstone north, a subsidy of $40,000 a year for twenty years is to be voted. If you capitalize that, you will find it is equivalent to a bonus, or a subsidy of about $8,000 a mile. That, perhaps, is not too large a subvention for a main trunk line to the Hudson Bay.

Mr. HAGGART. It is only $4,000 a mile.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.) It is 4 per cent on a million dollars if I can figure correctly.

Mr. HAGGART. But you must remember they do not get the capital back at the end of twenty years, which is an important thing.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.) It gives them pretty near to that as I think, on the basis of finance anyway. Well, it might not be too large a sum for a main trunk line to the Hudson Bay, but it does seem a large subvention for a mere colonization road, more particularly when there are competitors for the construction of a road through the same territory who would probably accept a less subsidy than is proposed to be granted to this road.

Mr. MACDONALD. As reference has been made to the Long Lake Railway, my recollection is that the $80,000 a year was given for certain services to be rendered, such as the transport of mails and Government supplies, and it is the same in this case. If, therefore, the road ceases to be operated the payment of $80,000 a year falls through.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.) If that were done in this case there would be no objection.

Mr. DALY. In answer to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) I may say that the conditions existing so far as the Regina and Long Lake Railway are concerned, and the conditions in this case are entirely different. From Regina to Saskatoon that railway runs through a country that is scarcely inhabited at all, and I do not suppose the company is earning anything on that portion

of the road. The first 125 miles of this line with which we are now dealing runs through a country that is settled to-day, and that will afford sufficient traffic to this railway to pay its running expenses even in the present condition of the country. Of course as the country grows and the population increases the carrying powers of the company will be increased correspondingly. There is no doubt in the world that from the day this line is started the company will be a going concern on this first 125 miles. The conditions which the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) mentions in connection with the Long Lake Railway cannot possibly exist in this case. The Government retains one-third of the land grant. This company is entitled to five and a half miles on each side of the railway. The building of the railway enhances the value of the land through which it runs, and the Government retaining one-third of that land grant, retains land that is not only worth the nominal sum of $1 an acre, but is also worth whatever increased value is given to it by the building of the railway. That one-third of the land grant will be ample security for any default which may be made on the part of the company. The hon. gentleman will see that where the railway runs right through this land grant, the land is proportionately increased in value as the country is settled up, and as the adjoining sections are occupied by homesteaders, and the adjoining odd-sections sold to settlers coming in. That one-third is perfect security for any default that may be made in the carrying on of the railway.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) There is one extraordinary thing about this road. There are forty miles constructed which are now to be practically abandoned. The intention of the parties was to build a road east of Lake Manitoba, and now it is proposed to locate the road west. This is not the same as if it were for the construction of a definite line of railway, but it is in search for the location of a road the charter of which is held by certain parties. The hon. gentleman said that this road would go to the Dauphin settlement, but the Dauphin settlement is west of Lake Dauphin and this road lies to the east.

Mr. HAGGART. Not all of it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes; as located on the map.

Mr. HAGGART. It goes to the south of the lake and east of it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The lake is very broad at the southern end, and the whole width of the lake intervenes between the road as located and the settlement, so that the Dauphin settlement must be left out of the question altogether as to the construction of the road.

Mr. HAGGART. We are not confined strictly to the line, as that is an approximate line on the map. You could go west of the lake if it is found to be more advantageous, and that would only increase the length of the road a couple of miles.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is the difficulty of getting through Northwood.

Mr. DALY. Even as the line is located it is only 18 miles from Gartmore which is the principal post office in the heart of the best settled portion of the Dauphin country. At present these people are about eighty miles from a railway by their nearest wagon route, and if we bring them within 18 miles, we give them all the accommodation that the great part of the people of Manitoba have got to-day. Gartmore is in Range 19, and the railway as located will run east off Lake Dauphin which is in Range 16.

Mr. MARTIN. I was struck with the observation made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), that this road was to be treated as merely a local colonization road. I take for granted that the propositions which the Government has made now are in strict accordance with the declarations made by the Government in 1891, when they first granted this subsidy of $80,000 a year. The statement made by the hon. Minister of the Interior of that time, Mr. Dewdney, was that the Government were not proposing by that Act to aid in any way a railway to the Hudson Bay, but were simply granting that subsidy for the purpose of opening up the country between Winnipeg and the Saskatchewan. That proposition has been still further modified by this resolution; that is to say, it is now proposed to divide that subsidy into two, and to grant $40,000 a year to this company for the purpose of opening up that comparatively small piece of country lying west of Lake Manitoba, including the Dauphin settlement. The whole undertaking, then, is treated as a local one, and there is in this resolution no recognition of the general scheme of a railway to connect Manitoba and the North-west with the Hudson Bay, with which this company started out. Discussing the local feature of the undertaking, I cannot understand the statement made by the hon. Minister of the Interior, because he must be mistaken as to the character of the country through which this railway is located. It is true, for twenty-five or thirty miles north of Gladstone there is a good settlement, which is now served by the Manitoba and North-western Railway; but north of that distance there are no settlers at all. It is true, there are settlers west of it, in the country between the Manitoba and North-western Railway and the Riding Mountains. That is a good country and well settled, and this proposed railway will skirt the eastern part of that settlement. But the country through which it runs itself is a low, swampy country, in which there are no settlers now, and there will not be any until the country is

drained, if it is possible to drain it, which I doubt very much. The country lying between Lake Manitoba and Lake Dauphin is the last country in the world that would require a railway. The ony reason that could have induced the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway to take that route is the directness of the line towards Hudson Bay. But if we are discussing this line as a colonization line, we must dismiss the question of its directness towards Hudson Bay; and if the Government are prepared to pay $40,000 per annum for a railway to open up the good country lying west of Lake Manitoba, they are taking the very worst possible route for that purpose. It is true, as the hon. Minister of the Interior has pointed out, the people of the Lake Dauphin settlement may come east to this railway, although I am very much inclined to think, from what I know of the country, that it will cost a very great deal to open up roads from that settlement to this railway. The hon. Minister must know that the Lake Dauphin settlement extends away west of Gartmore, and so far as that portion of it is concerned, this railway will be of no benefit whatever. If we desire simply to treat it as a local colonization road, we should compel the company to run it from Gladstone, somewhat in the direction they are taking, but going west of Lake Manitoba, and then westerly through the Lake Dauphin settlement. When the Minister talks of the land grant being valuable because the railway will be built through it, he is mistaken, because the land is not fit for agriculture, and will not be materially improved.

Mr. DALY. I spoke of the first 125 miles.

Mr. MARTIN. I say that with the exception of the first 25 miles north of Gladstone, the country through which this line is proposed to be run is low and swampy, and not the kind that can be developed for settlement.

Mr. DALY. You are mistaken.

Mr. MARTIN. I am not mistaken. The country is inhabited only by a few ranchers here and there, who have gone in for the hay. The only information the Minister has as to the character of the country is from the agent of this company. Would it not be well, before the Government undertake to give away $40,000 a year of the country's money, that they should get from their own engineer a report as to the character of the country through which this line is projected, and also the country west of Lake Dauphin? I am speaking from personal knowledge of the country, and I am satisfied that the report of that official would be that this railway as projected is not suited to the development of the country, and that it should be carried decidedly to the west of Lake Dauphin.

Mr. LAURIER. If such be the character of the country through which this railway is to be constructed, there is all the greater force in the remarks made by the hon. member for Cardwell. The road might not be operated as it should be, and the country would be liable for the subsidy without receiving any value in return for it.

Mr. BOYD. There is no doubt that there are more settlers between Gladstone and Lake Dauphin on this projected line than there are in the whole settlement to which the hon. member for Winnipeg refers. The railway is unquestionably going through a good country.

Mr. MARTIN. West of it, not east of it. I admit that it does skirt the eastern side of the settlement I refer to. But so far as the country between Lake Manitoba and this line is concerned, it is swampy and low.

Mr. BOYD. Have you ever been there?

Mr. MARTIN. No; but I have conversed with people who have been there.

Mr. BOYD. Just what I thought; you do not know anything about it.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, I do. I have seen plenty of people who have been up there, and I have been up in that direction myself, not very far, but I know the general character of the country. I have driven through portions of it. Between Riding Mountain and the railway, when you run east of Lake Dauphin, you get into a country of no use for settlement but only good for purposes of stock raising. If you take the other course, and vary still more to the west than this does, when you get to the Dauphin district you get into a good country which is already settled.

Mr. LAURIER. It is generally understood that the fertile portion of the Dauphin country is on the west side and not on the east side of the lake.

Mr. HAGGART. The whole question was threshed out five or six years ago before the Railway Committee. There was an application for a charter, the renewal of which passed the House the other day, for the purpose of building a road between Lake Dauphin and Lake Manitoba. There is a fall of sixteen feet from Lake Manitoba to Lake Winnipeg. It was proposed to lower the lake and make a canal, and then build this railway to that particular section of country. From all the information I have got providing there was a couple of feet of water lowered from Lake Manitoba, the region between Lake Dauphin and Manitoba would be the finest part of the whole Northwest. However, the charter does not limit the compay to go in between Lakes Dauphin and Manitoba. The company may have the option of selecting what part of the country they please going northerly, and they ought to be the best judges of the route.

Mr. MARTIN. It makes a great deal of difference whether the company view the

road as one from Gladstone to Hudson Bay or merely as a local road to build up the country.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It may be fairly assumed that the company will see that its line goes throught the best populated country. Permission has been given to deflect either to the right or to the left.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In going east, they are going through their own land. That may be a very important consideration with them.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I entirely agree in the observations made by the Minister of the Interior to the effect that the country through which the road is to be built is likely to be profitable to railway operation. If that be so, why is it necessary that so large a subsidy should be voted? At least I would ask from the Minister of Railways that a condition should be inserted to the effect that unless the road continues to be operated for twenty years, the $40,000 subsidy will not be granted. That would be perfectly logical and consistent, based on the statement, which no doubt is true, that the character of the country warrants a road being constructed through it and operated profitably. The country should be protected by our requiring continuous operation to take place before the subsidy is granted.

Mr. HAGGART. A subsidy of $40,000 a year, which would not be payable until twenty years afterwards would not be worth anything at all.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They already have their land.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman makes the calculation—it is spread over twenty years, and the total amounts to $800,000—if he purchased an annuity for that, my opinion is he would not receive half a million dollars.

Mr. MARTIN. The Government must not forget that the first forty miles of land earned will belong to the local government.. That would take up the great bulk of good land which this company has located there. I do not like to let pass the observations of the Minister of Railways with regard to the lowering of Lake Manitoba. That is another question. If Lake Manitoba were lowered, there is no doubt at all this country, which I referred to as being swampy, would be very much altered in character. But there is a great big "if" there. I am glad the Minister of Railways has that in mind and has not forgotten the observations made in this House. If the Government desire really to do something for Manitoba, there is their opportunity. It will not only apply to this particular country proposed to be served by this railroad but to the country around Lake Manitoba on the east, west and south. There are very large tracts of exceedingly valuable land, worth $15 to $20 an acre, if the lake were only lowered. It would not cost a very large amount to make the necessary canal, to deepen the outlet between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg. I should be glad to give the Government my hearty support in any proposition of the kind.

Resolutions read a second time and concurred in.

Mr. HAGGART moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 150), respecting the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I would take this opportunity of making a statement which I had hoped for an earlier opportunity of making. In the debate which arose on the ministerial explanations as to the formation of the Government, I made some remarks as to what had taken place respecting Sir Frank Smith. What I said was based upon a newspaper report which I have never seen corrected in any way and which I thought I was justified in assuming to be correct. I have since learned on what I consider to be reliable authority, that the report never was authorized by Sir Frank Smith, and, therefore, I came to the conclusion that the remarks I made were without foundation, and I have to express my sincere regret that I spoke as I did of a gentleman who is universally respected and whom I was sorry to feel called upon to characterize in the language I did.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like also to make an explanation as to a statement that I made, in a way, guardedly. I said, speaking from recollection, in answer to a question when the penitentiaries Bill was going through, that I thought the Roman Catholics were in the majority in the penitentiaries. That statement is erroneous. I find on looking at the report that there are more of other denominations than Catholics—some twenty more.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.30 a.m.

Afternoon Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received the following communication from the Secretary of His Excellency the Governor General:—

Office of the Governor General's Secretary,
Ottawa, 20th July, 1895.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the session of the Dominion Parliament, on Saturday, the 20th instant, at 5.30 p.m.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
ARTHUR GORDON,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

PENITENTIARIES ACT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved concurrence to amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 131) to amend the Acts respecting Penitentiaries. He said: The amendment has substantially the same effect as was intended in the first place. It corrects a mistake, probably of my own, made during the hurry of consideration when the Bill was in committee. It is in connection with the sections which shall apply to persons hereinafter appointed, and they vary the language by saying "hereinafter appointed or promoted to any office or employment."

Amendments concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

Bill (No. 149) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1896, and for other purposes relating to the public service of Canada, was read the second time, considered in committee, and read the third time and passed.

WINNIPEG GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. HAGGART moved second reading of Bill (No. 150) respecting the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I submit that this Bill cannot be now read the second time. It is a private Bill, and ought to have been introduced by petition, and therefore cannot be proceeded with as a public Bill. I think the case of the Northern Railway Company, which you will remember, is a case in point, and that being so I do not think this Bill can be proceeded with this session.

Mr. SPEAKER. This question having only just now been raised, it is impossible for me to decide the point without having an opportunity of looking into it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is a Government proposition.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not care whether it is a Government proposition or not. This is essentially a private Bill, it is a Bill to promote a private enterprise, it is a Bill dealing with the rights and interests of a private corporation as such. I will just read a paragraph from Dr. Bourinot's book, which I think will establish that fact:

> Sometimes doubts may arise whether a Bill should be classed as public or private. Many cases of this nature occurred in the practice of the old Canadian legislature, but the Houses generally allowed themselves to be guided by the decision of the committee to whom a Bill might be referred. A committee has, under such circumstances, made some amendments to a Bill in order to obviate the difficulty, and bring it under the category of a public or private Bill. In the session of 1865, a Bill was brought up from the Legislative Council intituled "An Act to enable the Church Societies and incorporated Synods of the Church of England Dioceses in Canada to sell Rectorial Lands in the said Dioceses," and the objection was taken that it was private in its character and ought to have been introduced by petition. The Speaker decided against the Bill, on which no further progress was consequently made. All bills respecting synods and religious corporations are considered private since 1867.

Then Mr. Mackenzie introduced a Bill relating to the Northern Railway, a road extending from Toronto northward to the shores of Lake Huron, and to make certain alterations in the charter of the Bill. Speaking on that occasion, it was decided that the Bill must be withdrawn and the proceedings taken by petition and notice in the regular way. It is clear from what the Minister of Railways said this afternoon that this is practically an amendment to a private Bill. Here is a private corporation created for the purpose of constructing a railway. The Government propose to make a change.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They could not do that by any Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly, the company might not be able to do so. But this is proof that the Bill is an amendment to an Act of incorporation of the company and should be introduced by petition and proceedings taken on it in the ordinary way as regards a private Bill. This in no respect differs from the proceedings in regard to the Northern Railway Bill, and the ruling of the Speaker at that time was that it was a private Bill and should be introduced as such.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is an obvious distinction. This is a rearrangement of a parliamentary grant, and it cannot be carried out except by legislation introduced by the Government on resolution. There is no way of accomplishing this except by the mode adopted, the Government in the first instance having obtained the assent of the Crown. All the necessary steps have now been taken. This is legislation regarding a grant of public money, and it is a matter over which the private members have no control. It is a mere accident that it is amending a charter, and, of course, this Bill is being pressed forward with the assent

of the parties interested. That was true of the Northern Railway Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman who raises the point will be kind enough to quote the Act incorporating the Hudson Bay Railway Company.

Mr. MARTIN. The Bill was passed in 1887.

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to put forward an argument which must convince the House that the Bill cannot be proceeded with according to the manner in which it has been introduced. The company is authorized to build a line from Winnipeg east of Lake Manitoba, and the plan shows the route to be followed. To-day it is proposed to deviate from the route which was authorized by the charter of 1887, when the Bill was introduced and passed.

Mr. HAGGART. The Bill says northerly and north-easterly from Winnipeg.

Mr. LAURIER. This is the practical effect of the Bill. According to the charter of 1887 the road is to pass east of Lake Manitoba. To-day, according to the plan submitted to the House, a new line is shown which is to be constructed according to the terms of this Bill, if it becomes law. It is a matter of public notoriety that bonds have been issued on the road as chartered in 1887, that there are over $200,000 of bonds affecting this road, the holders of those bonds having a vested interest in the road. Now it is proposed to give authority to this company to deviate from the line authorized to be built, which has been bonded and on which money has been obtained, and construct a new road, and thereby render valueless the bonds on which the company has obtained money. This affects private interests. How are the bondholders to protect themselves? They have received no notice of this Bill, and yet this company, authorized to build in a certain direction, proposes to build in another and thereby render their present bonds valueless. Under such circumstances we must come to the conclusion that the rights of the bondholders are seriously jeopardised by this legislation. What is the use of our rules in regard to private legislation? Notice has to be given to the parties, then a Bill introduced, and the Bill referred to committee, and many formalities has to be observed, so that the bondholders and creditors may have an opportunity of protecting and defending their rights when the Bill comes before the House for discussion. Under the present circumstances how is it possible to deviate the road to afford that right to private parties? What will occur? The company will be authorized to build, not the line bonded, but another line, and the bonds on the first line will not be worth the paper on which they are written. So, in my estimation, this is a fatal objection to the course taken. This Bill does not interfere in the least from the company's right to build in another direction. It simply gives power to construct the road from a different point. The bondholders hold bonds on a particular section already built, forty miles in length. The charter allows the company to go along the Saskatchewan, or take another route to Water Hen River, or to start from Gladstone to the Saskatchewan—the undertaking is bonded to the bondholders the same as if it was built from either point to the Saskatchewan. The bondholders could not possibly object to the proposed legislation because the undertaking, so long as it is continued by the company which intends to build the railway, is bonded to the bondholders, and is an increased security to them over and above what they possessed before.

Mr. MARTIN. These are statements that might be controverted. The hon. Minister takes one view, but others might contend for the contrary view, and there is there a question of private rights which it is attempted to decide and dispose of by this House without the ordinary formalities by which the rules of this House protect private interests in matters of this kind. Let me point to the statute of 1891 affecting this railway which is entirely unobjectionable. This Act is in accordance with the point mentioned by the Minister just as being a matter for the Government and a matter only requiring the consent of the Crown. There was a statute which, while it undertook to give to this railway a subsidy from the Crown, interfered in no respect with and altered in no respect the rights and liabilities of the company itself. That was a statute which was quite properly introduced into the House as a public measure. And I quite agree that those portions of this Bill which modify the statute of 1891, were quite in order, and that such a Bill could only be introduced by the Government. But the objection raised to this Bill is not with regard to the modification of the subsidy, not with regard to changes in the terms on which that subsidy is to be paid, but with regard to section 2 of this Bill, which undertakes to modify and change the statute, chapter 81 of the statutes of 1887, which was a private Act and to change it in such a way that various persons might contend, would be contrary to their interests. The Act of 1887, in pursuance of the Act which preceded it, because it is a consolidating Act, granted the railway aid for 40 miles of line. The local government aided the construction of that 40 miles of railway by handing over to the railway company, under the provisions of the local Act $256,000 worth of Manitoba Government bonds, in return for which the railway company agreed to transfer to the Manitoba Government 256,000 acres of land, to be held as security for the principal and interest of those bonds. Now, Mr. Speaker, surely it will not be contended that the

Manitoba Government would not have the right to be heard, and would not be entitled to the protection that the rules of this House provide in relation to private Bills as to the proposition to abandon that 40 miles of line. It is proposed to abandon that 40 miles.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; but to give this guarantee.

Mr. MARTIN. The proposal is to abandon that 40 miles. Here is what is provided by section 3:—

Instead of the said railway so to be completed as aforesaid under the existing contract commencing as therein provided for, at the north end of the forty miles already constructed by the company, it may commence at or near Portage la Prairie and run northerly to a point of intersection with the company's main line.

—and so on. When that 40 miles was built was it the intention to make a road running 40 miles from Winnipeg? No. The absurdity of that proposition is manifest when you consider the terms of the land grant which the local government gave. And besides, it is well known to everybody that the local government gave that money not for the purpose of aiding a road 40 or 50 miles in length, but for the purpose of aiding a road to run from Winnipeg to Hudson Bay. It was known as the Hudson Bay Railway. The amendment has the effect of allowing the railway to make its terminus not Winnipeg but Gladstone or Portage la Prairie. Surely it cannot be contended that that is not a modification of the private Act, chapter 81 of the statutes of 1887. There are two portions of this Bill, one providing for a change in the subsidy, as to which no objection is raised and which it is quite in order to introduce as a public measure, and the other, contained in section 3, giving the company new powers and new rights, as to which no notice has been given. As to this part, the Manitoba Government has had no opportunity to come before the Railway Committee of this House, as provided in the rules of this House, to show whether they take the view suggested by the hon. Minister of Railways or whether they take some other view. I believe they would take an entirely different view from that of the hon. Minister.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That would not effect this point.

Mr. MARTIN. Certainly. What is the object of the rules? The object is to give protection. Surely that is a——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It does not affect the Manitoba Government's position.

Mr. MARTIN. I only speak of the Manitoba Government because they are a body outside of this House which the rules of this House are intended to protect, just as they protect others.

Mr. SPEAKER. Have they bonded part of the road constructed?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, Mr. Speaker. They have issued bonds on the 40 miles, I think, at the rate of $20,000 a mile, a very considerable portion of which bonds are held by Messrs. Mann & Holt, who built the railway, and another portion are held by the company in England which furnished the steel rails used to construct the road. Now, surely, Mr. Speaker, it is most pertinent to the question of order whether this Bill interferes with the company in its relation to other persons. The object of the rule is to protect private interests in such cases. The object is that the House shall not proceed to deal with private interests and private rights unless and until a petition has been presented to Parliament, preceded by the advertisements provided for in the rules of the House and until the Standing Order Committee has satisfied itself that these rules have been complied with. And even then the Bill is referred to the Railway Committee, in order that parties interested may be heard. I am not asking the House to pronounce any decision as to the Manitoba Government's claims or the bondholder's claims or the judgment creditors claims—for there are judgment creditors, who are interested in anything that is done with regard to changing the line or changing the organization of the company in any way. No persons have been given any notice of this. It comes in at the end of the session, and even now the House has it before it in rather an irregular way. No printed copy of the Bill has been distributed, I understand. I am not in a position to say what view the Manitoba Government will take in regard to this matter. But I have stated their relation to the company, and undoubtedly their interest would entitle them to come to the Railway Committee and state whether they thought these changes would affect their interests or not. So also with the bondholders and the judgment creditors. Without attempting to suggest whether these claims are or are not fair, or whether they would or would not be considered fair by the Railway Committee, I make the point that these changes are such that the parties interested have a right to be protected by the rules of the House which provides for the method of introducing and passing a private Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With the consent of the House I wish to give an authority for the position I take. The Red Sea and India Telegraph Company was incorporated in the English Parliament, and in May I find a reference to it which seems to be exactly in point:

In 1861, the Red Sea and Indian Telegraph Bill, which amended a private Act, was introduced and proceeded with as a public Bill, as it concerned the conditions of a Government guarantee.

I submit, without further argument, that that is the best support of the point I took which was that in this case no private promoter could introduce or carry through the legislature. And, as the Minister of Railways has said, this interferes with none of the companies' rights ; it is a permissive Bill in that sense, and we are stating conditions upon which the company can, if it chooses, earn certain Government aid.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps I may be permitted the same privilege as the Minister of Justice. In the case the hon. Minister has just quoted there is nothing to show that private interests were involved as in this case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There must be.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That was a company in which the public had an interest and in which it was necessary for the Government to act. But as there were private parties who were to be affected by the Bill, it was held that the semi-judicial charter which applied to private Bills would apply to it, and therefore the parties whose interests were likely to be affected were entitled to the usual notice. That is precisely the principle applicable to this case. Here is a road which, as originally chartered, was to begin at Winnipeg and extend northward on the east side of Lake Manitoba for forty miles. Bonds are issued by private parties interested in that road ; the value of those bonds will depend largely on whether it is continued northward any further or not. If it is continued as far as the Saskatchewan, any one will say that the security will be far more valuable than if it terminated where it now does. If the present line is abandoned after the construction of the forty miles, these securities become comparatively valueless, and the parties who hold them are entitled to the usual notice. That is a point which I press upon your attention, Mr. Speaker, and which I hold governs in this case. These bonds, which are held by the parties for forty miles and which would, perhaps, never have been taken as a security for the indebtedness to them if they had supposed that the road would never be continued on that line, are very seriously affected by the proposed change in the location of the railway. That being so, every principle applicable in the case of private Bills is equally applicable in this case.

Mr. DALY. There might be something in the hon. gentleman's contention if the bondholders of whom he speaks were affected by the proposed legislation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So they are.

Mr. DALY. I cannot see that at all. For instance, the hon. member for Winnipeg speaks of the position of the Manitoba Government. That government have no lien or claim on the undertaking at all. Their lien was on the lands, and those lands have to be earned by the company. It makes no difference whether they are earned by the company building from Gladstone or from Winnipeg.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have no right to decide that question until they are heard.

Mr. DALY. Under the agreement which is lodged in the Department of the Interior, as well as in the Department of Railways, the company cannot part with an acre of those lands without the claim of the Manitoba Government, which is a first lien upon them, being satisfied ; and it makes no difference whether those lands are earned by the company building from Winnipeg or from Gladstone.

Mr. MARTIN. It might make a difference where the lands are located.

Mr. DALY. It makes no difference. By the Order in Council they are to be five miles on each side of the railway, and the company are getting as good or better value than they did before. The creditors are Mann & Holt and the West Cumberland Steel Company. They have the bonds, and these bonds are a first mortgage and preferential lien and charge upon the railway constructed or hereafter to be constructed and on all tolls, etc. Their security covers the whole undertaking, whether it is commenced at Gladstone or at Winnipeg ; and in addition to having the bonds, these creditors have judgments against the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company, and their judgment holds against the railway, whether it is constructed from Winnipeg or from Gladstone.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Suppose the railway when completed should be a much more valuable property if built on the line of the original project, does not the hon. gentleman see that to change its location affects very seriously the interests of those parties ?

Mr. DALY. I do not see it at all. Suppose that there was no legislation asked by this company to authorize them to start from Gladstone, and that they commenced to construct under the original Act from Winnipeg northerly to the Saskatchewan : could they not start at Gladstone and build easterly to Winnipeg and northerly to the Saskatchewan if they chose ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly not, for this reason : this security was given after the line was located and the work undertaken.

Mr. DALY. Not at all. If the hon. gentleman looks at the Act of 1891 he will see that section 4 provides :

> The line of railway to be constructed by the said company south of the Saskatchewan River shall not be commenced until the location thereof shall have been approved by the Governor in Council.

That clause was put in advisedly, I think, after the Bill was in committee, because the consensus of opinion on both sides of the House was that this railway should be built west of Lake Winnipeg, and in order to carry out what was suggested by Mr. Dewdney at that time, that clause was inserted, so that the company could not commence to build that line until they filed their plans with the Governor in Council.

Mr. MARTIN. But that clause does not give the company any power to change their route. It only provides that on the route where they had power to build, the Governor in Council was to approve of the location.

Mr. DALY. What I say is that in locating their line west of Lake Manitoba the company are only carrying out the intention of the House at that time.

Mr. LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman contend that this new line which is chartered to-day is subject to the existing bonds of the company ?

Mr. DALY. I do, most assuredly.

Mr. LAURIER. And that no new bonds can be issued ?

Mr. DALY. Not at all. The company cannot, under this Bill, build one mile of railway without that line being subject to every judgment, lien or bond existing against it, because these cover the whole undertaking, its tolls and everything else, and it makes no possible difference whether it is built from Gladstone or from Winnipeg.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let me ask the hon. gentleman this question. If you strike out of the Bill these provisions authorizing the company to build from Gladstone northward, and they go on and build on this line, is not this a substantial deviation which may affect the interests of those who have acquired interests in the road ?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand the Act exactly as the hon. Minister of Interior has explained it, that when the company got the alteration they could start northerly from Winnipeg and go by Gladstone. The object of the Bill is a limitation of that route, that is to say, it is to avoid duplicating the line of railway that already exists from Winnipeg to Gladstone, and to enable this company to start from Gladstone. The subject was fully discussed in the committee. The ground taken was that the last amendment of the charter gave the company power to locate their line west of Lake Winnipeg, and to build northerly from Winnipeg.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Look at these words in section 3 :

The deficiency shall form a lien on one-third of the land grants which may be earned by the company on the line between the end of the 40 miles of the said railway as now constructed and the Saskatchewan River.

Mr. HAGGART. It says "may." It allows the company to cross the Narrows of Lake Manitoba in going to the Dauphin country. The hon. gentleman will admit that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. And does it lessen the security of the bondholders to allow them to build from Gladstone ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is wholly a new line.

Mr. FOSTER. Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question that has been raised by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is that the reference in this Bill to the rights of a private company with regard to the construction of a railway, constitutes that portion of the Bill a private and not a public Bill. I presume that there is no doubt as to the rules of this House requiring notice to be given of a private Bill to be introduced in this House. I may, perhaps, trouble the House with one or two citations from Bourinot's Book on Parliamentary Procedure and Practice, in addition to the one made by the hon. member for Bothwell :

Whenever public Bills involve private interests which should be carefully guarded, they are subjected to the same examination provided for private Bills.

A Bill introduced in 1864 in the English Commons on the subject of the weighing of grain in the port of London was considered a public Bill, as it concerned the home and foreign trade, and also the public revenue ; but the Speaker called attention to the fact that there were allegations in the preamble which were open to dispute and required to be established by evidence, and under such circumstances he deemed it advisable to commit the Bill to a select committee, by whom these facts would be inquired into, and any local or private rights would be duly protected.

A similar case occurred in the Canadian House in the session of 1883, when a member introduced, on motion, a Bill, "to increase the harbour accommodation of the city of Toronto, to extend the esplanade, and to provide for the control of the use thereof by railway companies." This measure proposed that a board of commissioners should be established for the purpose of carrying out the objects, which were sufficiently set forth in the title. After the second reading it was referred to the Railway Committee with the understanding that due notice would be given to the private companies and great corporations which would be affected by the proposed legislation. The Committee did not, however, deal with so important a measure that session, but reported to the House that the preamble was not proven.

In the English House of Commons there is a class of quasi private Bills, distinguished as "hybrid Bills." They are brought in, by order, as public Bills, but as they affect private rights "Their further progress is subject to the proof of compliance with the standing orders before the examiner, and to the payment of fees." They are generally "Bills for carrying out national works or relating to Crown property, or other public works in which the Government is concerned," or they sometimes deal with matters affecting the metropolis. They are committed to

a select committee, when the Committee on Standing Orders has reported favourably. The rules of the Canadian Houses do not make any special provision for this class of Bills. The Toronto Esplanade Bill, just mentioned, would probably belong to this class, since the House found it necessary to refer it to a select committee with a view to protect the private interests involved.

In other cases, where Bills have affected both public and private interests, a different course has been followed. In the session of 1875, the Premier (Mr. Mackenzie) moved for leave to introduce a public Bill to re-arrange the "capital of the Northern Railway of Canada, to enable the said company to change the gauge of its railway, and to provide for the release of the Government lien on the road on certain conditions." Objection having been taken that some of the provisions affected private interests and altered the powers of the company in very material points, the Speaker decided that the Bill ought to be withdrawn. Separate Bills were subsequently passed by the House—one, relating to the Government lien, was treated as a public Bill, and the other, relating to the gauge and capital, as a private Bill.

In 1880, the Minister of Justice introduced a Bill to remove a difficulty that had arisen as to the title of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, which had been already the subject of Dominion legislation. The Government of Quebec, by whom that road had been acquired, believed it to be necessary to obtain additional legislation from the Dominion Parliament with respect to that portion of the railway extending from Montreal to Quebec, just as it had been previously obtained in the case of the part between Montreal and Aylmer. Objection was taken, on the second reading, that the Bill affected private interests, and the case of the Northern Railway Bill was adduced as a precedent. The Bill was then withdrawn.

What I am called upon to consider is whether the provisions of the Act now before the House affects private interests in such a manner as to constitute it a private Bill. I look at the Act of 1887, which, as I understand, has not been amended in the direction of giving the company any extended powers from that time up to the present, and I find that the company shall have full power and authority to lay out and construct and complete a double or single iron or steel railway, of a gauge of four feet eight and a half inches in width, from the city of Winnipeg northerly to Port Nelson or Churchill, or some other point on the shore of Hudson Bay; and to construct a branch railway from any point on its main line at or near the crossing of the Saskatchewan River to a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Lake Winnipegosis; and the same, together with such other as shall be hereafter constructed by the said company, shall constitute the line of railway hereinafter called the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway. The company may build the railway in sections as it requires under the provisions of the Railway Act; but the branch line hereinbefore mentioned shall not be commenced until the location thereof has been approved by the Governor General in Council. As the hon. the Minister of the Interior has said, the Act of 1891 provides that the line of railway to be constructed by the said company south of the Saskatchewan River shall not be commenced until the location thereof shall have been approved by the Governor in Council. I do not, however, consider that as being material, because the company were bound under the Act of 1891 to commence at the end of the forty miles. I take that to mean that they must commence at the end of the forty miles which have been constructed up to that point, and their subsidy was to be paid from that point to the Saskatchewan River on the completion of the road. Section 3 of this Bill provides:

> That instead of the said railway so to be completed as aforesaid under the existing contract commencing as herein provided for at the north end of the forty miles already constructed by the company, it may commence at or near Portage la Prairie and run northerly to a point of intersection with the company's main line where the latter is located through Township 13, or through Gladstone, and to be continued to the Saskatchewan River.
>
> Provided, however, that in the event of the company not complying with the terms of this Act, in so far as it relates to the construction of the first half of the company's railway, the Governor General in Council may, subject to the terms of the said Act and of this Act, transfer the amount applicable to such first half of the company's railway, namely, forty thousand dollars a year, &c., &c.

Now, it seems to me that this is a variation of the powers—I will not say whether it is an extension or a contraction of the powers—granted under the Act of 1887; but it is certainly a variation of the powers given to the company under that Act.

Mr. HAGGART. It is simply an addition.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes. It gives the company power to do something which, under the Act of 1887, it was not authorized to do; and from my reading, I am inclined to think that that portion of this Act should be introduced as a private Bill, with the due notice that persons interested ought to have with regard to private Bills. I am not going to discuss the point as to how the interests of the bondholders on the forty miles of road already existing would be affected by this Bill; but it seems to me that the creditors and everybody else interested should have notice of the intention of the company to apply for an addition to the powers granted it under the Act of 1887. I am, therefore, of opinion that that part of this Bill should have been introduced as a private Bill. Of course, as regards the subsidy to the railway, no doubt that is a public matter, and that part of the Bill has been properly introduced.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know how far we can proceed with the Bill now that such an important part has been withdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER. The point my hon. friend took objection to related to private rights, so to speak. That portion of the Bill is out of order according to the decision of Mr. Speaker. I think there is no objection to going on with the rest.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The decision of the Speaker is confined to clause 3.

Mr. MARTIN. The proposition is entirely based upon the company having power to change the route. That has been taken away.

Mr. FOSTER. That we can discuss in committee.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know that it is possible to reconcile the parts of the Bill now that this important section has been removed. Section 3 has been eliminated. Let us look at section 1. It reads :—

Clause 1 of the Aid Act is hereby repealed, and in lieu thereof it is hereby enacted as follows :—

" In order to enable the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway (formerly the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company) to construct so much of their railway to Hudson Bay as reaches from the city of Winnipeg to the Saskatchewan River, the Governor General in Council may enter into a contract with the company for the transport of men, supplies, material and mails for ten to twenty years, and may pay to the company for such services during the said terms, $80,000 per annum in manner following, that is to say : One half of the said sum of $80,000 to be paid annually, commencing from the date of the completion by the company of one half their line to be constructed between Winnipeg and the Saskatchewan River, and the remaining one half of the said sum of $80,000 to be paid annually, commencing from the date of the completion of the remaining half of their line to be constructed between Winnipeg and the Saskatchewan. Provided that such sums shall be paid in semi-annual instalments and the company may sell the same or may assign the same by way of security for any bonds or other securities issued by the company in respect of the company's undertaking.

Now, I understand from an observation made by the Minister of Railways that half this subsidy was to be paid upon the completion of the road from Gladstone or Portage la Prairie. But, Mr. Speaker, this cannot take place now, it having been decided that the third section, upon which the subsidy was to be paid, is now withdrawn. There is, therefore, no basis to proceed upon.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman will see that in the event of the company not performing the work, we may ask to have power to give that part of the subsidy to another railway which may have power to build from Gladstone, or some other point, in the direction of the Saskatchewan.

Mr. LAURIER. What railway is that ?

Mr. HAGGART. There is a railway company whose charter was passed to-day or yesterday.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we might go into committee on this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1.

Mr. MARTIN. The clause as you read it, Mr. Chairman, is not according to the copy placed in our hands. You read the name of the company Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company. In our copy it reads Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway Company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I read it as it is here.

Mr. MARTIN. But that is not according to the copy placed in our hands.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is the official copy. I cannot read anything but what is before me.

Mr. LAURIER. But we cannot follow what you are reading unless we have the Bill in our hands.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The notice relates to the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They have left out in the printed copy in the Chairman's hands certain words. In the original it reads : " The Winnipeg Great Northern Railway (formerly the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company)."

Mr. LAURIER. I move to add the following as Clause 1a :—

If at any time before the expiration of the said twenty years, the said railway to be so constructed as aforesaid, under the said contract shall cease to be operated regularly for freight and passenger traffic, then the said payments under the said contracts shall cease, and the liability of the Government in respect thereof shall be determined—or if the operation shall cease only for a portion of the said railway, to be discontinued either for the whole or any portion of the said railway, for only a portion of the residue of the said period of twenty years, then the liability of the Government in respect of the said payments shall be diminished only in a rateable proportion, that is to say, at the rate of six hundred and forty dollars per annum during the discontinuance for each mile on which it takes place.

This is to avoid an objection pointed out this morning by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Bill is no good with it, it destroys the whole object.

Mr. LAURIER. The object of the Bill, I understand, is to give a subsidy to this company, whether it is earned or not. If the railway, as we anticipate, is going to pass through a fine section of country, then there

would be enough traffic to maintain it. But I understand from the hon. gentleman's attitude at present that they have so little confidence in their scheme that the investors are guaranteed their money by the Government, whether it is earned or not. If that be the condition of the scheme, it is just as well we should know it at once.

Mr. HAGGART. Security of that kind would be worthless at present, unless they had a contract with some responsible people to work the road for 20 years. It will be impossible to negotiate something that eventuates at the end of 20 years.

Mr. LAURIER. Why impossible ?

Mr. HAGGART. For the reason that the payment would then only be due on the road 20 years. No person would advance one cent on it unless he had security from some party who is perfectly able to give security that the conditions would be performed at the end of 20 years.

Mr. MARTIN. So far as the aid that was given in 1891 is concerned, that has expired.

Mr. HAGGART. No it has not.

Mr. DALY. They have the whole year yet.

Mr. MARTIN. Now similar arrangements were made with the Regina and Long Lake, the Calgary and Edmonton, the Calgary and McLeod Railways, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company entered into an arrangement for six years to operate, at any rate one of them, the Long Lake Railway, and they had to be paid, the Government of Canada has to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they have to secure them against loss by transferring to them a considerable amount of land and guarantee them against loss in operating this Prince Albert road for six years. The six years are just about to expire, and the railway company have been a steady loser in the operation of that line. I fancy the same remarks would apply to the Edmonton line. Now they are placed in this condition in respect of these lines ; they have got to go to work again and give the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or some other company, a very considerable bonus to operate these roads, or else allow them to go out of operation. That is exactly the same position in which they are placing themselves in regard to this particular line. It seems to me a very objectionable kind of bonus, and I think it would be much better for the country to give a straight bonus in some other direction rather than be saddled with the necessity of seeing that this road is operated.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of the limitation of the assistance that the Government proposes ?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, I think that kind of assistance is not a good kind of assistance. I am prepared to support a bonus of a similar amount ; but I criticise the kind of assistance that the Government offer, because it involves the necessity of the Government seeing that this road is operated, or else they lose the whole of their money. Unless the railway is in a position to operate its line, of course it cannot carry any men, or mails, or freight, for the Government, and the equivalent for which the Government propose to pay $80,000 a mile cannot be rendered to the Government by the railway company unless the line is operated. And that there is going to be a loss to operate it. I think we can fairly assume, especially if it runs through a poor country, such as we were discussing this morning, if my contention is correct that the country is a swamp, and until it is made something different from a swamp, it will not furnish any traffic. It is merely a question of the traffic that it will pick up along the route. Under these circumstances I do not agree with the kind of aid the Government are giving to the railway.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman need not argue in that direction, because that feature of the Bill is struck out. The Winnipeg and Saskatchewan Railway have no right to build, as the Speaker has ruled, from Gladstone northerly, and the aid, if given at all, must be given to a road going to Dauphin Lake.

Mr. MARTIN. The Dauphin line would probably be a paying line.

Mr. HAGGART. That part with reference to the Winnipeg and North-western, and the Winnipeg and Saskatchewan, has been eliminated from the Bill, and as to whether it goes east or west from the Dauphin road. The hon. gentleman says he would like to know that the assistance is given to a road that was not passing through this unfertile country he speaks of. What proposal is there in the Bill to go through that country ?

Mr. MARTIN. It may be the hon. gentleman's criticism is correct. Of course, so far as we are concerned in Manitoba, we are willing to have this colonization road bonussed, and we are glad to get money from the Dominion Government under any pretext, we are not going to oppose anything of that kind. Our interest in the scheme is based upon its being part of a Hudson Bay railway. It seems to me the Government are taking a very poor way of aiding a road by giving to them $80,000 a mile which has to be paid to them whether they are able to operate the road or not ; in other words, the Government are putting themselves in exactly in the same position with regard to this road that they now find themselves in with regard to the Regina and Long Lake road, the Calgary and Edmonton road, and the Calgary and Fort McLeod road. They practically have these railways on their hands. They are bound

to give them $80,000 a year—I think it is the same amount—for the transport of men, materials, mails, etc. The railways have been shown to be non-productive by actual experience, it has been found that they will not pay expenses. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I understand, has lost money even on the bonus that they receive from the Government for operating the road, and it is not at all likely they will enter into any further contract without receiving considerably more than they have been paid to date. So that it is not only a question of giving a $80,000 a year, but the Government have got to take the responsibility of seeing that these roads are operated for 20 years. Now why should they place themselves in that position? Why not give the road a similar amount of money as a straight bonus, and relieve themselves from any responsibility of that kind?

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine that we will not change each other's opinions by long discussions on this point, and as our time is very short until the hour we have set for prorogation, I think it would be as well to take a vote now.

Mr. LAURIER. That is all very well, but it would have been much better to bring up that Bill at an earlier period. It was called by the Speaker five or six times before it was finally introduced.

Amendment negatived, on division.

On section 2,

Mr. HAGGART. I propose to amend this clause in order to comply with the ruling of the Speaker, so that it will read as follows:

That in the event of the contract not being entered into with the company in compliance with the terms of this Act, so far as it relates to the construction of the first half of the company's railway, the Governor in Council may, subject to the terms of said Aid Act and of this Act, transfer the amount to such first half of the company's railway, namely $40,000 per annum for twenty years, to a company authorized to construct a line of railway from Portage la Prairie or Gladstone to Lake Dauphin.

Mr. MARTIN. The Government propose to hand over $40,000 to another railway. If they do so, the other company should be amenable to all the conditions of the Act of 1890.

Mr. HAGGART. No doubt, and it will be provided for. The $40,000 goes to the other railway with all the limitations. The Governor in Council will not give the company greater rights than it had under the old contract.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

RELATION OF THE COLONIES TO THE EMPIRE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House adjourn during pleasure.

Mr. LAURIER. I should like to call the attention of the leader of the House to a matter of great importance. I observe that certain correspondence has been published with respect to the relations of the colonies, and rights affecting questions which have often come before this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I received to-day a copy of the correspondence. It relates to subject matters which came under the discussion of the Intercolonial Conference on the subject of treaty making; it is the elaborate discussion of the question, sent from the Colonial Secretary's office. These papers have just come into the hands of the Government. They will, I think, be made public in the recess.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And distributed.

Mr. FOSTER. I think so.

Mr. LAURIER. We had better move for an address to have the correspondence brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. That would make it formal.

Mr. LAURIER. I beg to move:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to lay before the House all the correspondence that has taken place between His Excellency and the Imperial Government in reference to the Intercolonial Conference held in Ottawa in the month of June, 1894.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to qualify that—of course, my hon. friend will be quite willing—by adding all the correspondence which can be brought down, that is, all that is not of a confidential nature. That does not, of course, refer to any correspondence that has been laid before the Imperial House.

Motion agreed to.

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE POST OFFICE.

Mr. MARTIN. I have a motion which I would like to bring before the House. I had extreme difficulty in getting the return on the subject from the Department of Public Works, and I got it only after a great deal of pressing. It is a matter not of very general importance, but of great local importance, the location of the new post office building in the town of Portage la Prairie. When the matter was before the House on a previous occasion, I pointed out that the Government had located this building at one end of the town, outside of the business portion entirely. The Minister answered that that was done on the report of his own official. Now, I have examined these papers very carefully, and I find that the official, Mr. Daniel Smith,

of Winnipeg, reported very strongly against the site which the hon. gentleman has selected. I also stated that the Government had paid $75 per foot frontage for the lot, when, as a matter of fact, it was not worth more than $20 or $25 per foot. The statement the Minister then made was that that was paid on the recommendation of the inspector. Now, I do not find that the inspector has made any recommendation. I find that the Government got the town assessor's valuation of this land, which was $45 or $50 a foot, and this in my opinion is fully double what the land is worth. But even taking it as a correct valuation, the Government deliberately paid $75 a foot, or $25 a foot more than the highest valuation they were able to obtain. They have on file and have returned to the House certain recommendations which may be used, perhaps, as an argument in favour of buying this land at the price stated: but these recommendations are entirely from individuals who own lands close to this, and whose interest was in getting the post office located there in order to enhance the value of their lands. The town council passed a resolution, which was communicated to the Government, to this effect:

That it is the opinion of the Council that the location of the contemplated new post office for the town of Portage la Prairie should be on the corner of Tupper Street and Saskatchewan Avenue, or the corner of Campbell Street and Saskatchewan Avenue.

Now, the Government were offered a site at each of these points at $75 a foot, the same price they paid for the lot actually selected. Both of these lots are among the best business properties in the town, though not as valuable as property on the north side of the street; but instead of acting on the recommendation of the town council, the Government took the lot at the corner of Annie Street and paid this exorbitant price. The Minister of Public Works adopted the very proper course under the circumstances of directing his officer in Winnipeg, Mr. Daniel Smith, to go to Portage la Prairie and make a report on the desirability of the different locations available for a post office. Mr. Smith made the following report:—

Winnipeg, August, 1894.

Sir,—In accordance with your instructions, I visited Portage la Prairie re reporting on a post office site in that town. I could not procure a map of the town showing the lots and streets as now laid out. I therefore made a map showing the business portion of the town. I also show the east and west boundaries of the business portion of the town. Principally all the business houses are on Saskatchewan Avenue, and located between Manitoba and Annie Street on the north side of Saskatchewan Avenue.

This post office is not located between those points, but it is west of the district which Mr. Smith reports as being the business part of the town——

There are four business houses west of the location shown on the map as business limit.

Mr. MARTIN.

The available sites for the post office I have marked in red and numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4. No. 1, 99 or 66 feet frontage, is available at $75 per foot. This property is owned by a Mr. Campbell, of Toronto, who, I understand, has been trying to sell it to the Government for a post office site. His agent stated he thought that he would most probably take what the other properties were offered for. He only owns 50 feet. I have another offer of the other 16 feet for $80 per foot. No. 4 is the property of the Presbyterian Church. The trustees offer the property either 66 feet or 99 feet frontage, for $80 per foot frontage, they to have the privilege of removing the buildings, which are of wood, without foundations of stone. With reference to the sites the maps show their location. The western site have the best sites for foundation, and are somewhat drier soil. There is no drainage, and the nature of the ground is wet below about 3 feet from the surface. I would, therefore, suggest that the building be well raised above the surface. The ground is level on all the sites. There are no available lots on the north side of the avenue, except inner lots, and they are held at fancy prices. The town hall is supposed to be about the centre of the town.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) D. SMITH.

Now, the solid business portion of the town lies between Annie Street and Manitoba Street, just as Mr. Smith reported. Then Mr. Smith was asked further to investigate the properties, and he made a report on the 23rd October, 1894, as follows:—

Dear Sir,—In accordance with your instructions by telegram, I came here to ascertain the price of land in the vicinity of the site offered for post office buildings. I find the Imperial Bank purchased a piece of land adjoining the bank property, the price was $75, not a corner lot, and east of the church property I offered for post office site. One other sale was made further east at the same figure, also inside lot. Properties Nos. 4, No. 3 and No. 2 on the map I forwarded to the department, I consider worth the prices asked. No. 1 being west of all business houses on the south side of the street is not worth as much.

Of those three sites, two were admirable sites, and the other was a reasonably fair site, and all available to the Government. No. 1, being west of all business houses on the south side of the street, is not worth as much. That is the site the Government selected. The inspector does not attempt to put a value upon it, but simply says it is not worth as much, and points out that it is entirely west of all the business houses on that side of the street. There is another letter from Mr. Smith, dated Winnipeg, 26th October, 1894, to A. Gobeil, Esq., Deputy Minister of Public Works:

I inclose you a letter from Mr. W. Sparling, re value of lands at Portage la Prairie. Mr. Sparling is the town assessor, and has a good idea of the value of lands in the town. I, therefore, thought well to get a valuation from him. I have marked the lots he refers to, No. 1, 2, 3 and 4 as shown on the plan I mailed Mr. Fuller, showing the available sites for the post office building at Portage la Prairie.

Now, Mr. Sparling makes a report, and without reading what he says with regard to the other sites which were not purchased by the Government, and which he says were worth $75 a foot, he says as to the site the Government did purchase:

To W. Boddy, site block 49, lot 25, is worth $50 per foot, and lots 26 and 27, $45 per foot.

Now, this is the valuation of the assessor, and yet the Government deliberately paid $25 a foot more than that. It was not because there were not other lots available, for there are none occupied at all on that side of the street, west of the present post office site. There were any number available at $25 a foot. I know as much of the value of property at Portage la Prairie as Prof. Sparling does, and I have no hesitation in saying that land has never been worth there in recent years more than $25 a foot. He, however, valued it at $50 and the Government paid $75 per foot. Here are some of the letters offered as an excuse for buying the land at this price. The first letter is dated Portage la Prairie, 20th October, 1894:

N. Boyd, Esq., M.P.

Dear Sir,—I have seen Mr. Daly's telegram of the 19th inst., re value of land on Saskatchewan Avenue, and in reply beg to say that I am prepared to make a declaration that about February, 1893, I offered $80 per foot for Saskatchewan Avenue property, distant about 170 feet from the property offered the Government for a post office site by Mr. T. W. Boddy, and I consider the property in the vicinity in question has increased in value since last year.

Yours truly,

JAS. McLENAGHAN.

That appears to be a letter that was worth something on the face of it, but when you learn the real facts, you will see it is not worth anything. Mr. C. McLenaghan owns a business block on the north side of the street, just east of Anne Street, and the post office is just west of Anne Street, and on the south side of the street. Mr. McLenaghan desired to put a fire wall on the east side of his block. In order to do that it was necessary for him to buy a small portion of the land, and he made an offer of $80 per foot for the land. He could not build his wall and make the extension he desired without having this little piece of land. Under these circumstances he offered to give $80 per foot, and the transaction consisted of a deal by which he made an exchange of land. You can see, therefore, that this valuation is most absurd. However, Mr. McLenaghan cannot be blamed for desiring to have the post office site on the south side of the street when he owns a business block on the north side just opposite. I wish only to point out the fact that this letter is not worth anything as a justification to the Government as far as value is concerned, in the face of the valuation of the gentleman selected by Mr. Smith, the assessor of the city, who valued the land at $50 per foot.

Then we have another letter from Mr. Newman, Portage la Prairie, in reply:

Replying to your inquiry as to the value of Saskatchewan Avenue property in this place, I beg to say that in May last I purchased 100 feet on the corner of said avenue and Anne Street, which I valued at $80 per foot. This property is immediately east of the property which I understand Mr. P. W. Boddy has offered the Dominion Government as a site for the post office.

Mr. Newman owns a business stand immediately opposite where the post office is to be and is most desirous of having the post office located there, because it will raise the value of his property. On this piece of land is a hotel which got into difficulties; and Mr. Newman and his brother, being the largest creditors, took over the property. Mr. Newman says he values the land at $80 a foot. Well, he gave that price for the property, for there was a large building and a large lot of furniture. There is no comparison whatever between the value of a piece of land with a hotel upon it and the value of a piece of land on the other side of the street. In a small town like Portage la Prairie, the property on which business houses are erected becomes high in value while the building is going on, but after the principal blocks are finished the prices go down. Mr. Smith refers to a sale of a piece of property by myself there at $75 per foot, but we have some property immediately west, just across the street, for which I would be glad to get $25 per foot. It is just outside the business part. Then we have another letter from Mr. J. M. Robinson:

Portage la Prairie, Oct. 20th, 1894.

N. Boyd, Esq., Esq., M.P.

Dear Sir,—In the matter of the price asked for the post office site offered by Mr. Boddy as per telegram from Hon. Mr. Daly, I might say that I was offered $80 per foot frontage for the lot upon which the "Review" office is situated over a year ago; and the gentleman making the offer agreed also to remove the "Review" building to another lot 150 feet distant, and to have it in as good repair as before moving. This offer I refused on ground of price not being sufficient. The "Review" lot is distant about 200 feet from proposed post office site.

The local Oddfellows' lodge own the lot directly opposite this proposed site, and I think it was $75 per front foot they were offered for their property over a year ago.

This offer was refused, some of the members thinking it would not be many years till this lot would go to $150 per foot; I think this price asked by Mr. Boddy, $75 per foot, is very reasonable, and the Government would not make a mistake in accepting his offer. So far as the offer made for the "Review" property is concerned, I may say I am prepared to make a statutory declaration to the truth of my statements, or perhaps, better still, produce the written offer, which I think I have among my papers.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) J. M. ROBINSON.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the same matter that was referred to by James McLena-

ghan in his letter. Mr. J. M. Robinson was offered this price for a small piece of property which Mr. McLenaghan needed for his fire wall, and so offered a fancy price for it. The land where the "Review" office is is very much more valuable than the land where the post office is. Up to the end of the business portion of the street, the land keeps nearly the same value. Suggestions have been made that the Government were wise in putting this building at the extreme west end of the town, because at the extreme east end there is water in the cellars and you cannot get as good a foundation. Well, Mr. Speaker, it has never been suggested by any person in the town that the Government should put the building at the east end. The two sites supported by the council are at the centre, while this is at the extreme west. The court-house is at the extreme east of the business part. It is said that the foundation has cost a large sum of money. I have the authority of Hon. Robert Watson, who has the matter in charge, to say that this is not correct. In the court-house they had no trouble with the foundation. The footings for the foundation, as shown on the plan on which the hon. Minister of Public Works has asked for tenders, are exactly the same for the building he proposes to put up as for the court-house. So it will cost the Dominion Government the same amount of money to put a proper foundation under their building on the site chosen as it cost the local government to put the foundation under their building in the east end of the town. It was never suggested that the post office should be put in the eastern portion, but that it should be as nearly as possible in the centre of the business portion of the town. The centre business coincides almost exactly with the centre of population. I consider that the Government have been guilty of a gross outrage in selecting this site for so important a building. I am confident that the hon. Minister, after he goes there and sees the place, will agree with me, and I am prepared to say that any hon. member will see that the sites recommended by Mr. Smith were better than the one that has been chosen. The Government is deliberately paying $75 per foot for land which is assessed for $55 per foot for the corner and $45 per foot for the rest. The assessor can only get at the value in a general way. I have no hesitation in stating that this valuation is altogether too high and that the land certainly would not have sold for a cent more than $25 per foot. It seems to me that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Boyd) has used his position to induce the Government to choose a site for the post office in Portage la Prairie to suit the interests and wishes of a few of his friends and supporters, men like Mr. McLenaghan, Mr. Newman, Mr. Garland and others of that kind. And if it is true that the Government could have obtained a good central location on the corner for the same price they paid for this out-of-the-way site they have chosen, it makes it all the more difficult for one to understand how they can justify themselves in the matter.

Mr. OUIMET It is too late to enter into a long discussion of this subject, but I will say a few words to show that the department was justified in the opinion that the site chosen was the best site. We must bear in mind that, for the last fifteen years at least, the post office has been situated within about 100 feet of the site now chosen.

Mr. MARTIN. Not fifteen years—not more than ten years.

Mr. OUIMET.—Well, ten years. And no objection was ever made.

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, yes, there was great objection.

Mr. OUIMET. No objection that I ever heard of. It is true enough that the present site is west of the centre of business. But it stands in the centre of population of the town——

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

Mr. OUIMET. The hon. gentleman is very positive in his statements, but I can only speak from the papers.

Mr. MARTIN. There is nothing in the papers to show that.

Mr. OUIMET. I am informed that west of the site there is more business done in one establishment alone, the establishment of Mr. Garland, than there is done at any other place east of the site chosen.

Mr. MARTIN. That place is a quarter of a mile away.

Mr. OUIMET. Further, I may say that west of the site, nearly opposite, is one of the largest hotels of the place, the Leland.

Mr. MARTIN. No; that is east. It is on the opposite corner, just across the street.

Mr. OUIMET. There are also the central school and the Lansdowne college.

Mr. MARTIN. The Lansdowne college has ceased to exist.

Mr. OUIMET. Both of these are situated west of the present site. The population, I am told, is moving west.

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, no.

Mr. OUIMET. My hon. friend has said that Mr. Smith did not recommend this site. Here is what he says. :—

The available sites for the post office I have marked in red, and numbered 1, 2, 3 and 4. No. 1, 99 or 66 feet frontage, is available at $75 per foot. No. 2, 66 feet, at $80. No. 3, 66 feet, at $100 per foot.

Mr. MARTIN. That is, of course, a mistake. He corrects that afterwards. Nos. 2 and 3 could be got for $75.

Mr. OUIMET. He says further :—

The western sites have the best soil for foundation, and are somewhat drier soil. There is no drainage, and the nature of the ground is wet below about three feet from the surface. * * * There are no available lots on the north side of the avenue except inner lots, and they are held at fancy prices.

As to prices, he was asked by telegram from Mr. Fuller :—

Are rates per foot frontage given in your report on Portage la Prairie fair and reasonable ?

The answer is :

Price reasonable, below current rates of adjoining property.

Mr. MARTIN. He did not refer to this side at all.

Mr. OUIMET. His report is dated in August, and this telegram is dated 8th September. For these reasons, I think the department was justified in coming to the conculsion that the present site is the best, the most central, and that the price paid was reasonable. Now as to the character of the recommendations, I do not know these gentlemen, McClenagan & Newman, but I understand they are good friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that they are respectable citizens of the town. But surely, if their evidence is going to be discredited because they are interested, the hon. gentleman's evidence must be challenged in the same way, because he advocates the eastern site, and if I am not mistaken, he is largely interested in that part of the town.

Mr. MARTIN. I have large properties in the west of the city, perhaps as much as some of these gentlemen.

Mr. OUIMET. There is another consideration. These gentlemen interested in that part of the city, were asking that their interests might be looked after simply because the hon. gentleman had espoused so strongly the interests of the eastern people. The western people had to be looked after by some one, because nobody else would have paid any attention to them. I think the hon. gentleman himself considered the people living in the western part of the town as men whose interests were not of much account. On the whole, I think the department has acted on the reports made by our officer, and has secured the best site, and at a reasonable price.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not blame the Minister of Public Works, because he has been misinformed, but the statements he has given to the House, are not accurate. I suppose he gives them on the authority of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Boyd.) I have no hesitation in saying they are not accurate, because I know every foot of this town. It is not true that this site is anywhere near the centre of the population of Portage la Prairie. I have no hesitation in saying that the population east of this site is very much greater indeed than the population west. So far as this business he referred to is concerned, there is nothing in that. Mr. T. A. Garland conducts a large business a quarter of a mile further west of this site, because years ago, in the boom days, he built a large warehouse upon his property in the west end hoping that business some day would go there, and rather than let the building go to ruin, he conducts the business in it. So far as the central school is concerned, it is very far from the centre of the town, and within a year or two they have been obliged to build ward schools in the eastern and northern part of the town. It is inaccurate to say that the town is growing more in the west than in the east. The town is growing far more in the east end than in the west end, and the population is increasing a great deal more east of this site than west of it. As for Lansdowne College, it was disbanded a year ago, and is now a boarding-house, and it throws no light upon the question. With regard to those gentlemen to whom the hon. gentleman has referred, whose testimony is given there, I drew attention to facts which nullify the testimony of those gentlemen. I would draw the Ministers attention to this fact with regard to Mr. Smith. I am sure Mr. Smith never intended to say that the price of this site was reasonable, because he has by his report practically put it out of the question.

Mr. BOYD. Since this question was before the House on a previous occasion, I cannot say that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) has thrown any new light on the subject. There is no question that there is a good deal of feeling in that town between the east and the west end, and the hon. member for Winnipeg is to a great extent responsible for that feeling. Now, the old post office has stood for the last twelve years, and the site has only been removed 100 feet west. He says the centre of the population is considerably east of the present site. I have undoubted evidence that one block east of where the present post office has been selected, is the centre of the population. I have also undoubted evidence that 40 per cent of the business of Portage la Prairie is done west of the present post office site.

Mr. MARTIN. Pshaw !

Mr. BOYD. That is the hon. gentleman's opinion, but I do not think any evidence I could produce or that any one else could produce, would satisfy the hon. member for Winnipeg, unless the post office was removed down close to the east end where he used his influence to have all the other local buildings placed. The central school is one block west.

Mr. MARTIN. No, the central school is in the same block.

Mr. BOYD. One of the ward schools is put at the very east end of the town, and another school was put at the west end, and the one in the east end is much nearer the post office than the one in the west end. So far as the hon. gentleman attributes blame to me, I suppose, if there are any evil effects, I shall have to suffer for it. I do not think any position in which the post office might be placed would suit the hon. member for Winnipeg, except on his own land, and thus enhance the value of his property. In regard to any blame that he may consider attributable to me, I am quite prepared to assume the responsibility for it.

Mr. DICKEY. Does the present leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Assiniboia, agree with his followers?

Mr. DAVIN. I hope my hon. friend will not press the Government too hard.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 22nd July, 1895.

Morning Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Ten o'clock.

PRAYERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.20 a.m.

Afternoon Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received the following communication from the Secretary of His Excellency the Governor General:—

Office of the Governor General's Secretary,
Ottawa, 22nd July, 1895.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon at 3.30 p.m., to prorogue the session of the Dominion Parliament.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
ARTHUR GORDON,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

THE QUEEN'S PRIZE WINNER AT BISLEY.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to bring a matter before the House that I think is of interest, not only to the hon. gentlemen present, but to the whole of Canada. We have seen in the daily press that a private in the Canadian militia has been successful in winning the Queen's Prize at the Bisley meeting; and I would ask the hon. Minister of Militia whether the information that is given us by the press is correct, as I have no doubt that he must have received some authoritative announcement. If this be the fact, I think it would be only right, and it would give satisfaction to the whole population of Canada, if the Government were to make some recognition of the glorious victory won by Private Hayhurst. I think this victory has done more to advertise us and to bring Canada to the front, than thousands of dollars could have done, if spent in the ordinary way by the Government of Canada. We have seen the enthusiasm that was created in England by the late Premier winning the Derby; and this is a victory that I think cannot conflict with the feelings of any religious sect, or of any class of people in Canada. It has been won in a manly sport, a sport that is kept up for the defence of Canada, and for the defence of British possessions. Under these circumstances, I think that the least we can do as a Parliament is to vote a sum of money to buy either a cup or a testimonial to show the appreciation of Canada of the way in which private Hayhurst has upheld the honour of Canada at the Bisley meeting. I am informed, I do not know whether correctly or not, that there is a precedent for the action I propose, and that the Government has seen fit by Order in Council, on a previous occasion, to give a sum of money to buy medals for the winners of the Kolapore Cup, when Canada was successful in that competition. I think, therefore, that, for the honour of Canada, this House should pass a vote in favour of giving private Hayhurst a testimonial for the magnificent way in which he has brought distinction upon his country at the Bisley meeting.

Mr. DICKEY. I am glad to be able to inform the House that I have had from two sources official confirmation of the statement we have seen in the daily press in regard to private Hayhurst's success at Bisley; and I think it is only right that I should say that,

as Minister of Militia, I fully appreciate the honour that this achievement has brought not only upon private Hayhurst himself, but upon the whole militia force of Canada ; and I also feel that it cannot but prove of great practical service to the country. It is no small event for any man to be the best shot in a gathering of all the best shots in the world, and we cannot help feeling proud that the man who has achieved that victory, has gone over with a Canadian team, and brings his honours back to Canada. I think this event will also tend to improve the whole morale of the militia force, and the shooting branch of it particularly. While in past years we have been very much gratified with the winning of the Kolapore Cup, and have looked upon that as the ultima thule of our riflemen's exercises over there, now we have moved the standard up to the very top, and Canadians now will feel disappointed if the Queen's prize does not remain in Canada for years to come. I could not allow this occasion to pass without, in this public way, testifying to the pleasure and deep gratification of the Department of Militia, and I am sure I can speak for the whole militia force of Canada, in the honours which private Hayhurst has brought to the force and to Canada. The suggestion made by the hon. gentleman with regard to a medal is, of course, one for future consideration. It is impossible at this stage of the session to do any more than formally to express the great gratification this country feels at the success of this gentleman.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may be allowed to say that I believe the Opposition is in full accord with everything that has been said by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) and the hon. Minister of Militia in testifying the general satisfaction felt throughout Canada at a Canadian's success in winning this prize, and I agree that the result cannot but be of great ultimate and practical advantage to Canada. While these feelings are doubtless to some extent only sentimental, there is no doubt that this event will bring the country before the attention of the world in a way that will be of great public benefit. While I congratulate the rifle team on this brilliant success, I also congratulate the officers in charge of that team this year, and especially the gentleman who has been so fortunate and so successful, and who has shown his great ability as a shot. As to the suggestion made by the hon. member from Victoria that the Government should mark in some tangible way our gratification at the success of private Hayhurst, I am sure that the Opposition will only be too glad to second any action that may be taken by the Government in that direction.

THE STEAMER "STANLEY."

Mr. BOYD. What use is made of the "Stanley" in the summer months? I believe it is only used in winter, and I think it could not be more profitably occupied in the summer than in navigating the Hudson Strait until they are closed up by ice in the fall. The only cost incurred would be the coal necessary to keep the vessel running ; and I have not the slightest doubt she would demonstrate that the straits are navigable not only for four or five months, but for seven or eight months. If the people of eastern Canada understood how important this question was to the people of Manitoba and the North-west, they would be prepared to incur this expense in order to demonstrate something of what will be of great importance to Manitoba and the North-west.

Mr. MACDOWALL. I beg to second the hon. gentleman's motion in calling the attention of the Minister of Marine to this important work and would refer the Minister of Marine to the last words of Marmion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The "Stanley" it still going on, but not in the direction of Hudson Bay She is used in the summer months as a cruiser for the protection of fishermen on the Atlantic coast, and we could not afford to take her away from the good service she is doing there. Prince Edward Island would be rather anxious if she got out of fair water into any dangerous straits.

VOLUNTEER LONG SERVICE MEDALS.

Mr. PRIOR. I see the Minister and the ex-Minister of Militia present and I would ask whether either of them has made any application to the Imperial Government for the long service decoration for the volunteers. All volunteers in England who have served 21 years are obtaining a medal. Although in Canada we call ourselves militia men, still we are, to all intents and purposes, volunteers, and the feeling certainly is amongst the militia of Canada that the men who have served 21 years should get that medal.

Mr. DICKEY. The difficulty is this, that in England there are two forces—the militia and volunteers. In the Australian colonies there are also two forces. The long medal service is only given to the volunteers. Application was made some time ago by my predecessor for this medal, and the objection was pointed out by the English authorities that our service was a militia service. On being pressed with the argument that we had no volunteers and therefore should be entitled to the same decoration for the corresponding service, they argued that a general order entitling the militia in the colonies to the medal would entitle also the militia of the Australian colonies, and would give rise to a claim on the part of the English militia. There are two solutions to the question. The one is to give a decoration for long service in the militia which will apply also to the Australian colonies. The other is, failing that, to

have the Canadian forces treated exceptionally, as that is the only force existing in Canada, and a special order made in reference to them. The Canadian force is practically a volunteer force, because the pay is merely nominal. No conclusion has been reached in this matter, but it is being pressed and will be pressed until we get a definite answer one way or the other.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways having laid on the Table a number of returns, I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will acknowledge the great promptitude with which these papers have been presented.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am glad to see these documents brought down even at this late hour of the session. I hope they will be considered before the 4th January next.

Mr. MACDOWALL. As I seem to be the only other member on the Opposition side, I may explain that I am sitting here to give moral support and moral tone to the Opposition. I am glad that my influence has already been such as to cause the Government to bring down three returns.

Mr. EDWARDS. We have not heard from the North-west concerning the great victory of Canada on the other side of the water. I would like to hear from my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) his opinions as to the winning of the Queen's prize at Bisley.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very glad that Private Hayhurst made a bull's eye. He must be a thorough Conservative, for I have never known a member of the Opposition to strike the bull's eye yet.

Mr. EDWARDS. If the hon. member had really appreciated the victory, I think we should have heard a longer speech from him.

Mr. DALY. The hon. member for West Assiniboia, having spoken, he desires me to say that he appreciates with other members of the House Private Hayhurst's victory at Bisley. I am sure that we were all very much gratified that the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) should have brought this subject before the House, especially so, in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman was commandant of the first Canadian team that went to Bisley. It seems most appropriate that he should be the gentleman to bring this subject before the House. While I am on my feet I would like to call attention to the fact that when the hon. member for Victoria speaks his congratulations he is backed by nine other members from the West of Lake Superior. The appearance of these gentlemen upon this the last day of the session when no other part of the country is so well represented shows that the members of that part of the Dominion give very close and appreciative attention to their parliamentary duties.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sir James.

Sir JAMES GRANT. It is indeed very gratifying to see nine gentlemen from the west who have come to take part in the legislative work of Canada remaining until the very close of the session. They have done credit to themselves and to the important part of the Dominion they represent. I have been delighted to hear the warm expression of appreciation of Private Hayhurst's victory at Bisley. I am glad this Chamber has closed in a most healthful condition, politically, and I trust that when we come back again we shall find ourselves in as good spirits as we are at present, in closing up this branch of the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada.

ANNEXATION OF NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. MACDOWALL. As there is no other question before the House, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether the Government has any plans in view, consequent upon the failure to annex Newfoundland to the Dominion, with the object of transporting the people of Newfoundland to our North-west. I believe there is an hon. member from New Brunswick in the House just now who has taken a lively interest in this matter, and who thinks that if we cannot annex the island, and all its wealth, we may at least get the people to immigrate into our North-west and help to contribute in that way to our wealth.

Mr. FOSTER. I must ask my hon. friend to put that question on the notice paper.

UNITED STATES ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. DAVIN. The Whip of the Conservative party had a Bill upon the Order paper dealing with alien labour, a Bill which I was to have seconded, but we have not been able to pass this Bill this session. However, next session I think we shall certainly have to do something in that regard, because the way the people of the United States are behaving towards Canadians is really shocking. In to-day's paper we see an account, showing how some of our people are being treated. I will read the article referred to :—

According to a despatch in the Toronto papers, a Mrs. Sherman and a Mrs. O'Connor, with their families, went a fortnight ago from Toronto to Niagara Falls, N.Y., where their husbands had obtained work on the new electric railway. On Wednesday, while their providers and protectors were absent, Government officials arrived at the house occupied by the women, took them and their children into custody, locked them up for two hours, and then carted them to the middle of the international bridge and unloaded them. The youngest child of six that were thus treated was twelve days old ; the oldest was ten years. The unfortunates were taken in and cared for by the mayor of the Canadian village, and he will get his reward. There have been a good many harsh things done on the Niagara frontier in connection with the enforcement of the United States

immigration laws, but this exceeds them all in heartlessness. If like treatment had been accorded to all poor people who came to the United States that country would not have so many rich people to-day.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the way the people of the United States are carrying out their alien labour law, is a scandal to civilization. It is exceedingly hard for a country like Canada, that desires to take just views of those people coming here to sell their labour, to know how we are to act, when we find a highly civilized and progressive country like the United States behaving in a manner that parallels in barbarism anything that we read of in the actions of governments in the middle ages.

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod :

Mr. SPEAKER :

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :—

An Act respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company and to change the name of the Company to the Niagara, Hamilton and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate Gilmour and Hughson (Limited).

An Act to incorporate the Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Company.

An Act to amend chapter 10 of the Statutes of 1892, respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers.

An Act further to amend the General Inspection Act.

An Act further to amend the Insurance Act.

An Act further to amend the Act to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels.

An Act to amend the Act respecting certain Female Offenders in the Province of Nova Scotia.

An Act to Incorporate the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the Oshawa Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Fisheries Act.

An Act further to amend the Public Works Act.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade.

An Act respecting the Clifton Suspension Bridge Company.

An Act further to amend the Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.

An Act further to amend "The Indian Act."

An Act further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

An Act to incorporate the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.

An Act further to amend the Civil Service Act.

An Act to incorporate the Merchant's Life Association of Canada.

An Act to revive and amend the Acts to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.

An Act respecting the Voters' Lists of 1895.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.

An Act respecting Commercial Treaties affecting Canada.

An Act for the settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and British Columbia relating to lands in the Railway Belt, British Columbia.

An Act respecting La Chambre de Commerce du district de Montréal.

An Act to amend "The Copyright Act."

An Act to incorporate the International Radial Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.

An Act respecting the discharge of a mortgage to Her Majesty, known as the Markland Mortgage.

An Act further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

An Act to amend the Act respecting roads and Road Allowances in the province of Manitoba.

An Act for the relief of Julia Ethel Chute.

An Act to amend the law respecting the Superannuation of Judges of Provincial Courts.

An Act further to amend the Customs Act.

An Act to incorporate the James Bay Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.

An Act to amend the law respecting the Lobster Fishery.

An Act respecting the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Civil Service Act.

An Act to legalize payments heretofore made to the general revenue fund of the North-west Territories of certain fines, penalties and forfeitures.

An Act respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Companies Act.

An Act respecting the Shore Line Railway Company.

An Act respecting the South Shore Line Railway Company.

An Act to revive and amend the Act respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Trans-Canadian Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Ottawa Land and Security Company.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion of Canada Trusts Company.

An Act to further amend the Winding-up Act.

An Act to authorize the Treasury Board to exempt certain Societies from the operation of the Insurance Act.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

An Act to encourage Silver-lead smelting.

An Act further to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.

An Act to amend the North-west Irrigation Act.

An Act further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1894.

An Act respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company.

An Act respecting the bounty on Beet-root Sugar.

An Act further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting Penitentiaries.

An Act respecting the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows :—

May it Please Your Excellency :

The Commons of Canada have voted certain Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill :—

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending 30th June, 1896, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service, to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words—

In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her Loyal Subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Fifth Session of the Seventh Parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH :

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In bringing this session of Parliament to a conclusion, I have to congratulate you on the industry and zeal which have marked your labours.

The necessary legislation having been passed, the Treaty of Commerce with France, from which favourable commercial results may be expected, will, as soon as ratified, be put into force by proclamation.

The negotiations with Newfoundland to which reference was made at the opening of the Session, I regret to say, have not resulted in any agreement for the present.

The reply of the Provincial Legislature of Manitoba to the Remedial Order issued by my Government on the 21st March last was considered of such a character as to justify postponement of further action until next session.

I am pleased to observe the grant of Parliament in aid of the fund contributed by the Canadian people for the benefit of the family of the late Right Honourable Sir John Thompson.

The amendments which have been made to the law relating to the Civil Service, will, it is believed, result in increased efficiency and economy.

The Legislation of the session will, I trust, lead to an improved administration of criminal law, to the advancement of commerce and the the extension of railway and telegraphic communication.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I thank you for the liberal provision which you have made for the services of the current year.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In relieving you from your duties, I venture to express the hope that you will find among the people you represent a continuance of that prosperity which marked the opening year.

The SPEAKER of the Senate then said :

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

It is His Excellency the Governor General's will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Saturday, the thirty-first day of August next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until the thirty-first day of August next.

INDEX

FIFTH SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1895.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following;—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts, Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B.C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept.. Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recomit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Allan, Mr. H. W., *South Essex.*

Fisheries of the Great Lakes, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3948 (ii).

Fishery Overseer, Kent District, Ont. (Ques.) 698.

Port Rowan Wharf, Construction, &c., (Ques.) 2360 (i).

Smith, Henry, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 926 (i).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3572 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1222 (i).

Butter Shipments to Great Britain, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4826 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2545, 2550 (ii).

Debates, Official Rep., on M. for Sel. Com. (remarks) 181 (i).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 730 (i).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1928 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 745, 1854 (i).

Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on personal explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2080 (i).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*

Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4216 (ii).

Private Bills Petitions, on M. to suspend Rules (remarks) 1178 (i).

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 1584 (i); Sen. Amts., 4863 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Militia and Defence (Military College) 3797 (ii).

Tariff, Statements respecting (Ms.) 265 (i).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3562 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1469 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2123 (i).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3243, 3413 (ii).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3580 (ii).

Baird, Mr. G. F., *Queen's, N.B.*

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 509 (i).

Baker, Mr. G. B., *Missisquoi.*
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4696 (ii).
Pub. Accounts, ref. to Standing Com. (M.) 425.
—— Shorthand Writer, Emplymt. (M.) 1267 (i).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*
Disallowance Man. School Act (M. for Pets.*) 300 (i).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4243 (ii).
Montreal Field Battery, Drill (Ques.) 3194 (ii).
N.W.T., Ordinance No. 22, Protests against (M. for Pets., &c.*) 300 (i).
Representation in House of Commons B. 124 (Mr. *Ouimet*) on consdn. of B., 3458 (ii).
South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35, on M. to refer back to Com., 1695 (i).

Bechard, Mr. F., *Iberville.*
Govt. Land in Iberville (Ques.) 1969 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1858 (i).
Public Employees, Assignment of Salaries (B. 108) 1°, 2136 (i).

Belley, Mr. L. de G, *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 14.
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°., 2555 (ii).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4455 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4236 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 5.
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2839 (ii).
Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on personal explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2047; on M. to adjn. deb. 2076 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4697 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
"Ocean" SS., Claims for Damages against, *re* Lock 12, Beauharnois Canal (M. for Cor.*) 2023 (i).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry., Subsides (M. for Ret.) 333 (i).
Valleyfield Sewer, Repairs (Ques.) 2509 (ii).

Bergin, Mr. D., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 4067 (ii).
Dom. Franchise Act Amt. (B. 20) 1°, 222 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1852 (i).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Three Rivers Hay Shed (Ques.) 2358 (i).

Borden, Mr. F. W., *King's, N.S.*
Agricultural Implements and Tariff, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4827 (ii).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3385 (ii)
Customs Collectorship, Montreal (Ques.) 205 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 2605 (ii).
Kemptville P.O., Ret. *re* (inquiry) 2815 (ii).
Liquor Traffic Commission, Number of Meetings, (Ques.) 3084 (ii).
Morden Pier, Engineers' Reps. respecting (M. for Cor., &c.*) 477 (i).
San Jose "Scale" Pest (Ques.) 926 (i).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum 3552 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3984 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 4329 (ii).
Indians (N.S.) 2484 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2629 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2278. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2308 (i).

Boston, Mr. R., *South Middlesex.*
Dingman, Absolam, General Inspector Indian Agencies, Appmnt. (Ques.) 4186 (ii).

Bowers, Mr. E. C., *Digby.*
Lobster Fishery Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3663, 3673 (ii).
Lobsters, Regulations as to Size of Catch (Ques.) 574 (i).
Kinney, Jos. R., Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (Ques.) 573 (i).
Meteghan Mail Service (Ques.) 3192 (ii).
Pilotage, St. John, Rep. of Commission (Ques.) 2360 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Public Works, 4278; Weights and Measures, &c., 4285 (ii).
Fisheries (Distributing Bounty) 3988; (Fish-breeding, &c.) 3621 (ii); (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2335 (i); (N.S.) 3618 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (St. John, &c., and Annapolis) 3593; (St. John and Halifax) 3598 (ii); (St. John and Halifax *via* Yarmouth) 2332 (i).
Militia and Defence (Military Properties) 3178 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 3176 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Seal Island Lighthouse Station) 3661; (Tidal Service) 3617 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2275 (i); (Que.) 3496. Harbours and Rivers (N. S.) 3511; (P.E.I.) 3514 (ii).

Boyd, Mr. N., *Marquette.*
Lands Leased for Homesteading, Wm. Fleming's case, on M. for Cor., 2375 (i).
Portage la Prairie P.O., Purchase of Site, on M. for O.C., 2379 (i); (remarks) 4902 (ii).
"Stanley," Str., and Hudson Straits (remarks) 4905 (ii).

Boyle, Mr. A., *Monck.*
Insurance Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Foster) in Com., 3119 (ii)
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3759 (ii).
Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*) on Sen. Amts., 4776 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Votes on Divisions, 4358.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Welland) 2268 (i).

Brodeur, Mr. L. P., *Rouville.*
Chenier, Dr., Monument, Customs Duties (Ques.) 3712, 4115 (ii).
Civil Service Promotion Examinations (Ques.) 482 (i).
——— Frauds, Montreal (Ques.) 3994 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries, on prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1884 (i).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Return respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1885 (i).
——— Papers *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 481 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (inquiries) 2671, 2942, 3373 (ii).
McDonald, Patrick, Emplymt. by Govt. on Lachine Canal (Ques.) 3994 (ii).
P. O. Inspector, Montreal District, Vacancy (Ques.) 482 (i).
Ste. Angele de Monnoir, ex-Postmaster (remarks) 3713 (ii).
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3843 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Printing (Ques.) 230 (i).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1521 (i).
Census and Agricultural Classes (Ques.) 3994 (ii).
Columbian Exhibition, Commissioner Cockburn's Expenses (Ques.) 2727 (ii).
Guilbault, E., Emplymt. by Pub. Works Dept. (Ques.) 305 (i).
House of Commons Reading Room, U.S. French Can. Papers (Ques.) 319 (i).
International Fraternal Alliance Ass. Co.'s Registration (Ques.) 3995 (ii).
Louisbourg, proposed Monument by U.S. Citizens (Ques.) 925 (i).
Quebec Citadel, Contract for Cordwood (Ques.) 2726 (ii).
St. Roch des Aulnets Lightship, Cordwood Contract (Ques.) 2727 (ii).
Seigniory of Sorel, Govt. Tenants (Ques.) 304 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 513 (i).
State Funerals (Ques.) 2570 (ii).
——— Hon. Thos. White (Ques.) 3193 (ii).
Superannuation of Civil Service Employees (Ques.) 4116 (ii).
Yamaska and St. Ours Locks, Charges on Vessels (Ques.) 2735 (ii).
Yamaska River, Obstructions in Channel (Ques.) 924 (i).

Bryson, Mr. J., *Pontiac.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2587 (ii).
Govt. Business, precedence on Wednesdays (remarks) 3625 (ii).
Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*) on Amt. to Sen. Amts., 4776 (ii).
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry., Gross Earnings, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 213 (i).
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. *Amyot*) in Com., 4774 (ii).
Ry. Act. Amt. (B. 23) 1°, 269 (i).
Ry. Employees, Payment of, *re* B. 23 (remarks) 4359 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 4463 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 3515, 3525 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. H., *Inverness.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1429 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Point Tupper Terminus (M. for Pets., &c.) 340 (i).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3402, 3418 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) in Com., 3463 (ii).
I.C.R., Siding or Flag Station in Inverness (M. for Pets., &c.*) 343 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co., &c. (M. for Cor.*) 300 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 508 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4334 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2315 (i).
Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3699 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*
Brigade Camp No. 1 District, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2610 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1539 (i).
Columbian Exhibition, Can. Expenses (Ques.) 1361 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. 6 m.h., 2150 (i)
Cullers at Montreal and Quebec, Number, &c. (Ques.) 577 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) in Com., 3463 (ii).
Industrial Establishments in Chatham (M. for Ret.*) 2406 (i).
McGregor's Creek, Sheet Piling (Ques.) 577 (i)
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 1942 (i).
Miscellaneous (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) conc., 2678 (ii)
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Lighting, &c.) 2303: (Man.) 2300 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3529 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Continued*

Toronto Drill Hall, Cost (Ques.) 1362 (i).
World's Fair, Dom. Employees (Ques.) 3710 (ii).

Cargill, Mr. H., *East Bruce.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2291 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A., K.C.M.G., *Rimouski.*

Antigonish and Shelburne Mail Service (Ans.) 2510 (ii).
Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Subsidy, Amount paid B. C. Express Co. (Ans.) 932 (i).
Athlone-Tottenham Mail Service, Tenders for Contract (Ans.) 1588 (i), 3193 (ii).
Baie St. Paul and Chicoutimi Mail Contract (Ans.) 3816 (ii).
Battleford and Saskatoon Mail Contract, Ret. *re*, 4358 (ii).
Bealton P.O., Change of Name (Ans.) 1268 (i).
Boston P.O., Change of Name (Ans.) 1267 (i).
B. C. Mail Service, Contracts (Ans.) 3708 (ii).
Cape Breton Mail Service (Ans.) 427 (i).
DeBlois Station (P.E.I.) Mail Contract (Ans.) 771 (i).
Grey, Lt.-Col. John, Appnmt. as Supt. of Stores (Ans.) 3358 (ii).
Hull P.O. Letter Carriers (Ans.) 1586 (i).
International Convention *re* Industrial Property, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 2405 (i).
Kemptville Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ans.) 697 (i).
Kildare Station (P.E.I) Post Office (Ans.) 2511 (ii)
Kingston and Ottawa Mail Service (remarks) 840 (i).
Kootenay and Spokane Registered Mail (Ans.) 1182 (i).
Lake Etchemin and Ste. Rose de Watford Mail Contract (Ans.) 575 (i), 3715 (ii).
Lamontagne, Jos., Mail Contract, on M. for copies (Amt.) 1974 (i).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 2353 (i).
Laprairie Camp, Supply of Groceries (Ans.) 3193.
Laurentides P. O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4805 (ii).
Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*) on Sen. Amts. 4775, (ii).
Little Hope Island Bell Buoy, on M. for Ret., 2403 (i).
Loiselle, Papers *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 482 (i).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1887 (i).
McIntyre's Station (C.B.) and Hawkesbury Mail Service (Ans.) 1971 (i).
Malignant Cove, Merigomish, Mail Service, Contract (Ans.) 2140 (i).
Mattice, Lt.-Col. G., Retirement and Reappointment (Ans.) 3358 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A.—*Continued.*

Mar. Provs. Mail Service (Ans.) 2359 (i).
Metapedia and Caplan Mail Service (Ans.) 305 (i).
Meteghan Mail Service (Ans.) 3192 (ii).
Militia Force, Savings by Reduction (Ans.) 3356.
Ministerial Resignations, Rumoured (statement) 4189 (ii).
Montreal P. O. Letter Box Contract (Ans.) 1969.
—— Field Battery, Drill (Ans.) 3194 (ii)
Ocean Mail Service, Dom. and Allan Lines (Ans.) 922 (i).
Papineauville and Cheneville Mail Contract (Ans.) 580 (i).
Port de Bert, Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ans.) 305 (i).
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 1697 (i).
Post Office Expenditure (Ans.) 926 (i).
—— Inspector Montreal District, Vacancy (Ans.) 482 (i).
Richmond Station and Denison's Mills Mail Contract (Ans.) 3357 (ii).
Ste. Angele de Monnoir Postmaster, Papers respecting (presented) 3627: (remarks) 3713 (ii).
St. Louis Station (P.E.I.) and Palmer Road, &c., Mail Contract (Ans.) 699 (i).
—— Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ans.) 771, 2359 (i).
St. Thomas P.O., Employees' Salaries (Ans.) 2357 (i).
Savings Banks Deposits, Gross Amounts, on M. for Ret., 332 (i).
—— Total Amounts (Ans.) 2508 (ii).
Secretan, J. A., Amount Paid by Govt. (Ans.) 3358 (ii).
Standing Coms., Lists (presented) 223 (i).
—— Names added (M.) 767 (i).
Sheep Exports to Great Britain, on M. for Cor. 2391 (i).
Shields, F., ex-Postmaster at Milton, N.S. (Ans.) 304 (i).
—— on M. for Cor., 325 (i).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 2505, 4312 (ii).
Civil Government (Post Office) 1913 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2101. Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2106 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3612 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3407 (ii).
Trois Pistoles, Charges against Postmaster (Ans.) 4708 (ii).
Wakefield and Rupert Mail Service (Ans.) 1585.

Carroll, Mr. H. G., *Kamouraska.*

I.C.R., Summer Time Tables, Changes (Ans.) 1970 (i).
Laurentides P.O., Purchase of Building (Ques.) 3083 (ii).

Carpenter, Mr. F. M., *South Wentworth.*

Dairy Products Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 4758 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R., K.C.M.G., *South Oxford.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 54 (i).
Allan, late Dr., Gratuity to Widow (M. for O. C., &c.) 298 (i).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
Auditor General's Pet., *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2435 (ii).
——— Rep., Delay in presentation (remarks) 86 (i)
Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealers by Russian Cruisers (remarks) 3372 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3867.
——— on M. for Cor., 216 (i).
——— Expenses *re* Arbitration (Ques.) 426 (i).
Budget, The (reply) 553, 622; (Amt.) 655; neg. (Y. 71, N. 117) 1816 (i).
——— on Finance Minister's Explanations (remarks) 622 (i).
Cabinet Representation for B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4798 (ii).
Canada and N'fld., Conference of Delegates (remarks) 271 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 350 (i).
Can. Order of Foresters incorp. B. 47 (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com., 2293 (i).
Canal Improvements in St. Lawrence (Ques.) 306
Census Inaccuracies, Return respecting, on Ques. of Order, 1831 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3746 (ii).
Commercial Treaties. *See* "Treaty with France."
Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4781 (ii).
Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 1082 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4164; on consdn. of B., 4473 (ii).
——— Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1268 (i).
Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 236 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., Distribution (remarks) 231 (i).
Dom. Govt's. Credit in Banks (Ques.) 204 (i).
Dom. Notes Act Amt. (remarks) 197 (i).
Estimates, Suppl. (Ques.) 572, 619, 1182 (i).
Exchange Bank, Rets. *re* (remarks) 3368 (ii).
Exports and Imports (M. for Ret*) 222 (i).
Farm Lands in Ont., Value (explanation) 772.
Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 456 (i).
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2700 (ii).
Immigration to the N.W.T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3780 (ii).
——— Transport of Jew Pedlars, on M. for Cor., 262 (i).
Imports and Exports, 1893-95 (Ques.) 425 (i).
——— Dutiable Goods (remarks) 576 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*
Ins. Act Amt. (remarks) 571 (i).
——— B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3116 (ii).
Industries, Returns *re* (remarks) 1186 (i).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3592 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries, on prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1884 (i).
Kingston and Ottawa Mail Service (remarks) 839.
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3070.
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4268.
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1898 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on M. to adjn. deb., 4573 (ii).
Markland Mortgage, Kingston (remarks) 1267 (i), 3557 (ii).
——— Discharge B. 136 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 1883 (i); on M. for 2°, 3928; in Com., 3930; on M. for 3°, 4063 (ii).
Ministerial Explanations, on Mr. Speaker's Ruling (remarks) 360 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 377.
Piping for Wells, Duty (Ques.) 3708 (ii).
Private Bills, on M. to extend Time (remarks) 1177 (i)
———Petitions, on M to suspend Rules (remarks) 1177 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Controller of Customs, M. to adjn. Hse., 4709 (ii).
Public Accts. Com., Meetings (remarks) 2945 (ii)
Public Works, Contracts Entered into (Ques.) 204, 230 (i).
Revenue and Expenditure for April, 1894-95 (Ques.) 427 (i).
Savings Banks Deposits, Total Amounts (Ques.) 2598 (ii).
Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 2°, 79 (i).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3552 (ii).
——— Meetings during Sittings of House, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3911 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 498 (i).
Senate, Vacancies and Appnmts. (Ques.) 482 (i).
Sittings of the House, Delay in Opening (remarks) 2607 (ii).
Statistical Year-Book, Printing, &c., Instructions, on M. for copy, 220 (i).
Sugar Imported into Montreal and Halifax (Ques.) 1060 (i).
——— Raw and Refined (Ques.) 768 (i).
Superannuation Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1821 (i).
——— List, Names, Appnmts., &c., on M. for Ret., 274 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3383; (Photographic Exhibition) 3355 (ii).

Canals—Capital (Rapide Plat) 3703: (Trent Valley) 3705 (ii). *Income* (Cornwall) 2263: (Chambly) 2261: (Lachine) Expenses re Commission, 2229: (Rideau) 2256: (Welland) 2267 (i).

Civil Government (Customs) 2710: (Finance) 2704 (ii); (Gov. Gen's. Sec's. Office) 1912 (i); (Post Office) 2719, computing Interest, 3090: (Railways and Canals) 2723 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Canals (Beauharnois) 2270: (Lachine) 2273: (Williamsburgh) 2272 (i). Culling Timber, 4282. Customs, 4349. Dominion Lands, 4347. Excise, 4279. Post Office, 2501, 4312. Public Works, 4276. Trade and Commerce, 4347. Weights and Measures, &c., 2504, 4301 (ii).

Fisheries (Frauds re Bounty) 2351 (i).

Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 3814; (Ont. and Que.) 2483 (ii).

Justice, Administration of (B.C.) 1948; (Ont.) 1847.

Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2097: (Hugh Sutherland's Indemnity) 2091: (Voters' Lists) 1952, 2099 (i). Library (Salaries, &c.) 3341 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 3617 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3609; (Baddeck, &c., and Port Mulgrave) 3608: (Pictou and Montague Bridge, P.E.I.) 3599: (St. John, &c., and W. Indies) 3597 (ii).

Militia and Defence (Esquimalt Defences) 3189: (Military College) 3806 (ii): (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2197, 2217 (i), 3177 (ii):

Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 2490 (ii): (Duties on Army and Navy Supplies) 3906: (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2491, 2611, 2626; (Thompson, Lady, contribution to Fund) 2653: (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2500, 2632; (Surveys, &c., Northumberland Straits) 3808 (ii).

Mounted Police, 3075 (ii).

Open Account (Seed Grain) 2661 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3141, Binder Twine, 3145 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3468 (ii): *Income:* Buildings (Man.) 2298: (N.B.) 2274 (i), 3490: (N.S.) 3477 (ii); (Ont.) 2296 (i), 3505 (ii): (Que.) Lighting Montreal P.O., 2295: (Repairs, &c., Rideau Hall) 2302 (i); Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3525: (Que.) 3514.

Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 3675: (I.C.R.) 3683 (ii).

Scientific Institutions, &c. (Hydrographic Surveys) 3618 (ii).

Statistics (Year-Book) 3345 (ii).

Tariff, Statements respecting, on Ms. for Rets., 266 (i).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3559; in Com., 3567; on M. for 3°, 3820 (ii.

—— B. 44 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 479 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, Contracts (Ques.) 204 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*

Vacancies in the Senate, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 3848: neg. (Y. 55. N. 95) 3855 (ii)

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 1827 (i).

Ways and Means, on M. for Com. (remarks) 180.

—— The Tariff: in Com., 4856 (ii).

Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c., on M. for Ret., 435 (i).

Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry., Legislation (remarks) 4254 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*

Address to His Ex., on the, 131 (i).

Agriculture Dept., Vacancy in Cabinet (remarks) 4581 (ii).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4274 (ii).

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3128 (ii).

Baie St. Paul and Chicoutimi Mail Contract (Ques.) 3816 (ii).

Baie St. Paul Pier, Contract for Construction (Ques.) 3816 (ii).

Barry's Bay Station, Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry., Closing (M. for Ret.) 4004 (ii).

Board of Experts (Customs) in U.S. (Ques.) 1826.

Budget, The (remarks) 1263 (i).

—— on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1794 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3762 (ii).

Commercial Treaties. *See* "Treaty with France."

Controller of Customs, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4718 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4694 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 1°, 3914 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. Hse., 4490.

—— Deptl. Employees, Special (Ques.) 2164 (i).

—— Duties on American Hardware, on Ques. of Order, 1283 (i).

—— Valuations, Outside Agents, &c. (Ques.) 1826 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 4071 (ii).

Drainage across Ry. Lines (M. for Stmnt.) 208.

—— Ry. Lands (B. 49) 1°, 477 (i).

Fenelon Falls, Filling up Road (Ques.) 4581 (ii).

Fisheries of the Great Lakes, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3977 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3638, 3641; in Com., 3658 (ii).

Govt. Business, precedence on Wednesdays (remarks) 3621 (ii).

Govt. Contracts to Aliens Prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2528 (ii).

Imports of Free Goods by Govt. (Ques.) 2571 (ii).

International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3759 (ii).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3002.

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*

Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Martin*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4115 (ii).

Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 839 (i).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*) on Amt. to Sen. Amts., 4777.

Liquor Traffic, Rep. of Royal Com. (Ques.) 85 (i).

——— Appnmt. of Royal Commission, Date, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 210 (i).

Locomotive Boilers, Inspection by Govt. (prop. Res.) 3199 (ii).

Manitoba Schools Question, on M. to adjn. deb., 4578 (ii).

Ministerial Explanations, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 370 (i).

N'fld, Rep. *re* Negotiations (remarks) 1184 (i).

Orange Procession on Parliament Grounds (remarks) 4255 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) *re* Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2513 (ii).

——— (Ques. of) Man. Schools, 820 (i).

——— (Ques. of) Unparliamentary Language, 3001 (ii).

——— Sel. Com. on Rys., &c., 3911 (ii).

Ottawa Public Buildings, Protection against Storms, &c. (remarks) 2573 (ii).

Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 609 (i).

Ry. Act Amt., Security of Passengers (B. 65) 1°, 617 (i).

St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans, Expend., &c. (Ques.) 4355 (ii).

St. Louis, Emmanuel, Judge Desnoyers's Decision (Ques.) 1552 (i).

——— Civil Proceedings against (Ques.) 1588 (i).

St. Peter's Canal, par. in North Sydney *Herald* (Ques.) 4580 (ii).

St. Thomas P. O., Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 2163 (i).

——— Employees' Salaries (Ques.) 2357 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 485, 501 (i).

Statistical Year-Book, Printing, &c., Instructions (M. for copy) 217 (i).

Superannuation List, Names, Appnmts., &c., on M. for Ret., 275 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 3343; (Agricultural Societies, N.W.T.) 3349 (ii); (Dairying Interests) 2116 (i), 3351, 3981, 4469; (Experimental Farms) 3981; (*Patent Record*) 3345; (Photographic Exhibition) 3352 (ii).

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2223. *Income* (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2254 (i).

Civil Government (Sec. of State) 3930 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, &c., 4309. Post Office, 4334. Weights and Measures, &c., 4285, 4301 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 3886 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 1954 (i).

Miscellaneous (Thompson, Lady, contribution to Fund) 2656: (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) conc., 2676 (ii).

Militia and Defence (Clothing) 3186; (Drill, City Corps, &c.) 4460: (Military College) 3790: (Military Properties) 3180 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2214, 2221 (i); (Transport, Freight, &c.) 3187; (Warlike, &c., Stores) 3185 (ii).

Quarantine (Organized Districts) 3354 (ii).

Statistics (Year-Book) 3345 (ii).

Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Revenue and Expenses (Ques.) 4356 (ii).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3826 (ii).

Voters' Lists, Outside Printing (Ques.) 229, 308 (i).

Wheat Profits, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2051 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*

Athlone-Tottenham Mail Service, Tenders for Contract (Ques.) 1587 (i), 3193 (ii).

Bealton P.O., Change of Name (Ques.) 1268 (i).

Boston P.O., Change of Name (Ques.) 1267 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1187 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. (B. 3) Seduction, &c., 1°*, 79; 2° m., 2145 (i).

——— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4086 (ii).

Customs Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1273 (i).

——— Employees, Extra or Regular (Ques.) 3191.

Commercial Treaties. *See* "Treaty with France."

Deptl. Reps., Distribution (M. for Stmt.) 312 (i).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 716, 1875 (i).

Exports to Australia (Ques.) 84 (i).

Franchise (Electoral) Act Repeal (B. 14) 1°, 182.

Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 446 (i).

Geological Survey Rep. (Ques.) 181 (i).

Govt. Business, precedence of deb. on Address, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 78 (i).

——— precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2026 (i).

Immigration, Transport of Jew Pedlars, on M. for Cor., 264 (i).

Imperial Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1825 (i).

Indemnity to Members, &c., on 2° of Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4121 (ii).

Land Grants (Denominational) in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 209 (i).

Langevin Block, Ottawa, Claim for Extras (Ques.) 1970 (i).

Lord's Day Observance (B. 2) 1°*, 79; 2°, 465; in Com., 737, 741, 1841 (i).

——— (M.) to restore to Order Paper, 766 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Lumber and Saw-logs Free, on M. for Com. of Sup. (personal explanation) 2031; on M. to adjn. deb., 2067 (i).
Maps of Electoral Districts, Preparation (Ques.) 1081 (i).
Military College, Board of Visitors (Ques.) 1588.
——— Number of Cadets (Ques.) 1973 (i).
N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4076, 4117 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4368 (ii).
Road and Road Allowances in Man. B. 114 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4073 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal and C.P.R. (Ques.) 1973.
Schools in Man., Judicial Decisions (M. for copies*) 221 (i).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3548 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 490 (i).
Subsidies Voted to Rys. in 1891 (Ques.) 230 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital (Rapide Plat) 3704 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 4284 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3607 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3466. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 3487; (Que.) 3495 (ii).

Sutton, Mr., Appnmt. to Royal Can. Dragoons (Ques.) 1972 (i).
Tay Canal, Revenue and Maintenance (Ques.) 230 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3233 (ii).
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3559; in Com., 3577 (ii).
U.S. Legislation re Navigation of the Great Lakes (remarks) 3556 (ii).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 1828 (i).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*

Butter Shipments to Great Britain, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4824 (ii).
Can. Ins. Promotion Ass. incorp. (B. 86) 1°*, 1179 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2548, 2553 (ii).
Gendreau, Telesphore, inquiry respecting (Ques.) 2138 (i).
——— Charges against (Ques.) 3712 (ii).
I.C.R., Cap St. Ignace and Halifax Express (Ques.) 1973 (i).
——— Cap St. Ignace Station, new Siding (Ques.) 2571 (ii).
——— Sale of Newspapers, Contract (M. for Ret.*) 222 (i).
——— Summer Time Tables, Changes (Ques.) 970 (i), 2571 (ii).
——— Thefts from Carleton Sheds (Ques.) 272 (i).

Choquette, Mr. P. A.—*Continued.*

Laurentides P.O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4807 (ii).
Little River St. François, Improvements (Ques.) 1361 (i).
Lowe, Henry, Employmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1179
Puize, L. T., Claim against Govt. (M. for Pets.*) 300 (i).
Quebec Citadel, Contract for Cordwood (Ques.) 2726 (ii).
St. Roch des Aulnets Lightship, Cordwood Contract (Ques.) 2727 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Extra Work by Contractors (Ques.) 272 (i).
Seizure of Illicit Still at L'Islet Station (Ques.) 2138 (i), 4115 (ii).
Silver-Lead Smelting, Encouragement B. 142 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4125 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Justice) Gisborne, &c., services, 1914 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, &c., 2593 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2495 (ii).
Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3654 (ii).

Tobacco Seizure at Isle Verte (Ques.) 697 (i).
——— in Temiscouata (Ques.) 489 (i).
Trois Pistoles, Charges against Postmaster (Ques.) 4708 (ii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4102 (ii).
Grenville Canal, Collector of Tolls (Ques.) 4357.
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 2806 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 504 (i).

Coatsworth, Mr. E., jr., *East Toronto.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1408 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (B. 24) Union Labels, &c., 1°, 269 (i).
Fish Imports from France, Quantities, &c. (Ques) 1550 (i).
Fishing Licenses paid N'fld., Refund (Ques.) 1551 (i).
Imperial Trusts Co. of Can. consolid. Act Amt. (B. 72) 1°*, 839 (i).
Kootenay and Spokane Registered Mail (Ques.) 1182 (i).
Lieut. Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 836 (i).
Lobster Hatcheries in Maritime Provinces (Ques.) 1551 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 425 (i); in Com., 3230, 3244, 3408, 4030; 3° m., 4154; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 4159.
——— (M.) to ref. back to Com., 3589 (ii).

Cleveland, Mr. C. C., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2126 (i).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., *Centre Toronto.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1084 (i).
Canals, Depth of Water (Ques.) 921 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4105 (ii).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3756 (ii).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4269.
Ocean Mail Service, Dom. and Allan Lines (Ques.) 921 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4677 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 494 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) on Amt. to M. for 3°, 4160 (ii).

Colter, Mr. N. R., *Carleton, N.B.*
Carleton, N.B., Bonded Warehouses, Closing (Ques.) 2357 (i).
Fishery Officers on the Miramichi (Ques.) 1081 (i).
——— Regulations, St. John River (Ques.) 430 (i).
Maduxnekeag, Fishway at Dam (Ques.) 699 (i).
St. John River, Improved Navigation (Ques.) 3359 (ii).
——— Fishing Regulations (Ques.) 273 (i).
Salmon Fishing in N.B. (Ques.) 3455 (ii.)

Corbould, Mr. G. E., *New Westminster.*
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2196 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1864 (i).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4377 (ii).
Penitentiary, B.C., Jas. Fitzsimmons's Reinstatement, on M. for Cor., 298 (i).
——— Justice Drake's Instructions (M. for copy) 297 (i).
——— Warden McBride's Retirement (Ques.) 308.
——— W. A. Kearney's Retirement (Ques.) 308.
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4819 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 3533 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 171 (i).
Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealers, on M. for Cor., 216 (i).
——— Expenses *re* Arbitration (Ans.) 426 (i).
——— Payment of Indemnity to Sealers (Ans.) 620 (i).
——— Seal Fisheries, Arms and Implements (Ans.) 1083 (i).
——— Compensation to Sealers (Ans.) 83 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J.—*Continued.*
Camp Harmony Angling Club incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 1733 (i).
Cascumpeque Harbour Buoys, Contract *re* (Ans.) 2358 (i).
Cattle Exports, Limitation of Space (remarks) 145 (i).
Darnley Basin, &c., Buoys and Range Lights (Ans.) 589 (i).
Dom. Police, Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 229 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt., Exemptions (B. 67) 1°, 618 (i); 2° m., 2574; in Com., 2593 (ii).
——— (B. 91) 1°, 1179 (i).
——— Salmon Fishery (B. 118) 1°, 2919 (i).
Fishery Officers on the Miramichi (Ans.) 1082 (i).
——— Overseer, Kent District, Ont. (Ans.) 698 (i).
——— Regulations, St. John River (Ans.) 273, 430 (i).
Fishing Licenses paid N'fld., Refund (Ans.) 1551.
——— Regulations in Detroit and St. C'air Rivers, &c. (Ans.) 2356 (i).
——— Regulations, Gulf St. Lawrence (Ans.) 427.
Gendreau, Télesphore, inquiry respecting (Ans.) 2138 (i).
——— Charges against (Ans.) 3713 (ii).
International Fisheries Commission, Rep. (Ans.) 3983 (ii).
Kinney, Jos. R., Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (Ans.) 573 (i).
Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 91) 1°, 1179; 2° m., 3092; in Com., 3094, 3659; Sen. Amts., 3672 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Season, Extension of Time (Ans.) 2573 (ii).
——— Hatcheries in Maritime Provinces (Ans. 1551 (i).
——— Packing, License Fees (Ans.) 286 (i).
Lobsters, Regulations as to Size and Catch (Ans.) 574 (i).
Maduxnekeag, Fishway at Dam (Ans.) 699 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4688 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Deptl. Reps. (presented) 758 (i), 2569 (ii).
Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O. C's, &c., 1986 (i).
North Cape (P.E.I.) Whistling Buoy (Ans.) 931.
Pilotage in Bonaventure, Compulsory, on M. for Cor., 340 (i).
——— St. John, Rep. of Commission (Ans.) 2360 (i).
Plummer's Wharf, Sault Ste. Marie, Govt. Title (Ans.) 2363 (i).
St. John River (N.B.) Fishing Regulations (Ans). 273, 430 (i).
St. Rochs des Aulnets, Cordwood Contract (Ans.) 2727 (ii).
"San Pedro," Removal of Wreck (Ans.) 933 (i).
Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers (N.S.) on M. for Ret., 1978 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J.—*Continued.*

Sea Fisheries, &c., Development (B. 74) 1°, 839 (i); 3°, 3086 (ii).

Shipping Regulations on the Great Lakes (Ans.) 2361 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Marine and Fisheries) 2721 (ii).

Collection of Revenue: Post Office, 4331 (ii).

Fisheries (Distributing Bounty) 3891 (ii); (Gratuity to J. R. Spencer's Widow) 2334 (i); (Man.) 3519; (N.S.) 3548 (ii); (Refund of Fines) 2334 (i).

Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 2091 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Gratuity to William Smith's Widow) 2234 (i); (Maintenance, &c.) 3517 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Seal Island Lighthouse Station) 3616; (Tidal Service) 3616 (ii).

Lignish Breakwater, Wharfage Fees Collected (Ans.) 982, 2358 (i).

—— Wharfinger, Amounts Collected, &c. (Ans.) 430 (i).

Curran, Hon. J. J., *Centre Montreal.*

Connolly, Messrs., Process of Execution against (remarks) 233 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. 6 m. h., 2149 (i).

—— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4107 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4183 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 4070 (ii).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M for Com. of Sup., 2968 (ii)

Larkin, Connolly & Co., Suit against (Ans.) 203 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 739, 1858 (i).

Penitentiaries' Rep. (presented) 1353 (i).

Penitentiary, B. C., James Fitzsimmons's Suspension (Ans.) 205 (i).

Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 608 (i).

St. Louis, Emmanuel, Prosecution *re* Lachine Canal Bridge Contract (Ans.) 927 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 512 (i).

South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35, on M. to refer back to Com., 1692 (i).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2654 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3417 (ii).

Watters, T. J., Offences under Customs Act (Ans.) 929 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1113 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D.—*Continued.*

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ingram*) 723 (i).

Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4679 (ii).

Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 2799 (ii).

Daly, Hon. T. M., *Selkirk.*

Anderson, Jas., of Sutton, Emplmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 306, 479 (i).

Booth, Gen., Land for proposed Colony (Ans.) 427, 2361 (i).

Dingman, Absolam, General Inspector Indian Agencies, Appmnt. (Ans.) 4186 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 116) 1°, 2507; in Com., 3270; Sen. Amts., 3920 (ii).

Foster, H. S., Sale of Govt. Land in Iberville (Ans.) 3195 (ii).

General Revenue Fund, N.W.T. (B. 134) prop. Res., 2573; in Com. on Res., 3122; 1° of B., 3267; in Com., 3720 (ii).

Geological Survey, Summary Rep. (presented) 181 (i).

—— Madoc and Marmora (Ans.) 2943 (ii).

Governor General, Reduction of Salary B. 4 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m.h., 3252 (ii).

Hatch, Walter, Superannuation (Ans.) 1079 (i).

Huron Indians at Lorette and agent Bastien, M. for Cor. 1975 (i).

Immigration, Michigan to Ont., Govt. Aid (Ans.) 429 (i).

—— to N.W.T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3771.

Indian Act Amt. (B. 100) 1°*, 2351 (i); 2° m., 3933.

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 181 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1082 (i).

Irrigation in N.W.T. (B. 120) 1°, 3079; in Com., 4768 (ii).

Isle aux Noix, Govt. Land Sales (Ans.) 2510 (ii).

Jew Pedlars, Transport from Chicago to Calgary, on M. for Cor., 250, 263 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2187 (i); in Com. on B. 127, 3732 (ii).

Land Grants (Denominational) in Man and N.-W.T., on M. for Ret., 209 (i).

Lands Leased for Homesteading, Wm. Fleming's Case, on M. for Cor., 2367 (i).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) in Com., 1965 (i).

Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 811, 812 (i).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1908 (i).

Manitoba Schools Question, on M. to adjn. deb. 4576 (ii).

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. (B. 121) 1°*, 3080; in Com., 4074, 4118; on 3°, 4361, 4762; Sen. Amts., 4470 (ii).

—— Act Amt. (B. 135) 1°*, 3455; 2°, m., 3930; in Com., 3932 (ii).

Daly, Hon. T. M.—*Continued.*
Oka Indians, Transfer to Muskoka, Number (Ans.) 1358 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Census Inaccuracies, 1831 (i).
——— Manitoba Schools, on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 804 (i).
Paradis, Rev. Father, Colonization Scheme (Ans.) 3197 (ii).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2169 (i).
Pre-emption Lots in Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Ret., 3199 (ii).
Public Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3283 (ii).
Qu'Appelle Valley Indian Reserves, Shooting Privileges (Ans.) 1550 (i).
Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4007.
Railway Belt (B.C.) Settlement B. 141 (Mr. *Foster*) 2° m., 4078; in Com., 4079 (ii).
Reed, Hayter, Ret. respecting (Ans.) 1830 (i).
Road and Road Allowances in Man. (B. 114) 1°*, 2405; in Com., 4073 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Water Lots (Ans.) 1549 (i).
St. Peter's Reserve Indians, Memorials, &c., on M. for Ret., 4009 (ii).
Salvation Army, Gen. Booth's Immigration Scheme (Ans.) 427, 2361 (i).
Seigniory of Sorel, Govt. Tenants (Ans.) 304 (i).
Six Nation Indians, Deptl. Reps., Distribution (Ans.) 429 (i).
Sugar Island, Sale by Govt. (Ans.) 3359 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 1945 (i), 2691; contingencies, 3102 (ii); (Interior) 1918, 1938 (i), 2389 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 4352, Dominion Lands, 4348, Post Office, 4342 (ii).
Geological Survey (Artesian Borings) 2488 (ii).
Government of N. W. T., 3305 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 2487, 3875, 3895; (Man. and N. W.T.) 3814; (N.B.) Salaries, 3813; (N.S.) 2481; (Ont. and Que.) 2483, 3813 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Medicine Hat Hospital) 2499; (Passamaquoddy Bay, Boundary) 3308; (Roads and Bridges, Banff) 3307 (ii).
Mounted Police, 3679 (ii).
Open Account (Seed Grain) 2661 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3172 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 2298.
Survey of Township 16, Range 16-W. (Ans.) 2138.
Thousand Islands, Reservations for Park, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4003 (ii).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co., on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4868; in Com, 4870; on M. for 2° of B., 4883 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3134 (ii).
Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2464 (ii).
Ballot Papers, B. respecting (remarks) 3915 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
Behring Sea, Conference between Great Britain and United States (remarks) 1185 (i).
——— Seizure of Sealers by Russian Cruisers (remarks) 3369 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3856, 3873 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1622 (i).
Can. and N'fld., Conference of Delegates (remarks, 270 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 343 (i).
Can. Order of Foresters incorp. B. 47 (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com., 2293 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Point Tupper Terminus, on M. for Pets., &c., 341 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. 6 m. h., 2149 (i).
——— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4085 (ii).
——— Joint Com., Reduction of Quorum, 3266.
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4144, 4167 (ii).
Customs Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1288 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 4065; in Com., 3922, 4066 (ii).
——— (B. 76) 1°, 918 (i).
Dom. Notes Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3087 (ii).
"Duart Castle," &c., SS., Manifests of Cargoes (M. for Ret.*) 2023 (i).
Female Offenders in N.S., B. 128 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 3717; in Com., 3719 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. (Exemptions) B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 619 (i); on M. for 2°, 2576; in Com., 2607 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) in Com., 3462 (ii).
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2699 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Subsidies respecting (Ques.) 1082 (i).
Imperial Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1824 (i).
Imports of Dutiable Goods, Amount and Duties Collected (Ques.) 576 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c., in Com. on Res., 4063 (ii).
Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3117.
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Time Tables (Ques.) 1828.
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3945 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (Salaries) in Com. on Res. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2181, 2193 (i); in Com. on B. 127, 3724 (ii).
——— (Superannuation) in Com. on Res., 3088 (ii)
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 2815; neg. (Y. 65, N. 102) 3077.

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*

Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3096; on 2° of Amts., 3672 (ii).

Lobster Fishing, Extension of Season (Ques.) 2573, 3360 (ii).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Return respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1899 (i).

Manitoba Schools, Papers respecting Law (remarks) 572 (i).

Ministerial Explanations, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 378 (i).

Newfoundland, Negotiations *re* Confederation (remarks) 840, 855, 919 (i).

——— Rep. *re* Negotiations (remarks) 1183 (i).

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4077 (ii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2176 (i).

——— Bill 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4366 (ii).

Pickford and Black's Contract, Halifax and W. Indies (Ques.) 922 (i).

Printing Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 309.

Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 605 (i).

Pub. Accts. Com., Meetings (remarks) 2946 (ii).

Rice Imports, July '94 to May '95, Quantity (Ques.) 1585 (i).

Rustico Breakwater, Tenders for Contract (Ques.) 699 (i).

Ry. System in P.E.I., Extension, on M. for Ret. 2777 (ii).

Sea Fisheries Development, &c., B. 74 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 3087 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 506 (i).

Steam Service, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 292 (i).

Subsidies to Rys. and Rys. Built by Dom., Names, Cost, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2023 (i).

Subsidized SS. Contracts, Mar. Provs. and W. Indies (M. for Ret.) 2023 (i).

Superannuation Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 2162 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3983 (ii)

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2224. *Income* (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2229 (i).

Charges of Management, 3106 (ii); (Asst. Receiver Gen.'s Office, Charlottetown) 1910 (i).

Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 3105: (Civil Service Examiners) 3100; (Customs) 2710: (Finance) 2708 (ii): (Interior) 1909; (Justice) J. W. Hughes' services, 1915 (i); (Marine and Fisheries) 2721; (Militia and Defence) contingencies, 3100: (Post Office) 2720; (Public Works) 2722, contingencies, 3102; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 3101; (Trade and Commerce) contingencies, 3105 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4331 (ii).

Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2335; (Refund of Fines) 2334 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Justice, Administration of (Official Arbitrators) 3106: (Supreme Court) 3108: (Travelling Expenses High Court Judges) 3107 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2104. Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2107 (i).

Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 3907; (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2493, 2616; (Mr. Fabre's Salary) 3907: (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2500, 2633, conc., 2673 (ii).

Militia and Defence (Military Properties) 3178 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3142 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) St. John Custom House, 2285: (Repairs, &c., Rideau Hall) 2302. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2323; (N.B.) 2295 (i); (N.S.) 3510; (Que.) 3524 (ii).

Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3683 (ii).

Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Funeral Expenses (remarks) 2516 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3410 (ii).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3839 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 1828 (i).

Watters, T. J., Offences under Customs Act (Ques.) 920 (i).

West Indies, Subsidised Service Ret. *re* (inquiry) 3819 (ii).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia.*

Address to His Ex., on The, 115 (explanation) 154 (i).

Cabinet Representation for B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4794 (ii).

Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1838 (i).

Controller of Customs, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4716 (ii).

Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage (prop. Res.) 4011 (ii).

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 239 (i).

Debates Official Rep., Distribution (remarks) 232 (i).

Enfranchisement of Women (prop. Res.) 701, 1837; neg. (Y. 47, N. 105) 2144 (i).

Freight Rates Commission, N.W.T. (prop. Res.) 4022 (ii).

Jew Pedlars, Transport from Chicago to Calgary, on M. for Cor., 262 (i).

Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4267.

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii)

Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4667 (ii).

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4119; on M. for 3°, 4364 (ii).

Qu'Appelle Valley Indian Reserve, Shooting Privileges (Ques.) 1550 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*

Rebellion in N.W.T., Scrip for Scouts, &c. (prop. Res.) 2400 (i).

Rifle Associations in N.W.T., Discarded Rifles (Ques.) 1078 (i).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3550 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2130 (i)
Canals—Income (Welland) 2268 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies 3104 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 3879 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3143 (ii).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3574 (ii).

U. S. Alien Labour Law (remarks) 4908 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com. (sawed boards) 4854 (ii).

Davis, Mr. D. W., *Alberta.*

Calgary and Lethbridge Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 839 (i).

Dawson, Mr. G. W. W., *Addington.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1436 (i).

Dominion Bank, Vanluven's Declarations (Ques.) 3996 (ii).

West Rideau Lake Dam, Claims for Land Damages (Ques.) 3996 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G., *West Toronto.*

Bankers' Life Association of Can. incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 425 (i).

Canals, Depth of Water (Ques.) 921 (i).

Customs Officials, Toronto, Emplymt. (Ques.) 305 (i).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1875 (i).

Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2698 (ii).

International Convention *re* Industrial Property (prop. Res.) 2403 (i).

International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3594 (ii).

Man. and North-west Loan Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 616 (i).

Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4216 (ii).

Nova Scotia Steel Co.'s incorp. (B. 56) M. for Com. (objection) 1731 (i).

Ocean Mail Service, Dom. and Allan Lines (Ques.) 921 (i).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3552 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 493 (i).

Denison, Mr. F. C.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital (Rapide Plat) 3703 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4318 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' List) 1951. Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2195 (i).
Militia and Defence (Military College) 3781 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2199 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) Lighting Montreal P.O., 2294 (i)

Devlin, Mr. C. R., *Ottawa (County).*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1092 (i).

Controller of Customs, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse. 4723 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2581; in Com., 2595 (ii).

Govt. Surveys, &c., Outside Work (Ques.) 1586.

Hull P. O. Letter Carriers (Ques.) 1586 (i).

Immigration, Michigan to Ont., Govt. Aid (Ques.) 429 (i).

"Laval" Dredge, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 428 (i).

Leduc, Charles, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4356.

Papineauville and Cheneville Mail Contract (Ques.) 580 (i).

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry., Condition, &c. (Ques.) 574 (i).

——— Gross Earnings (M. for Stmnt.) 211 (i).

——— Payment of Subsidy (Ques.) 1586 (i).

——— Reps. to Govt. (M. for copies, &c.*) 2405 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Interior) 1944 (i).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2625 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3143 (ii).

Voters' Lists for Wright (remarks) 2351 (i).

Wakefield and Rupert Mail Service (Ques.) 1585.

Dickey, Hon. A. R., *Cumberland.*

Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2472 (ii).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 860, 1661 (i).

Beacon Hill (B.C.) Powder Magazine (Ans.) 919.

Brigade Camp No. 1 District, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2609 (ii).

Can. Troops for England (Ans.) 1180 (i).

Carling Brewing Co.'s Property, Govt. Lease (Ans.) 573 (i).

Controller of Customs, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4735 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4106 (ii).

Garrison Artillery, Quebec, No. 3 Battery, on M. for Cor. (Amt.) 1974 (i).

Guy, Charles, Peterborough, Pension (Ans.) 1452.

Herbert, Maj.-Gen. Resignation as Commander of Militia (Ans.) 2137 (ii).

Isle aux Noix, Govt. Property (Ans.) 2511 (ii).

Lazier, Lt.-Col., Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3596 (ii).

Dickey, Hon. A. R.—*Continued.*

Laprairie Camp, Supply of Groceries (Ans.) 3193.
Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 793 (i).
London Military School, Sewage Discharge (Ans.) 1359 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 759 (i).
Louisbourg, Proposed Monument by U.S. Citizens (Ans.) 925 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).
Military College, Board of Visitors (Ans.) 1588 (i).
——— Kingston, Number of Cadets (Ans.) 1973.
——— Grounds at Annapolis, Rental of Stores (Ans.) 2140 (i).
Militia and Defence Deptl. Rep. (presented) 571.
——— Drill, 1895 (Ans.) 573 (i).
Permanent Corps, Total Strength (Ans.) 2362 (i).
Quebec Citadel, Contract for Cordwood (Ans.) 2726 (ii).
Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4904 (ii).
Rifle Associations in N.W.T., Discarded Rifles (Ans.) 1078 (i).
Royal Standard, Right to Hoist (Ans.) 2137, 2354.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Justice) J. W. Hughes' services 1916 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4333 (ii).
Militia and Defence (Clothing) 3185; (Dom. Cartridge Factory) 3189; (Drill, City Corps, &c.) 4460: (Esquimalt Defences) 3189; (Military College) 3800: (Military Properties) 3178 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2197, 2221 (i) 3177; (Provisions, &c.) 3187; (Transport, Freight, &c.) 3187; (Warlike, &c., Stores) 3184 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2626 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Drill Shed, New Westminster) 4462 (ii).
Sutton, Mr., and Appmnt. in Royal Can. Dragoons (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
Troops in Quebec, Reduction in Strength (Ans.) 2361 (i).
Volunteers' Long Service Medals (remarks) 4906.
Weir, Mr., of Keene, Pension (Ans.) 1453 (i).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2141 (i).
Lake St. John Ry., Gross Earnings, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 1974 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4442 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4060, 4197 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., *West Ontario.*

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
Boards of Trade incorp. Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3722 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*

Bounties on Pig Iron made in Canada (M. for Stmnt.*) 2022 (i).
Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1837 (i).
Can. and N'fld., Negotiations, *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 353 (i).
"City of Midland" Str., Seizure, &c. (Ques.) 4708 (ii).
Copyright, Berne Convention (Ques.) 82 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2683 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (B. 15) 2° m., 2542 (ii).
——— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4105 (ii).
Customs Dept. Alleged Irregularities (Ques.) 2754.
——— Duties on American Importations (remarks) 1271 (i).
——— on Spirits (Ques.) 698 (i).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*) in Com., 2697 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1873 (i).
Excise Duty on Spirits (Ques.) 698 (i).
Fenelon Falls, Filling up Road (Ques.) 458 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) (Voters' Lists) on M. for 2°, 3635; on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3638 (ii).
Frauds upon the Govt. Act Amt. (B. 15) 1°, 196 (i).
French Treaty and Foreign Powers, Privileges under (Ques.) 1697 (i).
Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3112 (ii).
I.C.R., Maintenance of Way and Works (Ques.) 430 (i).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3751, 3944 (ii).
International Arbitration (remarks) 773 (i).
——— Convention *re* Industrial Property, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 2405 (i).
——— Waterways Commission (remarks) 3456 (ii).
Jarvis, Helen Woodburn, Relief (B. 115) 1°*, 2506.
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2185 (i).
Liquor Traffic, Royal Com. Expenses (Ques.) 83, 201 (i).
Ministerial Explanations (remarks) 359 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 361 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) *re* Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2513 (ii).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 2166; in Com., 2175 (i).
Penitentiary, B.C., Jas. Fitzsimmons' Suspension (Ques.) 204 (i).
Permanent Reserve Life Ass. of Can. incorp. (B. 78) 1°*, 1000 (i).
Quebec Citadel, Groceries Contract (Ques.) 82, 201 (i).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Subsidies, on M. for Ret., 334 (i).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., Meetings during Sittings of House, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3909 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3547 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 488 (i).

South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 1692 (i).

South Shore Ry. B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4395 (ii).

Sugar Imports (Ques.) 1357 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Income (Welland) 2269 (i).

Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2660 (ii).

Tariff, Statements respecting, on Ms. for Rets., 265; (M. for Ret.) 335 (i).

Treaty with France (B. 126) (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3558, 3564; on M. for 3°, 3821 (ii).

Voters' Lists, Cost of Revision (Ques.) 83, 229 (i).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1129 (i).

——— (explanations) 1114, 1173, 1261 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2577; in Com., 2597 (ii).

Gilmour & Hughson incorp. (B. 79) 1°*, 1000 (i).

Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4907 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2290 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com. on Res. (sawed boards) 4850 (ii).

Fauvel, Mr. W. Le B., *Bonaventure.*

Anticosti, Electoral Lists, Revision (Ques.) 1359.

I.C.R., Thefts from Carleton Sheds (Ques.) 272.

Metapedia and Caplan Mail Service (Ques.) 305.

Pilotage in Bonaventure, Compulsory (M. for Cor.) 339 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Extra work by Contractors (Ques.) 272 (i).

Featherston, Mr. J., *Peel.*

Brampton Industrial Establishments (Ques.) 1182 (i).

Binder Twine, Govt. Sales (Ques.) 3818 (ii).

Cattle Embargo by Great Britain, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4847 (ii).

Exports, Limitation of Space (remarks) 144 (i).

Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s (B. 32) 1°*, 425 (i).

Sheep Exports to Great Britain (M. for Cor.) 2385, 2395 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., *Leeds and Grenville.*

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 744 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., Govt. Guarantee (Ques.) 2920 (ii).

Flint, Mr. T. B.—*Continued.*

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., Govt. Guarantee on M. for Com. of Sup., 3139 (ii).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1303 (i).

Can. and N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 352 (i).

Can. Temperance Act Amt. (B. 107) 1°, 2136 (i).

Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s (M. for Ret.) 3202, 3375 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4089 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts (Salaries) in Com. on Res. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2185 (i).

Liquor Traffic, Rep. of Royal Commission (Ques.) 203, 1083, 1951 (i).

——— Expenses of Royal Commission, including Printing, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2024 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3094 (ii).

Prohibition of Liquor Traffic (prop. Res.) 2789 (ii).

St. Thomas P. O., Employes' Salaries (Ques.) 2357 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 492 (i).

Senate, Vacancies and Appnmts. (Ques.) 480 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) on M. for 2°, 4827 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 3343; (Dairying Interests) 3988 (ii).

Fisheries (Distribution of Bounty) 3991 (ii); (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2335 (i); N.S.) 3618 (ii).

Indians (N.B.) Salaries, 3813; (Ont. and Que.) 3813 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2612; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) conc., 2679 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Exam. of Masters &c.) 3615 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2305 (i).

Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3694 (ii).

Statistics (Year-Book) 3347 (ii).

Thousand Islands, Number Sold, on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 1975 (i).

Yarmouth Bar Breakwater, Cost and Expenditure (M. for Cor.*) 2023 (i).

Forbes, Mr. F. G., *Queen's, N.S.*

Anticosti Island, Ownership (M. for Ret.) 322 (i).

Census, Industries in Queen's and Shelburne (M. for Ret.) 326 (i).

——— Ret. respecting (Ques.) 2031 (i), 2670 (ii).

Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3209, 3378, 4039 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2584; in Com., 2600 (ii).

Halifax Deep Water Terminus, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 3817 (ii).

——— Freight Shed, Tenders (Ques.) 2727 (ii).

I.C.R., Employees' Summer Vacation (Ques.) 2511 (ii).

Forbes, Mr. F. G.—*Continued.*

Liquor Traffic, Rep. of Royal Com. (Ques.) 203.
Little Hope Island Bell Buoy (M. for Ret.) 2401.
Liverpool Harbour, Engineers' Surveys, &c. (M. for copies) 325 (i).
Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3095 (ii).
Military Grounds at Annapolis, Rental of Stores (Ques.) 2139 (i).
Port De Bert Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ques.) 305 (i).
Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers, N.S. (M. for Ret.) 1975 (i).
Shelburne Harbour, Iron Buoys (Ques.) 700 (i).
Shields, F., ex-Postmaster at Milton (Ques.) 304.
——— (M. for Cor.) 324 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s Contract (Ques.) 1078 (i).
——— B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4396, 4615, 4771 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2338, 2341 (i).
Public Works—Income: Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 3537 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2305; (N.S.) 2304 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *King's, N.B.*

Address, to His Ex., on The, 36 (i).
——— Reply, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 3191 (ii).
Agriculture Dept., Vacancy in Cabinet (remarks) 4581, 4274 (ii).
Agricultural Implements and the Tariff, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4829.
Anticosti Island, Names of Owners, on M. for Ret., 323 (i).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., Govt. Guarantee (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 3125 (ii).
Auditor General's Rep., Delay in presentation (Ans.) 86 (i).
——— (presented) 309 (i).
——— Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept. (remarks) 2136.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2260, (i), 2421 (ii).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty (B. 148) 1°*, 4861 (ii).
Behring Sea, Conference between Great Britain and U. S. (remarks) 1185 (i).
Boards of Trade incorp. Act. Amt. (B. 137) 1°*, 3621; 2° m., 3721 (ii).
BUDGET, THE (Financial Stmnt.) 518 (i).
——— (explanation) 620 (i).
Cabinet Representation for B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4791 (ii).
Can. and N'fld., Conference of Delegates (remarks) 271 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 346 (i).
Can., France and Belgium SS. Line (Ans.) 3197.
Cattle Exports, Limitation of Space (remarks) 142 (i).
——— Embargo by Great Britain, on M. for Ret., 297 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting, on Ques. of Order, 1831; (remarks) 1833 (i).
Chignecto Ship Ry., Newspaper par. *re* (remarks) 1354 (i).
Civil Servants, Payment to Temporary Clerks (Ans.) 1585 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 104) 1°*, 1881 (i).
——— B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3746 (ii).
——— Temporary Employees (Ans.) 3995 (ii).
Colonies and the Empire (remarks) 4894 (ii).
Columbian Exhibition Commissioner's Expenses (remarks) 2733 (ii).
Commercial Treaties affecting Can. (B. 44) 1°, 479 (i); Order for 2° dschgd., 3085 (ii).
——— *See* "Treaty with France."
Companies' Act Amt. (B. 138) 1°*, 3707; 2° m., 4778; agreed to (Y. 50, N. 24) 4780; in Com., 4781 (ii).
Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 1082 (i).
Copyright, Berne Convention (Ans.) 82 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4140 (ii).
——— Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1275; (Ques. of Order) 1275 (i).
Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4017 (ii).
Dairy Products Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 4761 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., Sel. Com. (M). 180 (i).
Deptl. Reps., Distribution, on M. for Stmnt., 317.
Dom. Govt's. Credit in Banks (Ans.) 204 (i).
——— Notes Act Amt. (B. 22) 1°, 268 (i); in Com., 3087 (ii).
——— Loan (1894) Negotiations (Ans.) 1181 (i).
——— Day, adjnmt. (M.) 3545 (ii).
——— Bank, Vanluven's Declarations (Ans.) 3996.
Drouth in Ont. (remarks) 4582 (ii).
Estimates, The, 1895-96 (presented) 331 (i).
——— Suppl. (Ans.) 619 (i).
——— Suppl., 1894-95 (remarks) 1183 (i).
——— (presented) 1539 (i).
——— Suppl., 1895-96 (presented) 4352 (ii).
Exchange Bank, Ret. *re* (remarks) 3368 (ii).
——— Mr. Ogilvie's Guarantee (Ans.) 3455 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 735, 1867 (i).
Finance Minister's Private Secretary (Ans.) 1361.
Franchise (Electoral) Act Repeal B. 14 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 195 (i).
——— B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3638 (ii).
Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 442, 453 (i).
Govt. Business, precedence of deb. on Address (M.) 78 (i).
——— on Thursdays (M.) 2026; agreed to (Y. 87, N. 55) 2029 (i).
——— Wednesdays (M.) 3111, 3621 (ii).
——— Mondays (M.) 4254 (ii).
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 2569, 2614 (ii).
Govt. Land in Iberville (Ans.) 1969 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

Govt. Surveyors, Outside Work (Ans.) 1587 (i).
Gov. General's Warrants (presented) 85 (i).
Gravel, Bishop, Communication *re* Man. Schools (Ans.) 3368 (ii).
Halliwell, J. L., Pension (Ans.) 1969 (i).
Heir Apparent, Birth Acknowledgment of Address from H. M., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 85 (i).
House of Commons Reading Room, U. S. French-Canadian Papers (Ans.) 3195 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., on adjnmt. (remarks) 181 (i).
——— Subsidies respecting (remarks) 207 : (Ans.) 1082 (i).
Imperial Honours, Recommendations by Gov. Gen. (Ans.) 1973 (i).
——— Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1589 : (Ans.) 1823 ; on Ques. of Order, 1825 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c. (prop. Res.) 3915 ; 2° of Res. and 1°* of B. 143, 4121 (ii).
Internal Economy Com., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 5 (i).
International Arbitration (remarks) 773 (i).
——— Fraternal Alliance, Ass. Co.'s Registration (Ans.) 3995 (ii).
Industries, Returns *re* (remarks) 1185 (i).
Ins. Act. Amt. (B. 92) 1°, 1352 (i) ; in Com., 3112 ; Sen. Amts., 3716 (ii).
——— Exemption of Societies (B. 145) 1°, 4354 ; 2° m., 4768 ; in Com., 4770 (ii).
Ins. Co.'s in Can., Abstract of Statements (presented) 1829 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, precedence of deb. (M.) 2917 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3060 (ii).
Lands in Ry. Belt, B.C., Settlement (B. 141) 1°*, 3993 (ii).
Langevin Block, Ottawa, Claim for Extras (Ans.) 1970 (i).
Leduc, Charles, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4356.
Library, Sel. Com. (M.) 223 (i).
Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 783 (i).
Lieut.-Gov. of Man., Appnmt. (Ans.) 3710 (ii).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4265.
Liquor Traffic, Royal Com., Expenses (Ans.) 83, 202 (i).
——— Rep. of Royal Commission (Ans.) 85, 203, 208, 1083, 1959 (i).
——— Number of Meetings (remarks) 3084 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries, Extension of Season (Ans.) 3360 (ii).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1900 (i).
——— Ret. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 3373 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 476 ; in Com., 756 (i).
Magog Wharf, Expenditure of Vote (Ans.) 1968.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

Malone, Thos., Civil Service Ins. Policy (Ans.) 1586 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, 1894, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1453 (i).
——— Communications with His Ex. (Ans.) 2572.
——— Judgment of Imp. Privy Council, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 85 (i).
——— Papers respecting Law (remarks) 571 (i).
——— Remedial Order (Ans.) 3716 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3997 (ii).
——— Memorial of Legislative Assembly (presented) 4186 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4403 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4568 (ii).
Markland Mortgage Discharge (B. 92) 1°, 1352 (i); Order for 2° dschgd., 2408 (ii).
——— prop. Res., 1883 (i), M. for Com., 2406 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3557 (ii).
——— Discharge (B. 136) 1°, 3558 : 2° m., 3928 ; 3°, 4063 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 5, 331, 1453, 1539 (i), 3191, 4186, 4352 (ii).
Ministerial Explanations (remarks) 354 (i).
——— on (M.) for Com. of Sup., 376 (i).
——— Resignations, Rumoured (statement) 4187.
Moneys Paid to Members outside of Sessional Indemnity, on M. for Ret., 331 (i).
Mounted Police, Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 2814 (ii).
N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 842 (i).
——— Mr. Bond's Mission (remarks) 919 (i).
——— Papers *re* Negotiations (presented) 1539 (i).
——— Rep. *re* Negotiations (remarks) 1183 (i).
——— (Papers presented) 1246 (i).
Northumberland Straits, Tunnel Borings (Ans.) 206 (i).
Oaths of Office, Administration (B. 1) 1°, 2 (i).
Order (Ques. of) American Hardware Duties, 1275 (i).
——— Man. Schools on Mr. Speaker's Ruling (remarks) 804 (i).
——— Ruling of Mr. Speaker questioned by Mr. Martin (remarks) 2513, 2515 (ii).
Penitentiary (B.C.) Warden McBride's Retirement (Ans.) 308 (i).
"Prince Edward" Dredge (Ans.) 700 (i).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 223 (i).
——— Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 309 (i).
Private Bills, on M. to Extend Time (remarks) 1177 (i).
Prorogation, Two Sittings each day (remarks) 4738 (ii).
Provincial Payments into Dom. Treasury, on M. for Ret., 299 (i).
——— Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) adjnmt. of deb. (M.) 616 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

Public Accounts (presented) 181 (i).
——— Com., Irregular Meetings (remarks) 1829.
——— Meetings (remarks) 2945 (ii).
Quebec Citadel, Groceries Contract (Ans.) 82, 202 (i).
Queen's Birthday, adjnmt (remarks) 1355 (i).
——— adjnmt. (M.) 1452 (i).
——— State Festivities (M. to adjn. Hse.) 2030 (i)
Receiver General (Asst.) St. John, N.B. (Ans.) 1360 (i).
Returns, Cost since 1891-95 (Ans.) 2507 (ii).
——— on Inquiries (remarks) 2671, 2815, 3111, 3818 (ii).
Revenue and Expenditure for April 1894-95 (Ans.) 427 (i).
Rustico Breakwater, Tenders for Contract (Ans.) 699 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans, Expend., &c. (Ans.) 4355 (ii).
Savings Banks Deposits, Total Amounts (Ans.) 2508 (ii).
Seizure of Smuggled Goods, on M. for Ret., 4006.
Senate, Vacancies and Appnmts. (Ans.) 481, 483 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5, (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 486 (i).
——— *See* "Indemnity."
Silver-Lead Smelting, Bounty (prop. Res.) 3456; in Com., 3925 (ii).
——— Encouragement (B. 142) 1°*, 4065; in Com., 4124; (M. to recom.) 4763; in Com., 4767 (ii.)
Sittings of the House, Delay in Opening (remarks) 2607 (ii).
——— Morning Sittings (M.) 4770 (ii).
Smith, Henry, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 926.
Standing Committees, Select (M.) 4 (i).
——— Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 180 (i).
Steam Service P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 284 (i).
Streams Exempted under Fisheries Act (Ans.) 3356 (ii).
Superannuation Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 2152 (i).
——— (B. 102) 1°, 1818 (i); (prop. Res.) 3915 (ii).
——— List of Names, &c., on M. for Ret., 274, 299 (i).
——— Returns *re* (remarks) 774, 1084, 3819 (ii).
Superannuations since 1st Jan. 1895 (Ans.) 3994.
SUPPLY: (Res. for Com.) 189 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3986.
Canals—Income (Beauharnois) conc., 2672; (Farran's Point) conc., 2672 (ii).
Charges of Management (Asst. Rec.-Gen 's Office, Charlottetown) 1910 (i); 3106 (ii).
Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 3102; (Civil Service Examiners) 3100 (ii); (Customs) Bales's Salary, 1911 (i); (Finance) 2705; (Geological Survey) 2724 (ii); (Gov. Gen.'s Sec's Office) 1912 (i); (High Commissioner's Office) 3097; (Post Office) 2719; (Public Works) 2722;

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

(Sec. of State) contingencies, 3101 (ii); (Trade and Commerce) Carleton's services, 1912 (i), contingencies, 3105 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Beauharnois) 2270; (Welland) 2273 (i). Post Office, 4339. Trade and Commerce, 4347 (ii).
Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2335 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Official Arbitrators) 3106 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 1949, 1950 (i). Senate (Late Senator Burns's Indemnity) 4466; (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2669 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3601, conc., 4861; (Baddeck, &c., and Port Mulgrave) 3598; (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 3598; (Pictou and Montague Bridge, P.E.I.) 3599 (ii); (P.E.I. and Mainland) 2331 (i), 3597 (ii); Port Mulgrave and Guysboro') 2333; (St. John, Digby and Annapolis) 2332 (i); St. John, &c., and Annapolis) 3599 (ii); (St. John, Halifax and London) 2332 (i); (St. John, &c., and W. Indies) 3597 (ii); (St. John, and Halifax *via* Yarmouth) 2332 (i).
Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 2490; (Surveys, &c., Northumberland Straits) 3908; (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2659; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2633: (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2491, 2611, conc., 2673 (ii).
Mounted Police, 2482, 3675 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) Justice Drake and Foster, 2669; (Regina Jail) 3176 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (B.C.) Drill Shed, New Westminster, 4461. *Income:* Buildings (N.B.) 3489: (Ont.) 3596 (ii); (Que.) Lighting Montreal P.O., 2296. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2330 (i).
Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 3675 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Hydrographic Surveys) 3618.
Statistics (Year-Book) 3345 (ii).

Supply (B. 125) 1°*, 3085 (ii).
——— (B. 149) Res. in Com., 4862; 1°* of B. 4863 (ii).
Thibault, Chas., Payments to Superannuation Fund (Ans.) 577 (i).
Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Funeral Expenses (remarks) 2516 (ii).
Three Rivers Harbour, Revenue and Expenses (Ans.) 436, 4356 (ii).
——— Cost to Date (Ans.) 3995 (ii).
——— Act Amt. (B. 113) 1°, 2259 (i).
Treaty with France, Ratification (Ans.) 1968 (i), 3356 (ii).
——— (B. 126) 1°, 3085; 2° m., 3558; in Com., 3567, 3833 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Cost of Revision (Ans.) 83 (i).
Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 180 (i).
——— Res. in Com., 4847 (ii).
——— The Tariff: in Com., 4852 (ii).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry., Legislation (remarks) 4255 (ii).
World's Fair (1892) Medals and Diplomas (Ans.) 84 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*
Anticosti Island, Names of Owners, on M. for Ret., 324 (i).
Antigonish and Shelburne Mail Service (Ques.) 2510 (ii).
Cape Breton Mail Service (Ques.) 427 (i).
Census, Industrial Establishments, on M. for Ret., 327 (i).
—— Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1836 (i).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3392 (ii).
Customs Collectors as Brokers (Ques.) 1358, 1971.
Eastern Ass. Co. of Can. (B. 83) 1°*, 1078 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2591; in Com., 2607 (ii).
Fishing Regulations, Gulf of St. Lawrence (Ques.) 427 (i).
Grand Etang Channel (Ques.) 2141 (i).
—— Contract for Works (Ques.) 3709 (ii).
Halifax Drill Shed, Tenders for Construction (Ques.) 2357 (i).
I.C.R., Employees' Summer Vacation (Ques.) 2511 (ii).
Illicit Distilleries, Seizures (Ques.) 3357 (ii).
Industries in Guysborough Co. (remarks) 774 (i).
Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 822 (i).
Lobster Fishery Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3093, 3659, 3673 (ii).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1909 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1844 (i).
McIntyre's Station and Hawkesbury Mail Service (Ques.) 1971 (i).
Nova Scotia Steel Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 56) 1°*, 616.
Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 614 (i).
St. Peter's Canal, par. in North Sydney *Herald* (Ques.) 4580 (ii).
—— Opening of Navigation (Ques.) 307 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 487 (i).
Sugar, Raw, Imports (Ques.) 307 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2245 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4318; (Outside Service) 2505 (ii).
Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2345; (Refund of Fines) 2334 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Ont.) 1947 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2093, 2102. Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2105 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Port Mulgrave and Guysboro') 2333 (i).
Militia (Military College) 3789 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2655; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2639; (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2496, 2519 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3151 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3475. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 3480 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2310 (i).
Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3691 (ii).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3238, 3407; on Amt. to M. for 3°, 4160 (ii).
Wallace, George, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3084 (ii).
Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c., on M. for Ret., 4436 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Revision during Year (Ques.) 576.

Frechette, Mr. L. J. C., *Megantic.*
Montreal P.O. Letter Box Contract (Ques.) 1969.
Oka Indians, Transfer to Muskoka, Number (Ques.) 1358 (i).

Frémont, Mr. J. J. T., *Quebec County.*
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. *Amyot*) in Com., 4772 (ii).

Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1602 (i).
Customs Employees, Extra or Regular (Ques.) 3191.
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2532 (ii).
Herbert, Maj. General, Resignation as Commander of Militia (Ques.) 2137 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2848.
Permanent Corps, Total Strength (Ques.) 2362 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Farran's Point) 2264; (Welland) 2266 (i).
Civil Government (Interior) 1921; (Justice) Gisborne, &c., services, 1913 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Welland) 2273; (Williamsburg) 2270 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3466; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 3464. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 3490 (ii); (Ont.) 2297; (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2274 (i).
Sugar Imported into Montreal and Halifax (Ques.) 1000 (i).
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3582 (ii).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond, N.S.*
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3382 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1879 (i).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2541 (ii).
International Fisheries Commission, Rep. (Ques.) 3083 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4320 (ii).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 2594 (ii).
Granite and Freestone, Imports (Ques.) 306 (i).
Granite (Red) Monuments, Imports (Ques.) 306.
Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers (N.S.) on M. for Ret., 1979 (i).
Shore Line Ry. Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 3078; M. to place on Order paper for 2°, 3111 (ii).

Girouard, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Dynamite Factories on Lachine Canal (Ques.) 1080 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3067.
Manitoba School Question, Future Negotiations (Ques.) 4187 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4451 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4194 (ii).

Girouard, Mr. J., *Two Mountains.*
Hay Exports to U. S. and Great Britain (Ques.) 2357 (i).
Oka Indians. Transfer to Muskoka, Number (Ques.) 1358 (i).
Tobacco, Can., Amount of Duty Collected (Ques.) 1587 (i).

Grant, Sir J. A., K.C.M.G., *Ottawa City.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 97 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 982 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2582 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co's (B. 46) 1°*, 515 (i).
Jas. McLaren Co.'s incorp. (B. 29) 1°*, 425 (i).
Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O.C.'s, &c., 2019 (i).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 2806 (ii).
Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4908.
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2630 (ii).
Militia (Military College) 2783 (ii).
Trans-Canadian Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 46) 1°*, 515 (i).
Deschenes Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 30) 1°*, 425 (i).

Grieve, Mr. J. N., *North Perth.*
Binding Twine manufactured at Kingston Penitentiary, Sales, &c. (M. for Ret.) 2022 (i).
Connor, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3993.
Experimental Farm Reports, Number Published, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2406 (i).
Moir, Geo., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3196 (ii).
Sugar Island, Sale by Govt. (Ques.) 3359 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3987 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3143 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Census and Agricultural Classes (Ques.) 3994 (ii).
Customs Collector, Three Rivers, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 574 (i).
I.C.R., Employees at Chaudière Curve (Ques.) 575 (i).
International Fraternal Alliance Ass. Co., Registration (Ques.) 3995 (ii).
Mallette, Louis Z., Langevin Block Contract (Ques.) 1180 (i).
Malone, Thos., Civil Service Ins. Policy (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Princess Pier, Lévis (Ques.) 575 (i).
Revising Officers Laprairie County (Ques.) 930 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 3497 (ii).
Thibault, Chas., Payments to Superannuation Fund (Ques.) 577 (i).
Tobacco Seizure at Isle Verte (Ques.) 697 (i).

Guillet, Mr. G., *Northumberland, Ont.*
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) Amt., 2899; agreed to (Y. 68, N. 57) 2812 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Barry's Bay Station, Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry., Closing, on M. for Ret., 4006 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 655 (i).
Canal Improvements in St. Lawrence (Ans.) 307 (i).
Canals, Depth of Water (Ans.) 921 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Capital Expended to 1895 (Ans.) 1551 (i).
——— Receipts, &c. (remarks) 1587; (Ans.) 2354 (i).
Caraquet Ry., Gross Earnings, &c. (Ans.) 273 (i).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*) on M. for Com., 2353 (i); in Com., 2697.
Dynamite Factories on Lachine Canal (Ans.) 1080.
Farm Lands in Ontario, Value (remarks) 773 (i).
Fenelon Falls, Filling up Road (Ans.) 3581 (ii).
Freight Rates Commission in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4025 (ii).
Galops Rapids Works, Employees Dismissed (Ans.) 2509 (ii).
Gilbert Dredging and Blasting Co. (Ans.) 2509 (ii).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2526 (ii).
Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 3359 (ii).
Grenville Canal, Collector of Tolls (Ans.) 4357.
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2700 (ii).
Halifax Deep Water Terminus, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3817 (ii).
——— Freight Shed, Tenders (Ans.) 2727 (ii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Time Tables (Ans.) 1829.
——— Burning of Sheds at Richmond (remarks) 1355 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*

I.C.R., Cap St. Ignace and Halifax Express (Ans.) 1973 (i).

——— Cap St. Ignace Station, new Siding (Ans.) 2571 (ii).

——— Dismissal of Conductor McCulley (Ans.) 2140 (i).

——— Employees at Chaudière Curve (Ans.) 575.

——— Summer Vacation (Ans.) 2511.

——— Thefts from Carleton Sheds (Ans.) 272 (i).

——— Maintenance of Way and Works (Ans.) 430 (i).

——— Summer Time Tables, Changes (Ans.) 1970 (i), 2571 (ii).

International Radial Ry. Co.'s B 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3757, 3943 (ii).

——— Waterways Commission (remarks) 3456 (ii).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) in Com., 1962; on M. for 3°, 2352 (i).

Lake St. John Ry., Gross Earnings, on M. for Stmnt., 1974 (i).

Locomotive Boilers, Inspection by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 3201 (ii).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1891 (i).

McDonald, Patrick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3994 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Contract for Cedar Sleepers (Ans.) 3084 (ii).

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry., Gross Earnings, on M. for Stmnt., 214 (i).

——— Condition, &c. (Ans.) 574 (i).

——— Payment of Subsidy (Ans.) 1586 (i).

Princess Pier, Levis (Ans.) 576 (i).

Pub. Accts. Com., Meetings (remarks) 2946 (ii).

Pub. Works, Contracts Entered into (Ans.) 204, 230 (i).

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. *Amyot*) in Com., 4772 (ii).

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 515.

Railway Rates, Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 839 (i).

——— Employees, Payment of *re* B. 23 (remarks) 4359 (ii).

Rapide Plat Canal, Overseer, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3711 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Subsidies, on M. for Ret., 334 (i).

St. Louis, Emmanuel, Judge Desnoyers Decision (Ans.) 1552 (i).

St. Peter's Canal, Opening of Navigation (Ans.) 307 (i).

——— par. in North Sydney *Herald* (Ans.) 4580.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Extra Work by Contractors (Ans.) 273 (i).

——— Permanent Staff (Ans.) 1972 (i).

——— and C.P.R. (Ans.) 1973 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*

Sheik's Island Dams, Completion and Cost (Ans.) 3198 (ii).

South Shore Ry. (N.S.) Contract (Ans.) 1078 (i).

South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 1694 (i).

Straits of Northumberland, Borings (Ans.) 3712 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys., 1894-95 (Ans.) 1079 (i).

——— Provinces Located, Miles Built, &c. &c., on M. for Ret., 4007 (ii).

——— Voted in 1894 (Ans.) 230 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 3703; (Galops) 3704; (Grenville) 3707; (Rapide Plat) 3703 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2223 (i); (Soulanges) 3699; (Trent) 3705 (ii). *Income* (Beauharnois) 2257; (Chambly) 2261; (Cornwall) 2262; (Farran's Point) 2264; (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2229; (Rideau) 2256; (Trent) 2265; (Welland) 2266 (i).

Civil Government (Railways and Canals) 2723 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Canals (Cornwall) 2272; (Lachine) 2273; (Welland) 2273; (Williamsburg) 2270 (i). Post Office 4331, 4345 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Thompson late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2500 (ii).

Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 3682; (I.C.R.) 3683 (ii).

Ry. System in P.E.I., Extension, on M. for Ret., 2775 (ii).

Tay Canal, Maintenance and Revenue (Ans.) 230 (i).

Tobique Valley Ry., Dom. Bonus Voted, &c. (Ans.) 2941 (ii).

——— Opening for Traffic (Ans.) 2755 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Contracts (Ans.) 204 (i).

——— Cost since Confed. (Ans.) 481 (i).

Valleyfield Sewer, Repairs (Ans.) 2509 (ii)

Welland Canal, Lumber and Timber Supplies, Contract, on M. for Ret., 2363 (i).

West Rideau Lake Dam, Claims for Land Damages (Ans.) 3996 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal Supt., Appnmt. (Ans.) 3711.

Winnipeg and G. N. Ry. Co. (prop. Res.) 4819; Com. on Res. (M.) 4863; in Com., 4869; (B. 150) 1°*, 4876; on 2°, 4885; in Com., 4891 (ii).

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Grant (Ans.) 928 (i).

Haslam, Mr. A., *Vancouver Island.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2289 (i). Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 3535 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com. (sawed boards) 4855 (ii).

Hazen, Mr. J. D., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3764 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4090 (ii).

Hazen, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*
Dredge, New, Preparation of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 2942 (ii).
Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, on M. for Ret., 446 (i).
Gardiner's Creek Breakwater, Tenders for Construction (Ques.) 2942 (ii).
Indemnity to Members, &c., B. 143 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 4063; in Com. on B., 4470 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 754 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 499 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) St. John Custom House, 2275 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4101 (ii).
Harvesters, Self-binding, Number Exported, &c. (Ques.) 2734 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3159 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges, 3541.

Hughes, Mr. W. H., *North Middlesex.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4149 (ii).
Gravel, Bishop, Communication *re* Man. Schools (Ques.) 3360 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Co., Liens or Debts (remarks) 4740 (ii).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4684 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Trent) 3705 (ii). *Income* (Trent) 2266 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4345 (ii).
Indians (Ont. and Que.) 3813 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' List) 2090 (i). Senate (Late Senator Burns's Indemnity) 4460 (ii).
Militia and Defence (Clothing) 3187; (Dom. Cartridge Factory) 3189; (Military College) 3809 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2207 (i).
Statistics (Year-Book) 3346 (ii).

Hutchins, Mr. W. H., *North Middlesex.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 4468 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Can. and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 36) 1°*, 425 (i).
Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) 1°*, 617 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2560 (ii).
Gov. Contracts to Aliens, prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2541 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 507 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 3520 (ii).

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*
Cattle Embargo by Great Britain (M. for Cor.) 209 (i).
Controller of Customs Private Secretaries (Ques.) 1550 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 3507 (i).

Ives, Hon. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*
Atlantic Mail Service, Contract (Ans.) 305 (i).
Controller of Customs Private Secretaries (Ans.) 1550 (i).
Fish Imports from France, Quantities, &c. (Ans.) 1550 (i).
French Treaty and Foreign Powers, Privileges under (Ans.) 1697 (i).
Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 827 (i).
N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 851, 857.
Order (Ques. of) relevancy of Member's remarks to deb., 345 (i).
——— Unparliamentary Language, 826 (i).
Pickford and Black's Contract, Halifax and West Indies (Ans.) 922 (i).
World's Fair, Mr. Larke's Services (Ans.) 206 (i).

Jeannotte Mr. H., *L'Assomption.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1775 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 760 (i).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4214 (ii).
Tobacco, Entry of Foreign Leaf Duty Free (remarks) 2030 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 3501 (ii).

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., *Gaspé.*
Matane and Ste. Anne des Monts Daily Mail Service (M. for Pets., &c.*) 2023 (i).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4213 (ii).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2590; in Com., 2606 (ii).
Fish Imports from France, Quantities, &c. (Ques.) 1550 (i).
Fishing Licenses paid N'fld., Refund (Ques.) 1551.
Lobster Hatcheries in Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 1551 (i).
Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers (N.S.) on M. for Ret., 1977 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2344 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2322 (i).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., *Halifax.*
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3133 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1553 (i).

Kenny, Mr. T. E.—*Continued.*
Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3093 (ii).
South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 1691 (i).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3607 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 3485 (ii).

Lachapelle, Mr. S., *Hochelaga.*
"Alliance Nationale" (B. 61) 1°*, 617 (i).
Cattle Shipments to Belgium, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4830 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 726 (i).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4208 (ii).
South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 35) 1°*, 425; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 1689 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Binding Twine, Ret. *re* (inquiry) 2815 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1754 (i).
Carling Brewing Co.'s Property, Govt. Lease (Ques.) 573 (i).
Courtright, Customs Officer, Superannuation (Ques.) 3359 (ii).
Customs Collectorship, Montreal (Ques.) 205 (i).
Deptl. Reps., Distribution, on M. for Stmnt., 314 (i).
Drouth in Ont. (remarks) 4582 (ii).
Exchange Bank, Rets. *re* (remarks) 3368 (ii).
——— Mr. Ogilvie's Guarantee (Ques.) 3455 (ii).
Galops Rapids Works, Employees Dismissed (Ques.) 2509 (ii).
Govt. Pensioners, par. in Peterborough *Examiner*, N.W.T. Rebellion (Ques.) 923 (i).
Guy, Charles, Peterborough, Pension (Ques.) 1452.
Halliwell, J. L., Pension (Ques.) 1969 (i).
Imperial Honours, Recommendations by Gov. Gen. (Ques.) 1973 (i).
——— Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1589; (Ques.) 1823 (i).
Markland Mortgage Discharge B. 93 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1353 (i).
Ministerial Explanations (remarks) 360 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 367.
Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay (M. for O. C., &c.) 1979, 2016 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (inquiry) 3820 (ii).
Returns, bringing down (remarks) 1186 (i).
Sheep Exports to Great Britain, on M. for Cor., 2392 (i).
Southampton Customs Officers, Names, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 4116 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Finance) 2702 (ii); (Interior) 1941; (Justice) J. H. Hughes's services, 1915 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4316 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3605 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Militia and Defence (Clothing) 3186; (Military Properties) 3184; (Miscellaneous) 3188 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2622 (ii).
Sutton, Mr., and Appmt. in Royal Can. Dragoons (Ques.) 2919 (ii).
Tariff, Statements respecting, on M. for Ret., 338 (i).
Tobique Valley Ry., Dom. Bonus Voted, &c. (Ques.) 2941 (ii).
Weir, Mr., of Keene, Pension (Ques.) 1453 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F., *Centre Quebec.*
Atlantic Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 305 (i).
Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealers, on M. for Cor., 216 (i).
Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1837 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4090 (ii).
Culler's Office, Que., Abolition (Ques.) 579 (i).
——— Inspection Dues (Ques.) 1548 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., on M. for Sel. Com. (remarks) 180 (i).
Garrison Artillery, Que., No. 3 Battery (M. for Cor.) 1973 (i).
Govt., &c., Contracts and Employees' Liability B. 11 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 1°, 81 (i).
Landry, Phillippe Robt., Affidavit *re* Residence, &c. (M. for copies*) 2406 (i).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1909 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 476; in Com., 1844 (i).
Malone, Thos., Civil Service Insurance Policy (Ques.) 1585 (i).
Militia Force, Savings by Reduction (Ques.) 3355.
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans, Expend., &c. (Ques.) 4355 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2094 (i).
Three Rivers, Hay Shed (Ques.) 2358 (i).
——— Harbour, Cost to Date (Ques.) 3995 (ii).
——— Revenues and Expenses (Ques.) 4356 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G., *Three Rivers.*
Ministerial Resignations, Rumoured, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4060 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. (B. 94) 1°, 1353 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Census of Man., 1896 (Ques.) 429 (i).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 268 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 696 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. (presented) 3110 (ii).
——— 4th Rep. (presented) 3544 (ii).
Lands unpatented in Municipality of Morris (M. for Ret.*) 2024 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Continued.*
Manitoba Schools Question on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4583 (ii).
—— Appeal of R. C. Minority, &c. (M. for copies*) 299 (i).
Man. and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1**, 515.
Pre-emption Lots in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 3198 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W., *East Quebec.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 21 (i).
Anticosti Island, Names of Owners, on M. for Ret., 324 (i).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).
Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2477 (ii).
Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealers (M. for Cor.) 215.
Budget, The, on Finance Minister's Explanation (remarks) 621 (i).
Can. and N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse (remarks) 347, 848 (i).
Cattle Exports, Limitation of Space, on adjnmt. (remarks) 142, 144 (i).
Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1839 (i).
Charlebois' Claim *re* Langevin Block Construction (Ques.) 933 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 3741; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 3742; in Com., 3765 (ii).
Colonies and the Empire (remarks) 4894 (ii).
Connolly, Messrs., Process of Execution (remarks) 233 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 516 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 1°, 3914; on M. for 2°, 4126; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 4482 (ii).
Debates, Official, on 1st Rep. (remarks) 268 (i).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co's incorp. B. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*) in Com., 2697 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Daly*) on Sen. Amts., 3921 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 717; (Amt.) 719; neg. (Y. 47, N. 101) 2143 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Fishing Rights in River Matane, Contracts (M. for copies) 2397 (i).
Franchise (Electoral) Act Repeal B. 14 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 196 (i).
—— B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on M. for 2°, 3629; on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3640 (ii).
Gilbert Dredging and Blasting Co. (Ques.) 2509.
Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2026 (i).
—— Wednesdays, 3625 (ii).
—— on adjnmt. (remarks) 2569 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Hudson Bay Ry., on adjnmt. (remarks) 181 (i).
—— Subsidy (Ques.) 207 (i).
—— Govt. Aid (M. for O. C.*) 300 (i).
—— O. C. respecting (remarks) 516 (i).
Huron Indians at Lorette and Agent Bastien (M. for Cor.) 1975 (i).
—— (M. for Ret.*) 2022 (i).
Imperial Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1823 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c., on 2° of Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4123 (ii).
Ins. Act, Societies Exemption B. 145 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4769 (ii).
Intercolonial Conference between Imp. and Dom. Govts. (M.) 4894 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2188 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract (remarks) 2608 (ii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2888 (ii).
La Jeune Lorette, Indian Agent Bastien (M. for Ret.*) 2022 (i).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co's incorp. B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 2352.
Larkin, Connolly & Co., Suit against (Ques.) 203.
Laurentides P.O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4813 (ii).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4262.
Loiselle vs. Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1890 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, Ministerial Statement (Ques.) 3996 (ii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4699 (ii).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 4379; neg. (Y. 70, N. 114) 4457 (ii).
Markland Mortgage Discharge B. 93 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1353 (i).
—— in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2408 (ii).
Ministerial Explanations (remarks) 256 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 375.
Ministerial Resignations, Rumoured (Ques.) 4054, 4116; (M. to adjn. Hse.) 4055; neg. (Y. 72, N. 111) 4061 (ii).
—— on Ministers' Statements (M. to adjn. Hse.) 4190; neg. (Y. 82, N. 116) 4252 (ii).
—— (explanation) 4876 (ii).
N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 347, 848.
—— Rep. *re* Negotiations (remarks) 1184 (i).
Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O. Cs., &c., 1988 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Man. Schools, on Mr. Speaker's Ruling (remarks) 804 (i).
—— (Mr. *Foster*) *re* Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2514.
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2166 (i).
Pig Iron Imported into Can. from U.S. (Ques.) 932 (i).
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry., Gross Earnings, on M. for Stmnt., 215 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*

Printing Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 311.
Pub. Accts. Com., Meetings (remarks) 2945 (ii).
Public Works Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Ouimet*) on M. for 1°, 3082; in Com., 3267 (ii).
Queen's Birthday, adjnmt. (remarks) 1355 (i).
Railway Belt (B.C.) Settlement B. 141 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4079 (ii).
St. John Wharf, Collection of Tolls (M. for O. C., &c.) 221 (i).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Subsidies, on M. for Ret., 334 (i).
St. Peter's Reserve Indians, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies) 4007 (ii).
Sheik's Island Dams, Completion and Cost (Ques.) 3198 (ii).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3548 (ii).
——— Meetings during Sittings of Hse., on Ques. of Order, 3913 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 495 (i).
——— *See* "Indemnity."
Silver-Lead Smelting Bounty, in Com. on Res., (Mr. *Foster*) 3927 (ii).
South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*) on M. to refer back to Com., 1634

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2224. *Income* (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 232, 2242 (i).
Civil Government (Sec. of State) 3980 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 4284 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2093 (i).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2498, 2628; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) conc., 2673; (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2501, 2649 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 3506; (Que.) 3498 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 231 (i). Roads and Bridges, 3541 (ii).

Superannuation Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1819 (i).
Tariff, Statements respecting, on M. for Ret., 336.
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3831 (ii).
——— (M. for Cor.*) 221 (i).
Troops in Quebec, Reduction in Strength (Ques.) 2361 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com., 4859 (ii).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co. (remarks) 4738 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4868; in Com., 4873; on M. for 2° of B. 150, 4879; in Com., 4890 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4111, 4742 (ii).
——— B. 133 (Mr. *Daly*) 1°, 3266 (ii).
——— (B. 106) 1°, 2024 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Electoral Lists, Drummond and Arthabaska, &c., Printing (Ques.) 769 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2589; in Com., 2593 (ii).
Lake St. John Ry., Gross Earnings (M. for Stmnt.) 1974 (i).
Laurentides P. O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4800 (ii).
Richmond Station and Denison's Mills Mail Contract (Ques.) 3356 (ii).
Streams Exempted under Fisheries Act (Ques.) 3356 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 3517 (ii).

Treaty with France, Ratification (Ques.) 3356 (ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinongé.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1246 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., Translation (remarks) 359.
McMurray, L. J. A., Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 1001 (i).
Sugar, Raw and Refined, Imports (Ques.) 922 (i).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2652. (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2648 (ii).

Thibault, Chas., Payments to Superannuation Fund (Ques.) 577 (i).

Lepine, Mr. A. T., *East Montreal.*

Can., France and Belgium SS. Line (Ques.) 3197.
La Chambre de Commerce de Montreal (B. 117) 1°*, 2670 (ii).
Montreal P. O. Letter Box Contract (Ques.) 1969 (i).
Savings Banks Stamps (M. for Pets., &c.*) 2024.
Workmen and Labourers on Public Works (B. 43) 1°*, 478 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*

Coal Contract, Public Buildings, Ottawa (Ques.) 4709 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4817 (ii).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4782 (ii).
Courtright, Customs Officer, Superannuation (Ques.) 3359 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4135, 4180; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4174 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. Hse, 4488.
Finlay, W., Appnmt. in Customs Service (Ques.) 2139 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt., Exemptions, B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 1°, 619 (i).
Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 441 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*

Galops Rapids Works, Employees Dismissed (Ques.) 2509 (ii).

Hilton Wharf, St. Joseph's Island, Expend. (Ans.) 2362 (i).

Kemptville Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ques.) 697.

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co's. B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1933; in Com., 1961 (i).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1895 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 752 (i).

Militia Drill, 1895 (Ques.) 573 (i).

Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O. C., &c., 1998 (i).

Ogilvie, W. W., Drawback on Imported Corn (Ques.) 4357 (ii).

Plummer's Wharf, Sault Ste. Marie, Govt. Title, &c. (Ques.) 2363 (i).

Post Office Expenditure (Ques.) 926 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Irregular Meetings (remarks) 1829 (i).

——— (remarks) 2943 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Permanent Staff (Ques.) 1972 (i).

——— O.C., affecting (M. for copies*) 2023 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 503 (i).

Sheik's Island Dams, O. C. affecting (M. for copies*) 2023 (i).

Shipping Regulations on the Great Lakes (Ques.) 2361 (i).

South Shore Ry. B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4624 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Interior) 1922 (i).

Justice, Administration of (Ont.) 1947 (i).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3231 (ii).

Lowell, Mr. J. A., *Welland.*

Alien Labour in Can., Legislation (M. for Ret.*) 2405 (i).

American-made Milk Cans, Free Entry (Ques.) 3815 (ii).

Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 617 (i).

Customs Collectorship, Niagara Falls, Vacancy (Ques.) 574 (i).

Fort Erie Customs Officers, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3815 (ii).

Welland Canal, Lumber and Timber Supplies, Contract (M. for Ret.) 2363 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1340 (i).

Ministerial Explanations, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., 382 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C.—*Continued.*

Ry. System in P.E.I., Extension (M. for Ret.) 2756, 2786 (ii).

Steam Service, P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 286 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2131 (i).

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2330 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*

Binder Twine, Prison-made (Ques.) 3707 (ii).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 954 (i).

Census, Industrial Establishments, on M. for Ret., 330 (i).

——— Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1836 (i).

Cullers at Montreal and Quebec, Number, &c. (Ques.) 577 (i).

Deptl. Reps., Distribution, on M. for Stmnt., 320 (i).

Fredericton and St. Marys Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 483 (i).

Industrial Establishments in Wingham (M. for Ret.*) 2406 (i).

McGregor's Creek, Sheet Piling (Ques.) 577 (i).

Moir, Geo., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3196 (ii).

Ogilvie, W. W., Drawback on Imported Corn (Ques.) 4357 (ii).

Public Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3326 (ii).

Returns (remarks) 3820 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2495, 2628; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2643; (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2651 (ii).

Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Accounts *re* Funeral Expenses (Ques.) 2922 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Cost since Confed. (Ques.) 481 (i).

Macdonell, Mr. G. H., *Algoma.*

Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2535 (ii).

James' Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1179 (i).

Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O.C., &c., 2005 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3468 (ii).

Towing Saw-logs across Georgian Bay, &c. (prop. Res.) 2405 (i).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H., *Saskatchewan.*

N'fld., Annexation and Immigration (remarks) 4908 (ii).

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4119 (ii).

"Stanley," Str., and Hudson Straits (remarks 4906 (ii).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3982. *Indians* (B.C.) 3879 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York, Ont.*

Chute, Julia Ethel, Relief B. 139 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 3948 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4097 (ii).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 729 (i).

Govt. Contracts to Aliens, prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2529 (ii).

International Radial Ry. Co's B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3583, 3748, 3941 (ii).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 737 (i).

Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4682 (ii).

Ry. Employees Safety (B. 13) 1°, 143 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 488 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3532 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co's B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3231, 3418; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4154; neg. (Y. 39, N. 113) 4163.

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3573; on M. for 3°, 3838 (ii).

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3139 (ii).

Camp Harmony Angling Club's incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 1732 (i).

Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2° *, 2534 (ii).

Grand Falls Water-power and Boom Co's incorp. (B. 95) 1° *, 1452 (i).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co's incorp. (B. 80) 1° *, 1000 (i).

Private Bills Petitions, Suspension of Rules (M.) 1177 (i).

St. John River Bridge Co's incorp. (B. 28) 1°*, 425 (i).

Temiscouata Ry. Co's (B. 70) 1°*, 839 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*

Address to His Ex., on The, 154 (i).

Controller of Customs, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4730 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4105 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 4126; in Com., 4130; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4473; neg. (Y. 59, N. 115) 4486 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 16) 1°, 197 (i).

——— B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 4071 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D.—*Continued.*

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3639; in Com., 3658 (ii).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) in Com., 3459 (ii).

General Revenue Fund of N.W.T B. 134 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 3721 (ii).

Govt. Business, precedence on Wednesdays (remarks) 3624 (ii).

House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 25) 1°, 301 (i).

Indemnity to Members, &c., on 2° of Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4122 (ii).

Ins. Act Amt., Exemption of Societies, B. 145 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 4355 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 3727 (ii).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) precedence of deb., Ques. of Order, 2918 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3047 (ii).

Lieut.-Gov. of Man. (remarks) 735 (i).

Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 774 (i).

Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4264 (ii).

Man. Schools Question, Alleged Utterances of Ministers (Ques.) 577 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4437 (ii).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 4496; on M. to adjn. deb., 4568 (ii).

——— Communications with His Ex. (Ques.) 2572 (ii).

——— Remedial Order (Ques.) 578 (i), 3373, 3458, 3716 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4195 (ii).

Minister of Public Works' Speech in Prov. of Que. (Ques.) 925 (i).

Meeting of next Parlt., Gov. Gen.'s Authority (Ques.) 4054 (ii).

N.W.T. Act Amt. (B. 17) Dual Language, 1°, 197.

——— Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4119; on M. for 3°, 4363 (ii).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4367 (ii).

Printing Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 311.

Rapide Plat Canal, Appnmt. of Overseer (Ques.) 3711 (ii).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3547 (ii).

Road and Road Allowances in Man. B. 114 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4073 (ii).

St. Louis, Emmanuel, Prosecution *re* Lachine Canal Bridge (Ques.) 926 (i).

Williamsburg Canal Supt., Appnmt. (Ques.) 3711.

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Grant (Ques.) 928 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. (remarks) 4739 (ii).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., *Victoria, N.S.*
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1876 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1507 (i).

McDonald, Mr. W. W., *East Assiniboia.*
Langenberg and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 616; M. for Com., 1924; 3° m., 2352 (i).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4870 (ii).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret. (Amt.) 4033 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Indians (B.C.) 3899 (ii).

McDougald, Mr. F., *Pictou.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 3510 (ii).

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*
Fisheries of the Great Lakes, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3973 (ii).
Fishing Regulations in Detroit and St. Clair Rivers, &c. (Ques.) 2356 (i).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2540 (ii).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2178 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2502 (i).
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3574 (ii).

McInerney, Mr. G. V., *Kent, N.B.*
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 734 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1392 (i).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret. 3445 (ii).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1878 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3645 (ii).
Lobster Fishery Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3668 (ii).
Malignant Cove, Merigomish, Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 2140 (i).
Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 596 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4615 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works--Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 3511 (ii).

McKay, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 85) 1°*, 1179 (i); 2° m., 2698 (ii).
Ottawa Land and Security Co.'s incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 1959 (i).
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 617 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3242, 3411 (ii).
Unlawful Associations and Oaths B. 7 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 2520 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. R. R., *Glengarry.*
Contracts to Aliens prevention (B. 9) 1°, 80 (i).
Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. (B. 21) prop. Res., 208; in Com., 234; 1°* of B., 240 (i); on 2°, 4747 (ii).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention (B. 9) 2° m., 2520 (ii).
Govt., &c., Contracts and Employees Liability (B. 11) 1°, 80 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2874
Ry. Return Fare Tickets, Sale (B. 10) 1°, 80 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
Agriculture Dept., Vacancy in Cabinet, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4275 (ii).
Butter Trade with Great Britain (Ques.) 2511 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1057 (i).
Cattle Shipments, Ret. *re* (inquiry) 3457 (ii).
Cattle (Can.) Transport through U. S. for Export (Ms. for Cor.) 341, 477 (i).
Cheese Factories in P.E.I., under Dom. Dairy Commissioner (M. for Stmnt.*) 2023 (i).
Dairy Commissioner's Rep., presentation (Ques.) 2031 (i)
Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 236 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 504 (i).
Sheep Exports to Great Britain, on M. for Cor., 2394 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2108 (i), 4465; (Experimental Farm Bulletins) 3350; (Agricultural Societies, N.W.T.) 3350 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, &c., 4308. Weights and Measures, &c., 4305 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2661 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3144 (ii).
Public Works--Income: Buildings (Ont.) 3505. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3532 (ii).
Statistics (Year-Book) 3347 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 146 (i).
Agriculture, Inspecting Physician, Appnmt. (Ques.) 309 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., Govt. Guarantee (Ques.) 2920 (ii).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 3138 (ii).

Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2481 (ii).

——— Rep., Delay in presentation (Ques.) 86 (i).

Binder Twine, Prison-made (Ques.) 3707 (ii).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1002 (i).

Cape Breton Ry., Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 1587, 2354 (i).

——— Capital Expended to 1895 (Ques.) 1551 (i).

Carling Brewing Co.'s Property, Govt. Lease, &c. (Ques.) 573 (i).

——— (M. for Cor.*) 2022 (i).

Cattle (Can.) Transport through U.S., on M. for Cor., 342 (i).

——— Embargo by Great Britain, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4843 (ii).

Census, Industrial Establishments, on M. for Ret., 330 (i).

——— Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1836 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 3742; in Com., 3747 (ii).

——— Payments to Temporary Clerks (Ques.) 1585 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4098 (ii).

Cullers' Offices, Montreal and Quebec, Revenue and Maintenance (Ques.) 929 (i).

——— Supervisor at Quebec (Ques.) 1359 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4130, 4174 (ii).

——— Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1291 (i).

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 239 (i); on M. for 2°, 4762 (ii).

Deptl. Reps., Distribution, on M. for Stmnt., 315 (i).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 722, 1874 (i).

Estimates, The (Ques.) 331 (i).

Finance Minister's Private Secretary (Ques.) 1360 (i).

Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c. (M. for Ret.) 438, 451 (i).

——— Receipts, &c., Rets. made to Govt. (M. for copies*) 2024 (i).

Geological Survey, Madoc and Marmora (Ques.) 2942 (ii).

Governor General, Reduction of Salary B. 4 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 3261 (ii).

Hatch, Walter, Superannuation (Ques.) 1078 (i).

Immigration to N.W.T, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3778 (ii).

Industries, Returns *re* (remarks) 1185 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2186 (i).

——— Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 3722 (ii).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2867.

Lands Sold on Richelieu River to H. S. Foster (M. for Cor.*) 2406 (i).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 2352 (i).

Laurentides P.O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4809 (ii).

Lieut.-Gov.'s Salaries (B. 37) 1°*, 425 (i).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1902 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1865 (i).

"Mexico" SS., Wreck in Straits of Belle Isle (Ques.) 4359 (ii).

Moneys Paid to Members outside Sessional Indemnity (M. for Ret.) 331 (i).

N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 859 (i).

Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O.C., &c., 2021 (i).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 3931 (ii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2168 (i).

Receiver General (Asst.) St. John, N.B. (Ques.) 1360 (i).

Reed, Hayter, Amounts Paid in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 266 (i).

——— Ret. respecting (Ques.) 1829 (i); 2671, 2814, 3111 (ii).

Savings Banks Deposits, Gross Amounts (M. for Ret.) 332 (i).

Seizures of Smuggled Goods (M. for Ret.) 4006 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 505 (i).

Sheep Exports to Great Britain, on M. for Cor., 2388 (i).

Statistical Year-Book, Printing, &c., Instructions, on M. for copy, 220 (i).

St. Louis, Mr., Civil Action against (Ques.) 3457.

Subsidies to Rys., Provinces Located, Miles Built, &c., &c. (M. for Ret.) 4007 (ii).

Superannuation Act Amt. (B. 6) 1°*, 79; 2° m., 2152 (i).

——— B. 102 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 1820 (i); (remarks) 4739 (ii).

——— List of Names, Appnmts, &c. (Ms. for Ret.) 273, 299 (i).

——— Ret. *re* (Ques.) 744, 1083 (i) 3111, 3628, 3819, 3994 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2115 (i).

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2223 (i); (Trent) 3705 (ii). *Income* (Beauharnois) 2257; (Cornwall) 2262; (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2249; (Trent) 2265; (Welland) 2267 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Charges of Management, 3106 (ii).

Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 3102; (Finance) 2705; (High Commissioner's Office) 3097; (Indian Affairs) contingencies, 3101 (ii); (Interior) 1920, 1938; (Justice) J. W. Hughes's services, 1914; (Post Office) 1913; (Sec. of State) 1918 (i); (Trade and Commerce) 4459, contingencies, 3105 (ii), Carleton's services, 1912; (Unforeseen Expenses) 1917 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Canals (Cornwall) 2272; (Welland) 2272; (Williamsburg) 2270 (i). Culling Timber, 4283, 4462. Customs, 4350. Dominion Lands, 4348. Excise, 4279. Post Office, 4316. Public Works, 4277. Trade and Commerce, 4347. Weights and Measures, &c., 4307 (ii).

Dominion Police, 3141 (ii).

Geological Survey (Artesian Borings) 2488 (ii).

Government of North-west Territories, 3905 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 2487, 3900: (Man. and N.W.T.) 3814 (ii).

Justice, Administration of (Supreme Court) 3169.

Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2104; (Voters' Lists) 2087 (i), 3341. Library (Salaries, &c.) 3341 (ii). Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2105 (i); (Late Senator Burns's Indemnity) 4460 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3606 (ii).

Militia and Defence (Military Properties) 3182 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2220 (i).

Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 2490; (Mr. Fabre's Salary) 3906; (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2497; (Printing Bureau, Plant, &c.) 3907; (Roads and Bridges, Banff) 3907; (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2647, 2675.

Mounted Police, 3678 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 3142, Binder Twine, 3147 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3470; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 3464 (ii). *Income:* Buildings (Lighting Montreal P.O.) 2294; (Man.) 2298; (N.B.) 2278 (i), 3489; (N.S.) 3484 (ii); (Ont.) 2297 (i); (Que.) 3494 (ii).

Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 3681; (I.C.R.) 3683.

Statistics (Year-Book) 3346 (ii).

Temporary Clerks Employed by Govt., Amounts Paid (M. for Ret.*) 2024 (i).

Treaty with France, Ratification (Que.) 1968 (i).

——— B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3581 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com., 4858 (ii).

West Kootenay Customs Rets., on M. for Ret., 322 (i).

World's Fair (1892) Medals and Diplomas (Ques.) 84 (i).

——— Dom. Employees (Ques.) 3710 (ii).

——— Mr. Larke's Services (Ques.) 205 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*

Dairy Products Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 4759 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3653 (ii).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3075 (ii).

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Continued.*

Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4604, 4627 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4216 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Income (Welland) 2267 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, &c., 4286 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 3885 (ii).

Mara, Mr. J. A., *Yale.*

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 3729 (ii).

Kootenay and Spokane Registered Mail Service (Ques.) 1182 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1847 (i).

Penitentiary, B.C., Justice Drake's Instructions (M. for copy) 297 (i).

——— James Fitzsimmons's Reinstatement (M. for Cor.) 298 (i).

——— W. A. Keary's Retirement (Ques.) 308 (i).

——— Warden McBride's Retirement (Ques.) 308 (i).

Ry. Belt (B.C.) Settlement B. 141 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4080 (ii).

Silver-Lead Smelting, Encouragement B. 142 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4124, 4763 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Indians (B.C.) 3899 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 3509, Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 3534. Telegraphs, 3542 (ii).

War Eagle Gold Mining Co. and Customs Collector at Rossland, (M. for Cor.*) 2022 (i).

West Kootenay Customs Rets. (M. for Ret.) 321 (i).

Marshall, Mr. J. H., *East Middlesex.*

Brigade Camp, No. 1 District, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2610 (ii).

Martin, Mr. J., *Winnipeg.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Utilization (B. 132) 1°*, 3266 (i).

Battleford and Saskatoon Mail Contract (M. for Ret.*) 2024 (i).

———Ret. *re* (Ques.) 4358 (ii).

Behring Sea Arbitration (Ques.) 4862 (ii).

Binder Twine manufactured in Kingston Penitentiary (Ques.) 2355 (i).

Booth, Gen., Land for proposed Colony (Ques.) 2361 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 879 (i).

Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1834 (i).

Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4778 (ii).

Controller of Customs, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4723 (ii).

Martin, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 3°, 4494 (ii).
Freight Rates, N.W.T. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4026 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) on M. for 1°, 3081 ; in Com., 3459.
Govt. Business, precedence on Wednesdays (remarks) 3627 (ii).
Immigration to N.W.T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3766 (ii).
Jew Pedlars, Transport from Chicago to Calgary (M. for Cor.) 241, 258 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2947.
Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Northrup*) M. to ref. back to Com., 4113 (ii).
Lands Leased for Homesteading, Wm. Fleming's Case (M. for Cor.) 2364 (i).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 55) (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) in Com., 1959 ; on M. for 3°, 1938 (i).
Lieut.-Gov. of Man., Appmnt. (Ques.) 3710 (ii).
Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 797 (i).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1903 (i).
Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on personal explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2054 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on M. to adjn. deb., 4573 (ii).
N.W.T. Act (Cap. 50, Rev. Stat.) Amt. (B. 52) 1°*, 515 (i).
——— Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4119 ; on M. for 3°, 4364 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4373 (ii).
Penitentiary (B.C.) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4823 (ii).
Post Office Expenditure (Ques.) 926 (i).
Portage la Prairie P. O., Purchase of Site (M. for O.C.) 2376 (i).
——— Ret. (inquiries) 3457, 3628, 3715, 4894 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2512.
Royal Standard, Hoisting (Ques.) 2137 (i).
Subsidies to Rys., 1894-95 (Ques.) 1079 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Interior) 1923, 1938 (i).
Collection of Revenues : Customs, 4351. Post Office, 4339 (ii).
Fisheries (B.C.) 3620 ; (Man.) 3619 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2651 (ii).
Open Account (Seed Grain) 2662 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3171 (ii).
Public Works—Capital : Buildings (Drill Shed, New Westminster) 4461 (ii). *Income* (Lighting, &c.) 2303 ; (Man.) 2300 (i).
Survey of Township 16, Range 16-W. (Ques.) 2138 (i).
Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c. (M. for Ret.) 431 (i).

Martin, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co., on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4864 ; in Com., 4872 ; on M. for 2° of B. 150, 4880 ; in Com., 4890 (ii).

Masson, Mr. J., *North Grey.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 933 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4088 (ii).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 96) 1°*, 1548 (i) ; in Com., 3593, 3748, 3938 (ii).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2855.
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 748, 1844 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4658 (ii).
Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 1175 (i).
South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 1689 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 4392 (ii).

Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., *Yamaska.*
Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy (Ques.) 3359 (ii).
Yamaska and St. Ours Locks, Charges on Vessels (Ques.) 2735 (ii).
Yamaska River, Obstructions in Channel (Ques.) 924 (i).
——— Lock and Dam, Repairs and Maintenance (Ques.) 1697 (i).
——— Construction (Ques.) 2359 (i).
——— Construction of Embankment (M. for Cor.*) 2406 (i).

Mills, Hon. D., *Bothwell.*
Address to His Ex., on The, 87 (i).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3130 (ii).
Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept. (presented) 2132 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2260 (i), 2408 (ii).
Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealing Vessels by Russia, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3868 (ii).
Cabinet Representation for B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4799 (ii).
Can. and N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 348 (i).
Census, Industries in London (remarks) 207 (i).
——— Industrial Establishments, on M. for Ret. 328 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 423 (i).
——— Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1830 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 3743 ; in Com., 3746, 3762 (ii).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4779 ; in Com., 4781 (ii).

Mills. Hon. D.—*Continued.*

Controller of Customs, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. Hse., 4714 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2562 (ii)

——— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 515 (i); in Com., 4092 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 1°, 3914; on M. for 2°, 4126; in Com., 4127, 4167 (ii).

——— Duties on American Hardware, on Ques. of Order, 1280 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 4065; in Com., 4069 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 3270 (ii).

Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 720 (i).

Fishing Rights in River Matane, Contracts, on M. for copies, 2399 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on M. for 1°, 768 (i); on M. for 2°, 3631; in Com., 3657; on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3638 (ii).

Grey, Lieut.-Col. John, Appnmt. as Supt. of Stores (Ques.) 3358 (ii).

Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2702; in Com., 2704 (ii).

Hudson Bay Ry., on M. for adjnmt. (remarks) 182 (i).

Indemnity to Members, &c., on 2° of Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4123 (ii).

Indian Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. for 2°, 3933 (ii).

Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3112.

International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3758 (ii).

Irrigation Act (N.W.T.) Amt. B. 120 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4768 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2186 (i).

——— Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 3730 (ii).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for Com., 1928; in Com., 1963 (i).

Laurentides P.O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4803 (ii).

Lieut.-Gov. of Man. (remarks) 736 (i).

Lieut.-Gov. Schultz and Man. Schools, Dr. Bourinot's Letter (remarks) 788, 817 (i).

Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 4256; neg. (Y. 66, N. 105) 4271 (ii).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1892 (i).

London Military School, Sewage Discharge (Ques.) 1359 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1861 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2063 (i).

Man. and North-west Loan Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Denison*) in Com., 1968 (i).

Markland Mortgage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 2407 (ii).

——— Discharge B. 130 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3930 (ii).

Mattice, Lieut.-Col. G., Retirement and re-Appointment (Ques.) 3358 (ii).

Ministerial Resignations, Rumoured, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., (remarks) 4058 (ii).

N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 845 (i).

——— Rep. *re* Negotiations (remarks) 1184 (i).

N.W.T. Act. Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 3931 (ii).

——— Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4074, 4120: on M. for 3°, 4360, 4762 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2515 (ii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2169 (i).

Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on Amt. (Mr. *Guillet*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 2812 (ii).

Public Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Amt.) 3271; neg. (Y. 57, N. 87) 3339 (ii).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Ouimet*) in Com., 3268 (ii).

Ry. Belt (B.C.) Settlement B. 141 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4081 (ii).

Revising Officers, Duplicate Appnmts. (Ques.) 1080 (i).

Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers (N.S.) on M. for Ret., 1978 (i).

Secretan, J. A., Amount Paid by Govt. (Ques.) 3358 (ii).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3548 (ii).

——— Meetings during Sittings of Hse., on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3910 (ii).

Senate, Law Officers' Opinion *re* Speaker (M. for copies*) 221 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 496 (i).

——— *See* "Indemnity."

Superannuation Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McMullen*) on Mr. Speaker's Ruling (remarks) 2161 (i).

——— List of Names, Appnmts., &c., on M. for Ret., 275 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 3343 (ii); (Dairying Interests) 2126 (i).

Canals—Income (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2248; (Trent) 2266; (Welland) 2268 (i).

Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 3103; (Civil Service Examiners) 3100 (ii); (Customs) 1911 (i), 2715; (Finance) 2707; (Geological Survey) 2723 (ii); (Justice) J. W. Hughes's services, 1915 (i); (Indian Affairs) 2663, contingencies, 3102 (ii); (Interior) 1939 (i), 2689; (Post Office) 2720;

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

(Printing and Stationery) contingencies, 3101; (Sec. of State) contingencies, 3101; (Trade and Commerce) contingencies, 3106 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Dominion Lands, 4348. Trade and Commerce, 4347. Weights and Measures, &c., 4306 (ii).

Indians (B. C.) 3877 (ii).

Justice, Administration of (Circuit Allowances, B.C.) 3107; (Supreme Court) 3109 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2095: (Voters' Lists) 1949 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Allan SS. Co.) 3608 (ii).

Militia and Defence (Clothing) 3186; (Military Properties) 3179 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2219 (i).

Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2492 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 3509 (ii); (Man.) 2299 (i); (N.B.) 3490; (N.S.) 3480, 3486; (N.W.T.) 3508; (Que.) 3494, 3500 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2327 (i); (Ont.) 3528; (Que.) 3522 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binding Twine, 3153 (ii).

Statistics (Year-Book) 3345 (ii).

Tariff, Statements respecting, on Ms. for Rets., 265 (i).

Thousand Islands, Reservations for Park, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4004 (ii).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 3563; in Com., 3565; on M. for 3°, 3828 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co's. B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3244; on Amt. to M. for 3°, 4156 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com. (sawed boards) 4855 (ii).

Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co., on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4865; in Com., 4871; on M. for 2° of B. 150, 4877, 4883 (ii).

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis.*

Centennial Exhibition, Can. Commissioner's Expenses (Ques.) 2736 (ii).

James' Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) on Sen. Amts. 4777 (ii).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*) on Sen. Amts. (Amt.) 4775.

Mail Service to Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 2359 (i).

Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement (prop. Res.) 587 (i).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., *East Lambton.*

Can. Benevolent Societies incorp. (B. 31) 1°*, 425 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4170 (ii).

Ont. Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1000.

Monet, Mr. D., *Napierville.*

Bédard, Charles, Appnmt. as Revising Officer (Ques.) 3993 (ii).

Electoral Lists, Laprairie and Napierville (Ques.) 930 (i).

Monet, Mr. D.—*Continued.*

House of Commons Reading Room, U. S. French Can. Papers (Ques.) 3194 (ii).

Laprairie Camp, Supply of Groceries (Ques.) 3193.

Laurentides Post Office (Ques.) 3360 (ii).

Mallette, Louis Z., Langevin Block Contract (Ques.) 1180; (M. for Ret.*) 2406 (i).

Montreal Field Battery, Drill (Ques.) 3194 (ii).

Napierville Returning Officers, Appnmts. (Ques.) 3993 (ii).

Paradis, Rev. Father, Colonization Scheme (Ques.) 3197 (ii).

Revising Officer, Chambly and Verchères (Ques.) 930 (i).

Revising Officers, Laprairie County (Ques.) 930.

Montague, Hon. W. H., *Haldimand.*

Agriculture, Rep. of Minister (presented) 229 (i).

——— Inspecting Physician, Appnmt. (Ques.) 309 (i).

——— Dept., Vacancy in Cabinet, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4275 (ii).

Anticosti Electoral Lists, Revision (Ans.) 1359 (i).

Bédard, Charles, Appnmt. as Revising Officer (Ans.) 3993 (ii).

Brampton Industrial Establishments (Ans.) 1182.

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1698, 1733 (i).

Butter, Purchases by Govt. (Ans.) 199 (i).

——— Shipments to Great Britain (Ans.) 1180 (i).

——— Trade with Great Britain (Ans.) 2512 (ii).

Cattle Trains, Conductors between U. S. and Can. (Ans.) 207 (i).

——— Entries into Can. from Montana, on M. for Cor., &c., 332 (i).

——— Embargo by Great Britain, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 585 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Ways and Means (remarks) 4840 (ii).

——— on M. for Ret., 209 (i).

Census and Agricultural Classes (Ans.) 3994 (ii).

——— Industries in London (remarks) 208 (i).

——— Queen's and Shelburne, on M. for Ret., 328 (i).

——— (Ans.) 2031 (i), 2670 (ii).

——— Man., 1896 (Ans.) 429 (i).

——— Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1833 (i).

Centennial Exhibition, Can. Commissioners' Expenses (Ans.) 2753 (ii).

Chinamen in B.C., Quarantined, Amounts paid by C.P.R. (Ans.) 698 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°, 3190; 2° m., 3739; in Com., 3763, 3846 (ii).

——— Examiners' Rep. (presented) 2570 (ii).

——— Promotion Examinations (Ans.) 482 (i).

Columbian Exhibition, Can. Expenses (Ans.) 1362 (i), 3710 (ii).

——— Commissioner Cockburn's Expenses (Ans.) 2734 (ii).

Montague, Hon. W. H.—*Continued.*
Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (remarks) 2401 (i).
Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4014 (ii).
Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 238 (i); on 2°, 4746 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep., Distribution (remarks) 231.
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 68) 1°, 768 (i); 2° m., 3921, 4065; in Com., 4070 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Drummond and Arthabaska, &c., Printing (Ans.) 771 (i).
——— Lotbinière Co., Printing (Ans.) 771 (i).
——— Laprairie and Napierville (Ans.) 930 (i).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) M. to adjn. deb., 716 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. (B. 69) Voters' Lists, 1°, 768 (i); 2° m., 3628; in Com., 3657 (ii).
Indian Act Amt. (B. 109) 1°*, 2351 (i); 2° m., 3932 (ii).
Industries in Queen's and Shelburne, Ret. respecting (Ans.) 2031 (i), 2670 (ii).
——— in York County, on inquiry for Ret., 2814.
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1863 (i).
Maps of Electoral Districts, Preparation (Ans.) 1081 (i).
N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed. (remarks) 847 (i).
Napierville Returning Officers, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3994 (ii).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2177 (i).
Printing Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 311.
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3190 (ii).
McMurray, L. J. A., Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 1001 (i).
Returns *re* Cattle Embargo, &c. (remarks) 774 (i).
——— on inquiries (remarks) 3457, 3820 (ii).
Revising Officers, Laprairie County (Ans.) 930 (i).
——— Chambly and Verchères (Ans.) 931 (i).
——— Duplicating Appnmts. (Ans.) 1080 (i).
Statistical Year-Book, on M. for copy of Instructions, 219 (i).
San Jose "Scale" Pest (Ans.) 926 (i).
Sheep Exports to Great Britain, on M. for Cor., 2387 (i).
Superannuation of Civil Service Employees (Ans.) 4116 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Agricultural Societies, N.W.T.) 3348; (Archives) 3242 (ii); (Dairying Interests) 2111 (i), 3351, 3981, 4465; (Experimental Farm Bulletins) 3350; (*Patent Record*) 3345; (Photographic Exhibition) 3352 (ii).
Canals—Income (Welland) 2266 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 2721 (ii); (Indian Affairs) 1946; (Sec. of State) 1918 (i), 3979 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4340 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2093; (Voters' Lists) 1949, 2086 (i), 3341 (ii).

Montague, Hon. W. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous (Can Temperance Act) 3906; (Printing) 3906; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 3907 (ii).
Quarantine (Organized Districts) 3354; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3355; (Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospital) 3355 (ii).
Statistics (Year-Book) 3346 (ii).
Tariff, Statements respecting, on M. for Ret., 338.
Voters' Lists, Cost of Revision (Ans.) 229 (i).
——— Outside Printing (Ans.) 229, 308 (i).
——— Revision during Year (Ans.) 576 (i).
——— (correction) 1002 (i).
——— Wright division, Ottawa Co. (remarks) 2352 (i).
World's Fair, Dom. Employees (Ans.) 1362 (i), 3710 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W., *North York, Ont.*
Agriculture Dept., Vacancy in Cabinet, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4273 (ii).
Agricultural Products, Imports in June, 1894 (Ques.) 2137 (i).
——— Imports from Australia (Ques.) 2360 (i).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3135 (ii).
Athlone-Tottenham Mail Service, Tenders for Contract (Ques.) 1588 (i), 3193 (ii).
Camp Harmony Angling Club's incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 1733 (i).
Caraquet Ry., Gross Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 273 (i).
Cattle Embargo by Great Britain, on M. for Ret., 209 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.) 296 (i).
——— Ret. respecting (Ques.) 1830 (i).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4831, 4847 (ii).
——— Entries into Can. from Montana (M. for Cor., &c.) 332 (i).
——— Exports, Limitation of Space (remarks) 146 (i).
——— Trains, Conductors between U.S. and Can. (Ques.) 207 (i).
Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1838 (i).
Charlebois, Mr., Arbitration *re* Claim for Extras (M. for Ret.*) 300 (i).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co., on M. for Ret., 4031 (ii).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4783 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) in Com., 4169, 4177; on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. Hse., 4492 (ii).
Deptl. Reps., Distribution, on M. for Stmnt., 321.
Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4016 (ii).
Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 460 (i).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on M. for 2° (Amt.) 3636; neg. (Y. 39, N. 82) 3656 (ii).
Gov. General's Salary Reduction (B. 4) 1°, 79 (i); 2° m., 3246 (ii).
General Revenue Fund of N.W.T. B. 134 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 3720 (ii).
Indemnity to Members, &c., in Com. on Res., 4062 (ii).
Independence of Parliament (B. 111) 1°, 2257 (i).
Industries in York County, Ret. *re* (inquiry) 2814.
Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. 3117.
——— Exemption of Societies B. 145 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 4355; on M. for 2°, 4769 (ii).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3594, 3750 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2190 (i).
——— Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 3728; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 3916; neg. (Y 57, N. 90) 3919 (ii).
——— Superannuation B. 129 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4252 (ii).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) precedence of deb., 2917 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1924 (i).
Langevin Block, Ottawa, Claim for Extras (Ques.) 1970 (i).
Lazier, Lt.-Col., Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3596 (ii).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1905 (i).
Military College Board of Visitors (Ques.) 1588.
——— Kingston, Number of Cadets (Ques.) 1973.
N.W.T. Representation Act Amt B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*) in Com., 4077, 4120; on M. for 3°, 4365.
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2170 (i).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4367 (ii).
Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry., Gross Earnings, on M. for Stmnt., 215 (i).
Printing Bureau, Reps., Bills, &c. (remarks) 310.
Public Works Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Ouimet*) in Com., 3268 (ii).
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. *Amyot*) in Com., 4773 (ii).
Returns *re* Cattle Embargo, &c. (remarks) 773 (i).
——— (inquiry) 3820 (ii).
Salmon Fishing in B. C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4839 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal and C.P.R. (Ques.) 1973.
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3545 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 79; 2° m., 483, 495 (i).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*

Silver-Lead Smelting B. 142 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4766 (ii).
Sutton, Mr., Appnmt. to Royal Can. Dragoons (Ques.) 1972, 2219 (i).
South Shore Ry. B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4394 (ii.

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Photographic Exhibition) 3352 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) construction, 2228. *Income* (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2231; (Rideau) 2256; (Trent) 2265 (i).
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 1945; (Interior) 1940; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 1912; (Sec. of State) 1918 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 3874 (ii).
Legislation: Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2669 (ii).
Militia and Defence (Drills, City Corps, &c.) 4461; (Military College) 3797 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2197 (i).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) conc., 2673 (ii).
Mounted Police, 3676 (ii).
Open Account (Seed Grain) 2663 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 2300 (i); (N.S.) 3543. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3526 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3146 (ii).
Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 3687 (ii).

Tariff, Statements respecting, on M. for Ret., 338.
Tobique Valley Ry., Opening for Traffic (Ques.) 2755 (ii).
——— Dom. Bonus, Voted, &c. (Ques.) 2941 (ii).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3230, 3409 (ii).
Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c., on M. for Ret., 436 (i).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. (remarks) 4739 (ii).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1019 (i).
Clifton Suspension Bridge Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 1585.
Independent Order of Foresters (Supreme Court) incorp. Act Amt. (B. 84) 1°*, 1179 (i).
Maitland and Cobourg Canal Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 75) 1°*, 918 (i).
Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 611 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., *Muskoka.*

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 4484 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 16) 1°, 197 (i).
Indemnity to Members, &c., on 2° of Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4122 (ii).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4266.
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4702 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E.—*Continued.*

Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O.C., &c., 2010 (i).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 17, Dual Language, 1°, 197.

Salvation Army, Gen. Booth's Immigration Scheme (Ques.) 426 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia and Defence (Military College) 3810 (ii); (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2293 (i).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., *Laval.*

Baie St. Paul Pier, Contract for Construction (Ans.) 3816 (ii).

Butter Shipments to Great Britain, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4827 (ii).

Cattle Embargo by Great Britain (Ans.) 4709 (ii).

Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1836 (i).

Charlebois' Claim *re* Langevin Block Construction (Ans.) 744, 933 (i).

Coal Contract, Public Buildings, Ottawa (Ans.) 4709 (ii).

——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4817 (ii).

Cole's Wharf, Bedeque, Dredging (Ans.) 3196 (ii).

Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 4779 (ii).

Customs Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1289 (i).

Dredge, New, Preparation of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 2942 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 2703 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3647 (ii).

Gardner's Creek Breakwater, Tenders for Construction (Ans.) 2942 (ii).

Grand Etang Channel (Ans.) 2141 (i).

——— Contract for Works (Ans.) 3710 (ii).

Guilbault, Ed., Emplymt. by Pub. Works Dept. (Ans.) 306 (i).

Halifax Drill Shed, Tenders for Construction (Ans.) 2358 (i).

Hilton Wharf, St. Joseph's Island, Expend. (Ans.) 2362 (i).

Laurentides P.O., Purchase of Building (Ans.) 3084, 3360 (ii).

——— Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4802 (ii).

"Laval" Dredge, Total Cost, &c., (Ans.) 428 (i).

Little River St. Francois Improvements (Ans.) 1361 (i).

Liverpool Harbour, Surveys, &c., on M. for copies, 326 (i).

McGregor's Creek, Sheet Piling (Ans.) 577 (i).

Magog Wharf, Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 2572 (ii).

Mallette, Louis Z., Langevin Block Contract (Ans.) 1180 (i).

Manitoba Schools Question, Alleged Utterances of Ministers (Ans.) 578 (i).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*

Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii).

Miminegash Breakwater, Extension (Ans.) 931.

Minister of Public Works' Speech in the Prov. of Que. (Ans.) 925 (i).

Ministerial Resignations (statement) 4189 (ii).

Portage la Prairie P.O., Purchase of Site, on M. for O. C., 2383 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4900 (ii).

Port Rowan, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2360 (i).

Public Works Act Amt. (B. 123) 1°, 3082; in Com., 3267 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1829 (i).

Returns, Charlebois' unsettled Accounts (remarks) 774 (i).

Representation in House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 124) 1°, 3082; on consdn. of B., 3458 (ii).

St. John River, Improved Navigation (Ans.) 3360 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 489 (i).

State Funerals (Ans.) 2570 (ii).

——— Late Hon. Thos. White (Ans.) 3193 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Public Works) contingencies, 3102 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Public Works, 4276 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2645, 2676 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Kaministiquia River) 3465; (St. Lawrence River Ship Channel) 3464 (ii). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 2300 (i), 3509 (ii); (Lighting, &c.) 2303; (Lighting Montreal P.O.) 2293; (N.B.) 2273 (i), 3489; (N.W.T.) 3508; (N.S.) 3477 (ii); (Ont.), 2297 (i), 3505 (ii); (Que.) 2293 (i), 3494 (ii); (Repairs, &c., Rideau Hall) 2302; (St. John Custom House) 2273 (i). Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 3536. Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 3533 (ii); (Mar. Provs. generally) 2305, 2326; (N. B.) 2305 (i), 3514; (N. S.) 2304 (i), 3510; (Ont.) 3525; (P.E.I.) 3513 (ii); (Que.) 2331 (i); 3514. Roads and Bridges, 3540. Slides and Booms, 3539. Telegraphs, 3542 (ii).

Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Funeral Expenses (Ans.) 2726, 2941 (ii).

Three Rivers, Hay Shed (Ans.) 2358 (i).

Tignish Breakwater, Repairs (Ans.) 1361 (i).

Toronto Drill Hall, Cost (Ans.) 1362 (i).

Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3846 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 1827 (i).

West Point Wharf, Rebuilding (Ans.) 206 (i).

Yamaska and St. Ours Locks, Charges on Vessels (Ans.) 2735 (ii).

——— Obstructions in Channel (Ans.) 925 (i).

——— River, Lock and Dam, Repairs and Maintenance (Ans.) 1697 (i).

——— Construction (Ans.) 2359 (i).

Patterson, Mr. W., *South Brant.*

Address to His Ex., on The, 106 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 679 (i).
Six Nation Indians, Deptl. Reps., Distribution (Ques.) 429 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Indian Affairs) 1946 (i), 2690 (ii); (Interior) 1918 (i).
Geological Survey (Artesian Borings) 2489 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Hugh Sutherland's Indemnity) 2092; (Voters' Lists) 1952, 2086 (i).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2492 (ii).
Tariff, Statements respecting, on Ms. for Rets., 266 (i).

Patterson, Mr. W. A., *Colchester.*

I.C.R., Dismissal of Conductor McCulley (Ques.) 2140 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. L. C., *Laprairie.*

Franchise (Electoral) Act Repeal (B. 99) 1°, 1696.
School Savings Bank incorp. Act Amt. (B. 59) 1°*, 616 (i).

Perry, Mr. S. F., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1416 (i).
Cascumpeque Harbour Buoys, Contract *re* (Ques.) 2358 (i).
De Blois Station, Mail Contract (Ques.) 771 (i).
Duvar Road Crossing, Ry. Accommodation (M. for Pets., &c.) 2385 (i).
Kildare Station Post Office (Ques.) 2511 (ii).
Lobster Fishery Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3095, 3668 (ii).
Lobster Packing, License Fees (Ques.) 206 (i).
Miminegash Breakwater, Extension (Ques.) 931.
North Cape Whistling Buoy (Ques.) 931 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Contract for Cedar Sleepers (Ques.) 3084 (ii).
——— Extension of System, on M. for Ret., 2769 (ii).
St. Louis, Postmaster (Ques.) 771, 2359 (i).
——— Station and Palmer Road, &c., Mail Contract (Ques.) 699 (i).
Steam Service, P.E.I. and Mainland (M. for Ret.) 275 (i).
Straits of Northumberland, Borings (Ques.) 206 (i), 3711 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2319 (i); (P.E.I.) 3512 (ii).
Tignish Breakwater, Wharfage Fees Collected (Ques.) 430, 931, 2358 (i) 3715 (ii).
——— Repairs (Ques.) 1361 (i).
——— Names of Vessels (M. for Ret.*) 2406 (i).
West Point Wharf, Rebuilding (Ques.) 206 (i).
Winter Service, P.E.I. and Mainland (M. for Stmnt.*) 300 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*

Beacon Hill Powder Magazine (Ques.) 919 (i).
Behring Sea Sealers, Payment of Indemnity (Ques.) 620 (i).
——— Seizure of Sealers by Russia, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3872 (ii).
Cabinet Representation for B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4786 (ii).
Chinamen in B. C., Quarantine, Amounts paid by C.P.R. (Ques.) 698 (i).
Customs Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1286 (i).
Fisheries of the Great Lakes, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3979 (ii).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2540 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2194 (i).
Provincial Payments into Dom. Treasury (M. for Ret.) 299 (i).
Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4904 (ii).
Red Mountain Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 616 (i).
Return (inquiries) 2943, 3111, 3818 (ii).
"San Pedro," SS., Removal of Wreck (Ques.) 933 (i) 3708 (ii).
Seal Fisheries, Arms and Implements (Ques.) 1083 (i).
——— Compensation to Sealers (Ques.) 83 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 3351.
Indians (B.C.) 3902 (ii).
Militia and Defence (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2214 (i).
Miscellaneous (Passamaquoddy Bay Boundary) 3908; (Printing, &c.) 3905 (ii).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 3354 (ii).
Trail Creek and Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 57) 1°*, 616 (i).
Volunteer Long Service Medals (remarks) 4906 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 19) 1°, 222 (i).
St. Lawrence River Water Lots (Ques.) 1549 (i).

Rider, Mr. T. D., *Stanstead.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1568, 1589 (i).
Butter, Purchases by Govt. (Ques.) 199 (i).
——— Shipments to Great Britain (Ques.) 1180 (i).
Can. Troops for England (Ques.) 1180 (i).
Civil Service, Temporary Employees (Ques.) 3995.
Dom. Loan (1894) Negotiations (Ques.) 1181 (i).
Employees' Voting at Elections (B. 42) 1°, 478 (i).
Foster, H. S., Sale of Govt. Land in Iberville (Ques.) 3195 (ii).
Isle aux Noix, Govt. Land Sales (Ques.) 2510 (ii).
Magog Wharf, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 2572 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Cornwall) 2262 (i).
Civil Government (Interior) 1919, 1944; (Justice) J. W. Hughes's services, 1914 (i).

Rider, Mr. T. D.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, 2505, 4302 (ii). Canals (Welland) 2273 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper, 2103 (i).
Militia and Defence (Military Properties) 3182 (ii.)
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Lighting Montreal P.O.) 2293 (i); (N.S.) 3489 (ii); (N.B.) St. John Custom-house, 2288 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Que.), 3515 (ii).

Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Funeral Expenses (Ques.) 2726 (ii).

Turenne, Auzias, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1181 (i).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbiniere.*

Bourassa, Philip S., Suspension (Ques.) 1970 (i).

Cullers' Office, Quebec, Inspection Dues (Ques.) 1548 (i).

Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4014 (ii).

Electoral Lists, Lotbiniere Co., Printing (Ques.) 771 (i).

Garrison Artillery, Quebec, No. 3 Battery (M. for Cor., &c.) 1973 (i).

Robillard, Mr. H., *Ottawa.*

Ottawa and Aylmer Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 616 (i).

Rosamond, Mr. B., *North Lanark.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1613 (i).

Customs Collections on Theatrical Printing, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2022 (i).

Ryckman, Mr. S. S., *Hamilton.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1593 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*

Criminal Code (1892) B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4093 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 4481 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2592; in Com., 2598 (ii).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4370 (ii).

Private Bills, on M. to Extend Time (remarks) 1177 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2125 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 3104 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2652 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 3507 (ii).

Smith, Sir D. A., K.C.M.G., *West Montreal.*

South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s B. 35, on M. to ref. back to Com., 1692 (i).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2655 (ii).

Smith, Mr. W., *South Ontario.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1295 (i).

Cattle Embargo by Great Britian (prop. Res.) 581 (i).

Oshawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 1179 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2120 (i).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1362 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2129 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Brant.*

Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Subsidy, Amount Paid B.C. Express Co. (Ques.) 932 (i).

B. C. Mail Service, Contracts (Ques.) 3708 (ii).

Controller of Customs Private Secretaries (Ques.) 1550 (i).

Sugar Island, Sale by Govt. (Ques.) 3359 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Income (Welland) 2270 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Cornwall) 2272; (Williamsburg) 2271 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Voters' Lists) 2088 (i).
Miscellaneous (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2631.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3162 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3241, 3413 (ii).

Trent Canal, Simcoe and Balsam Lake Div., Tenders (M. for copies*) 2406.

Speaker, Mr. (HON. PETER WHITE) *North Renfrew.*

Address, The, Reply: Mess. from His Ex. (read) 3191 (ii).

Adjmnt. of House, on M. (remarks) 1840 (i).

Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept. (remarks) 2136 (i).

Census Inaccuracies, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1832 (i).

Cockburn, Commissioner, Expenses to Columbian Exhibition, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 2734 (ii).

Committees, references to (ruling) 2539 (ii)

Controller of Customs, relevancy of deb., 4730 (ii).

Creameries and Cheese Factories in N.W.T., on prop. Res. (remarks) 2401 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3924, 4068 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (ruling) 3640 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Govt. Pensioners, par. in Peterborough *Examiner re* N.W.T. Rebellion (ruling) 924 (i).
Heir Apparent, Birth of, Acknowledgment from H. M.: Mess. from His Ex. (read) 85 (i).
Imperial Titles to Canadians (ruling) 1823 (i).
Internal Economy Com., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5 (i).
Interruptions by Members, 1473, 1705 (i).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract on Ques. of Order, 2918 (ii).
Lake St. John Ry., Gross Earnings, on M. for Stmnt., 1974 (i).
Library of Parliament, Joint Rep. (presented) 4.
Manitoba Schools Question (ruling) 4570 (ii).
——— Judgment from Imp. P.C.: Mess. from His Ex. (read) 85 (i).
Members' remarks checked, 1875, 1884 (i), 2943, 3383, 3423, 3622, 3671, 4361, 4748 (ii).
Members, New (notification) 2, 143, 222, 268, 301.
Member's Statement impugned (ruling) 1266 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5, 85, 331, 1453 1539 (i), 3191, 4186, 4352 (ii).
Ministerial Explanations (ruling) 359 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Ives*) on relevancy on Member's remarks, 345 (i).
——— (Mr. *Weldon*) *re* Man. Schools, 799, 803, 814 (i).
——— (Mr. *McCarthy*) reference to previous debate, 814 (i).
——— Member making a correction (ruling) 1029.
——— (Mr. *Foster*) *re* ruling Portage la Prairie P.O. Site, 2513, 2516 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Edgar*) amending Order of the Hse. (ruling) 3912 (ii).
Personal Explanation (Mr. *Taylor*) reading Newspaper Articles (ruling) 4814 (ii).
Procedure (Ques. of) raising deb. without Notice (ruling) 1293 (i).
Prorogation, Coms. from Gov. Gen's. Sec., 4876, 4903 (ii).
Questions put by Members: Authorities quoted, 1882 (i).
Royal Assent to Bills, Com. from Gov. Gen's. Sec. (read) 3455 (ii).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3550; (ruling) 3553 (ii).
Speech from the Throne (reported) 2 (i).
Standing Committees, ref. to, ruled out of Order 2944 (ii).
Superannuation Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 2159 (i), 2518 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Hugh Sutherland's Indemnity) 2093 (i); (Printing, Paper, &c.) 3342. Library (Salaries, &c.) 3342 (ii). Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2106 (i).
Public Works—Income: Roads and Bridges, 3540.
Unparliamentary Language, 821, 844, 1106, 1834, 1906, 2061, 2070, 2380 (i), 2944, 3001, 4488, 4491 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Vacancies (notification) 1 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com. on Res. (sawed boards) 4851 (ii).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co's. B. (ruling) 4886 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy (MR. J. G. H. BERGERON) *Beauharnois.*
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1539 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Tisdale*) *re* Private Bills Notice (ruling) 3237 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Unforeseen Expenses) 1917 (i).
Unlawful Associations and Oaths R. 7 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) Amt. ruled out of Order, 2520 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., First Rep., conc., 477 (i).
Adulteration of Food Act Amt. (B. 41) 1°, 478 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1454 (i).
Cattle Embargo by Great Britain on prop. Res. (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 584 (i).
——— (Ques.) 4709 (ii).
——— Exports, Limitation of Space (remarks) 145 (i).
Can. Mutual Life Association, &c. (M. for Cor., &c.*) 221 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (inquiry) 2671 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for 2°, 3744 (ii).
Conspiracies, &c., in Restraint of Trade Act Amt. (B. 112) 1°, 2259 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2563 (ii).
Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (M. to adjn. deb.) agreed to (Y. 62, N. 57) 4021 (ii).
Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies (B. 12) 1°, 81 (i).
Enfranchisement of Women, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 719 (i).
Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2028 (i).
——— Wednesdays (remarks) 3623 (ii).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2537 (ii).
Hamilton Distillery Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 478 (i).
——— Township Loan Society's Act (1885) Amt. (B. 39) 1°*, 478 (i).
Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3121.
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3588 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 2191 (i).
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1000 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1936 (i).

Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1903 (i).

Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2065 (i).

Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O. C., &c., 2012 (i).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 2180 (i).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4374 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s (B. 63) 1° *, 617 (i).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3549 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 509 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairying Interests) 2110 (i), 4466 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Post Office, 4318 (ii).

Penitentiaries: (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3147 (ii).

Public Works—Capital (Kaministiquia River) 3476 (ii).

Thousand Islands, Number Sold (M. for Ret.) 1974 (i).

——— Reservations for Park, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4001 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3236, 3245 (ii).

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz.-Wm., *Halifax.*

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 48) 1° *, 515.

I.C.R., Burning of Shed at Richmond (remarks) 1354 (i).

Ottawa Mail Service to Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 2359.

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2638 (ii).

Windsor and Annapolis Ry. Co.'s (B. 49) 1° *, 515.

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*

Agricultural Products, Imports in June, 1894 (Ques.) 2137 (i).

Anderson, James, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 306, 479 (i).

Brigade Camp, No. 1 District, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2608 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 1262 (i).

Canal Improvements in St. Lawrence (Ques) 306.

Camp Harmony Angling Club's incorp. (B. 71) 1° *, 839; in Com., 1732 (i).

Census Inaccuracies, Ret. respecting (remarks) 1837 (i).

Customs Collectorship, Niagara Falls, Vacancy (Ques.) 574 (i).

Dairy Products Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 4760 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Guilbault, Ed., Emplymt. by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 305 (i).

Hilton Wharf, St. Joseph's Island, Expend. (Ques.) 2362 (i).

International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3760, 3942, (ii).

Laurentides P. O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4812 (ii).

Queen's Prize Winner at Bisley (remarks) 4905.

Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 33) 1° *, 425 (i).

Seigniory of Sorel, Govt. Tenants (Ques.) 304 (i).

Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3550 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2348 (i).

Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2096. Senate (Senator Sullivan's Indemnity) 2108 (i).

Militia and Defence (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2205 (i).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 3489; (N.W.T.) 3508; (N.S.) 3485; (Ont.) 3507 (ii).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3231, 3415 (ii).

Trans-Atlantic Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 305.

Tarte, Mr. J. I., *L'Islet.*

Dairying in N.W.T., Bonus to Encourage, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4020 (ii).

Employees in Pub. Works Dept. non-permanent (M. for Stmnt.*) 343 (i).

Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).

Laurentides P. O., Rent of Building, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4811 (ii).

Manitoba Schools Question on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4420 (ii).

Military Riding School, Montreal, Amounts Paid (M. for Stmnt.*) 343 (i).

Montreal City P. O., Repairs, Amounts Paid (M. for Stmnts.*) 343 (i).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses) 2644; (Lady Thompson Fund, contribution) 2649 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 3538. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 3517. Slides and Booms, 3539 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 27) 1°*, 425 (i).

Alien Contract Labour prevention (B. 18) 1°*, 198 (i).

Can. Order of Foresters incorp (B. 47) 1°*, 515.

Chute, Julia Ethel, Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 3815 (ii).

Cattle Embargo by Great Britain (Ques.) 4709 (ii).

Custom Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1271 (i).

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com. on Res., 237 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Continued.*

Debates, Official, 5th Rep. of Com. (presented) 4255 (ii).
Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of Church of Eng. in Can. incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 1818.
Dom. Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 100) 1°*, 1818 (i).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4224 (ii).
Personal Explanation, Article in *Canada Farmer's Sun* (remarks) 4813 (ii).
Prohibition of Liquor Traffic, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) Amt. to Amt., 2809; neg. (Y. 51, N. 70) 2812 (ii).
Returns, Cost since 1891-95 (Ques.) 2506 (ii).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3552 (ii).
——— 8th Rep. (M.) to ref. back to Com., 3265.

SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries (Kingston) Binder Twine, 3149 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 3531 (ii).

Thousand Islands Ry. Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 1179 (i).
———Number Sold (M. for Ret.) 1974 (i).
——— Reservations for Park (prop. Res.) 3997.

Temple, Mr. T., *York, N. B.*

Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co., Tolls Collected, &c., on M. for Ret., 445 (i).
Saw-dust Deposits in Rivers (N. S.) on M. for Ret., 1978 (i).

SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) St. John Custom-house, 2277 (i).

Tisdale, Mr. D., *South Norfolk.*

Brigade Camp, No. 1 District, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2611 (ii).
Camp Harmony Angling Club's incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 1731 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2567 (ii).
——— B. 51 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) in Com., 4088 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*) in Com., 2697 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on M. for 2°, 3632 (ii).
Govt. Contracts to Aliens prevention B. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*) on M. for 2°, 2530 (ii).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Masson*) in Com., 3761, 3940 (ii).
Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 77) 1°*, 1000 (i).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1930, 2353 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 765 (i).

Tisdale, Mr. D.—*Continued.*

Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2083 (i).
Private Bills, on M. to Extend Time (remarks) 1175 (i).
Provincial Officials, Disfranchisement, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 601 (i).
St. Lawrence River Water Lots (Ques.) 1549 (i).
Sel. Com. on Rys., &c., Meetings during Sittings of House (M.) 3909, 4113 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3547 (ii).

SUPPLY:
Militia and Defence (Permanent Corps, Pay, &c.) 2218 (i).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*) in Com., 3236 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H., K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*

Address to His Ex., on The 70 (i).
Auditor General's Pet. *re* Estimates for Dept., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2442 (ii).
Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3140 (ii).
Ballot Papers, B. rspecting (remarks) 3916 (ii).
Behring Sea, Arbitration (Ans.) 4862 (ii).
——— Seizure of Sealers by Russian Crusiers (remarks) 3369 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3863 (ii)
Binder Twine, Govt. Sales (Ans.) 3818 (ii).
——— manufactured in Kingston Penitentiary (Ans.) 2356 (i), 3707 (ii).
Business of the Hse., Bills Reported (M.) 4740 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3762 (ii).
Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3205, 3377 (ii).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4782 (ii).
Connor, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3993.
Controller of Customs, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4712 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 103) 1°*, 1881 (i); in Com., 4081 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2685 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) Amt., 6 m.h., 2147 (i).
——— B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 2557 (ii)
——— (B. 51) 1°, 515 (i); in Com., 4083, 4741 (ii).
——— Joint Com., (M.) 2406 (ii).
——— Reduction of Quorum, 3266 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. Wallace) in Com., 4128, 4166; on Order for consdn. of B., 4470 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. Hse., 4492 (ii)
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*) in Com., 2695 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. *Montague*) in Com., 3923; on M. for 3°, 4065; in Com., 4069 (ii).
Female Offenders in N.S. Act Amt. (B. 128) 1°*, 3556; 2° m., 3716; in Com., 3719 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—*Continued.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2576; in Com., 2596 (ii).
Fishing Rights in River Matane, Contracts, on M. for copies, 2398 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Montague*) Voters' Lists, on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3637 (ii).
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s, incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2701; in Com., 2704 (ii).
Imperial Titles to Canadians (remarks) 1824 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Salaries (prop. Res.) 1883, 2180; in Com., 2183, 2196 (i).
——— (B. 127) 1°*, 3086; in Com., 3722; 3° m., 3916 (ii).
——— Superannuation (prop. Res.) 2165 (i); in Com., 3088 (ii).
——— (B. 129) 1°*, 3122; in Com., 4252 (ii).
Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3026, 3075 (ii).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*) on M. for 3°, 1927 (i).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).
Loiselle *vs.* Guillet, Ret. respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1894 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) M. to dschge. Order for Com., 2517 (ii).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4545 (ii).
——— On M. to adjn. deb., 4570 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4192 (ii).
Noble Bros. Fishing Fleet, Seizure in Georgian Bay, on M. for O.C., &c., 1988 (i).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. (B. 131) 1°, 3190; in Com., 4366; Sen. Amts., 4877 (ii).
——— (explanation) 4876 (ii).
——— Insane Convicts (B. 66) 1°, 618; in Com., 2165 (i).
Penitentiary, B.C., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 4821 (ii).
Remedial Order *re* Man. Schools (Ans.) 579 (i).
Returns presented, 4906 (ii).
St. Louis, Emmanuel, Civil Proceedings against (Ans.) 1588 (i), 3457 (ii).
St. Thomas P. O., Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 2164 (i).
Salmon Fishing in N.B. (Ans.) 3455 (ii).
"San Pedro" SS., Removal of Wreck (Ans.) 3708.
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., Meetings during Sittings of Hse., on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3910 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Weldon*) to reduce Quorum, 3549 (ii).
South Shore Ry. B. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) in Com., 4393 (ii).
"Stanley" Str., and Exploration of Hudson Straits (remarks) 4906 (ii).
Superannuation Act Amt. (B. 6) on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, 2163 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Lachine) Expenses *re* Commission, 2230 (i).
Civil Government (Justice) Gisborne, &c., services, 1913; J. W. Hughes's services, 1914 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2502. Weights and Measures (Litigation) 2502 (ii).
Dominion Police, 3141 (ii).
Fisheries (Frauds *re* Bounty) 2335: (Refund of Fines) 2334 (i).
Justice, Administration of (B.C.) 1947 (i); (Circuit Allowances, B.C.) 3107; (Official Arbitrators) 3107 (ii); (Ont.) 1947; (Que.) 1948 (i); (Supreme Court) 3109; (Travelling Expenses, High Court Judges) 3107; (Travelling Expenses, Judges) 3141 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Durocher's Ballot Paper) 2093; (Voters' Lists) 1953 (i).
Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 2490: (Liquor Traffic Commission) 2494, 2623 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 3486 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2331 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 1948 (i); (Dorchester) 3176; (Kingston) 3141, Binder Twine, 3144 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 1948 (i).
U.S. Legislation *re* Navigation of Great Lakes (remarks) 3557 (ii).
Winding Up Act Amt. (B. 144) 1°, 4353 (ii).
Winnipeg Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 4878; in Com., 4890 (ii).

Turcotte, Mr. A. J., *Montmorency.*
Treaty with France B. 126 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 3841 (ii).

Vaillancourt, Mr. C. T., *Dorchester.*
Lake Etchemin and Ste. Rose de Watford Mail Contract (Ques.) 575 (i).
——— (remarks) 3715 (ii).
Lamontagne, Jos., Mail Contract, &c. (M. for copies) 1974 (i).

Wallace, Hon. N. C., *West York, Ont.*
Agricultural Imports from Australia (Ans.) 2360.
——— Products, Imports in June, 1894 (Ans.) 2137 (i).
Allen, late Dr., Gratuity to Widow, on M. for O.C., 298 (i).
American-made Milk Cans, Free Entry (Ans.) 3815 (ii).
Board of Experts (Customs) in U.S. (Ans.) 1827.
Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1140 (i).
——— (explanation) 1259 (i).
Chenier, Dr., Monument, Customs Duties (Ans.) 3712, 4115 (ii).
"City of Midland," Str., Seizure, &c. (Ans.) 4708.
Courtright Customs Officer, Superannuation (Ans.) 3359 (ii).

Wallace, Hon. N. C.—*Continued.*

Customs Act Amt. (B. 140) 1°, 3913; 2° m., 4125; in Com., 4131, 4168; on consdn. of B., 4471; 3° m., 4473; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4477 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. Hse., 4490.
——— Collectorship, Montreal (Ans.) 205 (i).
——— Collector, Niagara Falls, Vacancy (Ans.) 574 (i).
——— Collectors as Brokers (Ans.) 1359, 1971 (i).
——— Collector, Three Rivers, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 574 (i).
——— Dept., alleged Irregularities (Ans.) 2754.
——— Deptl. Employees, Special (Ans.) 2164 (i).
——— Extra or Regular (Ans.) 3191 (ii).
——— Duties on American Hardware (remarks) 1269 (i).
——— on Spirits (Ans.) 698 (i).
——— Officers at Fort Erie, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3815 (ii).
——— Officials, Toronto, Emplymt. (Ans.) 305.
——— Valuators, Outside Agents (Ans.) 1826 (i).
Exports to Australia (Ans.) 84 (i).
Finlay, W., Appnmt. in Customs Service (Ans.) 2139 (i).
Granite and Freestone, Imports (Ans.) 306 (i).
Granite (Red) Monuments, Imports (Ans.) 306.
Harvesters, Self-binders, Number Exported (Ans.) 2734 (ii).
Hay Exports to U.S. and Great Britain (Ans.) 2357 (i).
Imports and Exports, 1894-95 (Ans.) 426 (i).
Imports of Dutiable Goods, Amount and Duties Collected (Ans.) 576 (i).
——— Free Goods by Govt. (Ans.) 2571 (ii).
Lumber and Saw-logs, Free, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) 2058 (i).
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
Moir, Geo., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3196 (ii).
Ogilvie, W. W., Drawback on Imported Corn (Ans.) 4357 (ii).
Pig Iron Imported into Can. from U.S. (Ans.) 932 (i).
Piping for Wells, Duty (Ans.) 3708 (ii).
Rice Imports, July, 1894, to May, 1895, Quantity (Ans.) 1585 (i).
Seizure of Illicit Still at L'Islet Station (Ans.) 2139 (i).
Southampton Customs Officers, Names, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 4116 (ii).
Sugar Imports (Ans.) 1357 (i).
——— (Raw) Imports (Ans.) 507 (i).
——— Imports, Raw and Refined (Ans.) 768, 922 (i).
——— Imported into Montreal and Halifax (Ans.) 1001 (i).
Sutton, Mr., Appnmt. to Royal Can. Dragoons (Ans.) 1972 (i).

Wallace, Hon. N. C.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Customs) 2711 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 2502, 4350; (Litigation) 2503 (ii).
Trade and Navigation Returns (presented) 86 (i).
Tariff, Statements respecting, on Ms. for Rets., 265, 335 (i).
Tobacco Seized from Alphonse Thibault (Ans.) 480 (i).
——— Seizures in Temiscouata (Ans.) 480 (i).
Wallace, George, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3084 (ii).
West Kootenay Customs Rets., on M. for Ret., 322 (i).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., *Albert.*

Can. and N'fld., Negotiations *re* Confed., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 349 (i).
Copyright, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2687 (ii).
Customs Duties on American Hardware, on Ques. of Order, 1285 (i).
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. 85 (Mr. *McKay*) on M. for 2°, 2699 (ii).
Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4270.
Manitoba Schools Question, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
Ministerial Resignations, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4212 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) Man. Schools 799 (i).
Sel. Com. on Railways, &c., Reduction of Quorum (M.) 3545 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 491 (i).
SUPPLY:
Justice, Administration of (Supreme Court) 3108.

Welsh, Mr. W., *Queen's, P.E.I.*

Chignecto Ship Ry., Newspaper par. (remarks) 1354 (i).
Ry. System in P.E.I., Extension, on M. for Ret., 2763 (ii).
Steam Service P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 288 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 3512 (ii).

White, Mr. N. W., *Shelburne.*

Coast and South Shore Ry. Co.'s, on M. for Ret., 3215, 3374, 4033 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 3094 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 514 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 88) 1°*, 1179 (i).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Seal Island Lighthouse Station) 3616 (ii).

White, Mr. R. S., *Cardwell.*

Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths Act Amt. (B. 7) 1°, 79 (i); 2° m., 2519 (ii).

Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4869; in Com. on B. 150, 4890 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 487 (i).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures, &c., 4303 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 8) 1°, 80 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 3536 (ii).

Wood, Hon. J. F., *Brockville.*

Bourassa, Philippe S., Suspension (Ans.) 1970 (i).

Carleton (N.B.) Bonded Warehouses, Closing (Ans.) 2357 (i).

Cullers at Montreal and Quebec, Number, &c. (Ans.) 577 (i).

——— Offices, Montreal and Quebec, Maintenance and Revenue (Ans.) 929 (i).

——— Que., Abolition (Ans.) 579 (i).

——— Inspection Dues (Ans.) 1549 (i).

——— Supervisor at Quebec (Ans.) 1359 (i).

Excise Duty on Spirits (Ans.) 698 (i).

General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 122) 1°, 3080; in Com., 3459 (ii).

Illicit Distilleries, Seizure (Ans.) 3357 (ii).

——— Still at L'Islet, (Ans.) 4115 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 147) 1°*, 4861 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 181 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Inland Revenue) 2718 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, &c., 4338. Culling Timber, 4282, 4463. Excise, 4279; (Methylated Spirits) 4281. Weights and Measures, &c., 4285, 4301 (ii).

Wood, Hon. J. F.—*Continued.*

Tobacco, Can., Amount Collected (Ans.) 1587 (i).

——— Entry of Foreign Leaf Duty Free (remarks) 2030 (i).

——— Seizure at Isle Verte (Ans.) 697 (i).

Weights and Measures Rep. (presented) 181 (i).

Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c., on M. for Ret., 434 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., *Westmoreland.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1379 (i).

Can. Order of Foresters incorp. B. 47 (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com., 2293 (i).

Ins. Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 3116.

Man. and North-west Loan Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Denison*) in Com., 1967 (i).

Steam Service P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 290 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) St. John Custom-house, 2279 (i).

Yeo, Mr. J., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Cole's Wharf, Bedeque, Dredging (Ques.) 3196 (ii).

Darnley Basin, &c., Buoys and Range Lights (Ques.) 580 (i).

Lenkletter P. O., Establishment (Ques.) 1179 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 3093; in Com., 3096, 3660 (ii).

Magog Wharf, Expenditure of Vote (Ques.) 1968.

Ry. System in P.E.I., Extension, on M. for Ret., 2773 (ii).

Steam Service P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Ret., 283 (i).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Distribution of Bounty) 3991 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 3536 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2317 (i); (P.E.I.) 2513(ii).

Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses (Ques.) 2726 (ii).

INDEX.—PART II.

SUBJECTS

ACADEMY OF ARTS: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

ACTIVE MILTIA FORCE, SAVING BY REDUCTION IN STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*), 3355 (ii).

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Bennett*) 5; seconded (Mr. *Belley*) 14 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 21; (Mr. *Foster*) 36; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 54; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 70; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 87; (Sir *James Grant*) 97; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 106; (Mr. *Davin*) 115; (Mr. *Casey*) 131; (Mr. *McMullen*) 146; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 154; (Mr. *Costigan*) 171 (i).

——— REPLY: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 3191 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS:

DOM. DAY, ; M. (Mr. *Foster*) 3545 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3456 (ii).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, : Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1355 (i).

——— STATE FESTIVITIES, : M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2030 (i).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. *See* "Justice."

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 2, ; *pro forma*.

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 41 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°, 478 (i).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 4308 (ii).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS AND THE TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4827 (ii).

——— IMPORTS FROM AUSTRALIA: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2360 (i).

——— PRODUCTS IMPORTED INTO CANADA, VALUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2137 (i).

——— SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 3349 (ii).

AGRICULTURE:

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 228 (i).

——— 1ST REP.: conc. (Mr. *Sproule*) 477 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i), 3342, 4465 (ii).

——— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2721 3102 (ii).

——— VACANCY IN CABINET: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*, &c.) 4273 (ii).

——— PRODUCTS IMPORTED INTO CANADA, VALUE, &c: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2137 (i).

——— INSPECTING PHYSICIAN, APPMNT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 309 (i).

BUTTER PURCHASES BY GOVT. DURING 1895: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 199 (i).

——— SHIPMENTS TO ENGLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4824 (ii).

——— ON GOVT. ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1180.

——— TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2511 (ii).

AGRICULTURE—*Continued.*

CATTLE EMBARGO BY GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor. &c. (Mr. *Innes*) 209 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 296 (i).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 581 (i).

——— Ret. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 173, 1830 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4831 (ii).

——— Removal: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4709 (ii).

——— EXPORTS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*, &c.) on adjnmt., 142 (i).

——— QUARANTINE: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4840 (ii).

——— REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*, &c.) 144 (i).

——— SHIPMENTS TO BELGIUM: Ques. (Mr. *Lachapelle*) 4830 (ii).

——— TRANSPORT THROUGH U.S. FOR SHIPMENT: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McMillan*) 341, 477 (i).

CHEESE FACTORIES IN P.E.I., MANUFACTURE AND SALE: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2023 (i).

DAIRY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2031 (i).

DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i), 3350, 4465 (ii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM BULLETINS: in Com. of Sup., 3350 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 3501 (ii).

——— REPS., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Grieve*) 2406 (i).

HARASS NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 3349 (ii).

MCMURRAY, L. J. A., EMPLYMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 1001 (i).

MONTANA CATTLE ENTERING CANADA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 322 (i).

"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 3345 (ii).

PUBLIC HEALTH IN QUARANTINE DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

SAN JOSE "SCALE" PEST IN U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 926 (i).

SEED GRAIN, PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 2661 (ii).

SHEEP EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Featherston*) 2385 (i).

SUPERANNUATION, PAYMENTS BY CHARLES THIBAULT: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 577 (i).

[*See* "ARTS AND STATISTICS."]

AGRICULTURE, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Montague*) 229 (i).

Alberta Railway and Coal Company's B. No. 27 (Sir *Donald Smith*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 919 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 45.)

Alien Contract Labour, prevention B. No. 18 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°, 198 (i).

Aliens, Contracts to, prevention B. No. 9 (Mr. *McLennan*). 1°, 80 (i); 2° m., 2520; deb. adjd., 2542 (ii).

ALIEN LABOUR IN CAN., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lowell*) 2405 (i).

ALIEN LABOUR LAW, U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 4908 (ii).

ALLAN AND DOMINION SS. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 921 (i).

ALLAN SS. CO.'S OCEAN MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3600 (ii).

"Alliance Nationale" B. No. 61 (Mr. *Lachapelle*). 1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i).

"ALPHA AND BETA," MANIFESTS OF CARGO, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

AMERICAN HARDWARE, CUSTOMS DUTIES AND SPECIAL AGENTS: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn., 1268 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Wallace*) 1269; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1271; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1271; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1273; (Mr. *Foster*) 1275; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1280; (Mr. *Casey*) 1283; (Mr. *Weldon*) 1285; (Mr. *Prior*) 1286; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1288; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1289; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1291; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ruling, 1293 (i).

AMERICAN-MADE MILK CANS, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3515 (ii).

ANDERSON, JAS., OF SUTTON, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 306, 479 (i).

Angling Club. *See* "CAMP HARMONY."

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1359 (i).

—— NAMES OF OWNERS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 322 (i).

ANTIGONISH AND SHERBROOKE MAIL ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2510 (ii).

ANNAPOLIS MILITARY GROUNDS, LEASE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2139 (i).

ARCHIVES: in Com. of Sup., 3342 (ii).

ARTESIAN BORINGS IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).

ARTS AND STATISTICS:

ACADEMY OF ARTS: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

ARTS AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 3342 (ii).

CENSUS AND AGRICULTURAL CLASSES: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3994 (ii).

—— PAR. IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN" REFLECTING ON MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 423 (i).

CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION, CAN. COMMISSIONERS' EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2736 (ii).

COCKBURN, MR., M.P., EXPENSES AT COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2727 (ii).

COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION, CAN. EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3710 (ii).

—— MEDALS AND DIPLOMAS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 84 (i).

—— EXPENSES IN CONNECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1361 (i).

—— MR. LABRE'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 205 (i).

INDUSTRIES IN BRAMPTON, DESCRIPTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 1162 (i).

—— CHATHAM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Campbell*) 2406.

ARTS AND STATISTICS—*Continued.*

INDUSTRIES IN QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE, N.S.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 326 (i).

—— WINGHAM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2406 (i).

PHOTOGRAPHIC EXHIBITION AT IMP. INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 3351 (ii).

"STATISTICAL ABSTRACT OF CANADA:" in Com. of Sup., 3345 (ii).

STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK, PRINTING, &C.: M. for instructions (Mr. *Casey*) 217 (i).

WORLD'S FAIR, CAN. COMMISSIONER'S EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2727 (ii).

[*See* "AGRICULTURE," "Columbian Ex.," &c.]

ARNPRIOR P.O., CUSTOM HOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

ASHCROFT AND CARIBOO MAIL SERVICE, SUBSIDY PAID TO B.C. EXPRESS CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 932 (i), 3708 (ii).

Assiniboine River. *See* "WINNIPEG."

ASST. RECEIVER GENL.'S OFFICE, CHARLOTTETOWN: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).

—— ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1360 (i).

ATLANTIC AND SUPERIOR RY. CO., GOVT. GUARANTEE: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 2920 (ii).

—— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

ATHLONE-TOTTENHAM MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1587 (i) 3193 (ii).

AUDITOR GENERAL'S PET. *re* ESTIMATES FOR DEPT.: Presented (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2132.

—— Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2260 (i).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup:

Deb. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2408; (Mr. *Foster*) 2421; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2435; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 2442; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2464; (Mr. *Dickey*) 2472; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2477; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2481 (ii).

—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 309 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 86 (i).

AUSTRALIA, EXPORTS FROM CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 84 (i).

BADDECK, GRAND NARROWS, &C., SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3598 (ii).

BAIE ST. PAUL AND CHICOUTIMI MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

BAIE ST. PAUL PIER, CONTRACT FOR BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

BANFF HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

Bankers Life Ass. of Can. incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

BANKING AND COMMERCE, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 227 (i).

BASTIEN, AGENT, AND HURON INDIANS OF LORETTE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1975 (i).

—— LETTER *re* PICAUD *vs.* PICAUD: M. for copy* (Mr. *Laurier*) 2022 (i).

BATTLEFORD AND SASKATOON (N.W.T.) MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 2024 (i).

BAY OF FUNDY SS. Co.'s SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2332 (i).

BEACON HILL, VICTORIA (B.C.) POWDER MAGAZINE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 919 (i).

BEALTON, P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1268 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i); conc. 2672 (ii).

BEDARD, CHARLES, APPNMT. AS REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3993 (ii).

Beet Root Sugar Bounty B. No. 148 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 4861; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 6.)

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION, SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4852 (ii).

——— COMPENSATION TO SEALERS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 83 (i).

——— CONFERENCE, GREAT BRITAIN AND U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1185 (i).

——— EXPENSES *re* ARBITRATION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 426 (i).

——— SEAL FISHERIES, SEALING OF ARMS, &C.: Remarks (M. *Prior*) 1083.

——— SEIZURE OF SEALERS BY RUSSIAN CRUISERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3369, 3856 (ii).

——— SEIZURE OF SHIPS BY U.S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 215 (i).

BELL BUOY FOR LITTLE HOPE ISLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2401 (i)

Benevolent Society. *See* "CANADIAN."

BERNE CONVENTION *re* COPYRIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82 (i).

BERTRAND, CHAS., TOBACCO SEIZED FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480, 697 (i).

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 2; *pro forma.*

BILL (No. 2) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 79; 2°, 465, in Com., 737; M. to restore to Order Paper, 766; again in Com., 1841 (i); Order for Com., read, 2517 (ii).

BILL (No. 3) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction.—(*Mr. Charlton.*)
1°*, 79; 2° m., 2145; Amt. (*Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.*) 6 m. h., 2147; agreed to, 2152 (i).

BILL (No. 4) To reduce the salary of the Governor General.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 79 (i); 2°, m., 3246 (ii).

BILL (No. 5) In further amendment of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 79; 2° neg. (Y. 46, N. 100) 2517 (i).

BILL (No. 6) Further to amend the Superannuation Act.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°*, 79; 2° m., 2152 (i); deb. rsmd. and ruled out of Order, 2518 (ii).

BILL (No. 7) Further to amend the tenth chapter of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, respecting Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell.*)
1°, 79 (i); 2°, 2519; in Com. and 3°*, 2570 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 8) Further to amend the Act respecting Weights and Measures.—(Mr. *Wilson.*)
1°, 89 (i).

BILL (No. 9) To prevent the letting of contracts to Aliens.—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
1°, 80 (i); 2° m., 2520; deb. adjd., 2542 (ii).

BILL (No. 10) Respecting the sale of railway return-fare tickets.—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
1°, 80 (i).

BILL (No. 11) Respecting the liability of the Government and public companies for labour used in the construction of public works.—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
1°, 80 (i).

BILL (No. 12) Respecting Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°, 81 (i).

BILL (No. 13) To promote the safety of railway employees.—(Mr. *Maclean, York.*)
1°, 143 (i).

BILL (No. 14) To repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to make certain provisions in place thereof.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°, 182 (i).

BILL (No. 15) In amendment of the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°, 196 (i); 2° m., 2542; deb. adjd., 2569 (ii).

BILL (No. 16) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 197 (i).

BILL (No. 17) Further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 197 (i).

BILL (No. 18) To prevent the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°, 198 (i).

BILL (No. 19) In further amendment of the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Reid.*)
1°, 222 (i).

BILL (No. 20) In further amendment of the Dominion Franchise Act.—(Mr. *Bergin.*)
1°, 222 (i).

BILL (No. 21) To amend "The Dairy Products Act, 1893."—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
Res. prop., 208; in Com., 234; 1°* of B., 240 (i); transfrd. to Govt. Orders, 4187 (ii).

BILL (No. 22) Further to amend "The Dominion Notes Act."—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 268 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3087 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 23) Further to amend "The Railway Act."—(Mr. *Bryson.*)
1°, 269 (i).

BILL (No. 24) Respecting union labels and trade marks, and to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°, 269 (i).

BILL (No. 25) Further to amend the Act respecting the House of Commons.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 301 (i).

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Bankers Life Association of Canada.—(Mr. *Denison.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

BILL (No. 27) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Sir *Donald Smith.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 919 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 45.)

BILL (No. 28) To incorporate the St. John River Bridge Company.—(Mr. *McAlister.*)
1°., 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1732 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the James Maclaren Company (Limited).—(Sir *James Grant.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1357 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 90.)

BILL (No. 30) To incorporate the Deschênes Bridge Company.—(Sir *James Grant.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 919 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 73.)

BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Canadian Benevolent Society.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 80.)

BILL (No. 32) Respecting the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. *Featherston.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 57.)

BILL (No. 33) To grant certain powers to the Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Company of Algoma (Limited.)—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1357 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 76.)

BILL (No. 34) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com., 3230, 3407, 3948; recom., 4030, 4154; 3° m., 4154; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 4154; neg. (Y. 39, N. 113) 4163; 3°, 4164 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the South Shore Suburban Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lachapelle.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i).

BILL (No. 36) To amend the Act incorporating the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 37) Respecting the salaries of Lieutenant-Governors.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°*, 425 (i).

BILL (No. 38) To incorporate the Hamilton Distillery Company (Limited).—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°*, 478; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1732 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 92.)

BILL (No. 39) To incorporate the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°*, 478; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 85.)

BILL (No. 40) Respecting drainage on and across railway lands.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°, 477 (i).

BILL (No. 41) Further to amend the Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilizers.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°, 478 (i).

BILL (No. 42) To facilitate voting by employees at elections of members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Rider.*)
1°, 478 (i).

BILL (No. 43) To determine the hours of labour for workmen and labourers employed on public works.—(Mr. *Lépine.*)
1°*, 478 (i).

BILL (No. 44) Respecting Commercial Treaties affecting Canada.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 479 (i); Order for 2° dschgd., 3085 (ii).

BILL (No. 45) Respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Sir *James Grant.*)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 572; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 48.)

BILL (No. 46) To incorporate the Trans-Canadian Railway Company.—(Sir *James Grant.*)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 572 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 68.)

BILL (No. 47) To incorporate the Canadian Order of Foresters.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 573; in Com. and 3°, 2293 (i).

BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Stairs.*)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 573 (i); in Com., 2695; 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 47.)

BILL (No. 49) Respecting the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Stairs*).
1°*, 515; 2°*, 573 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 573; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 55.)

BILL (No. 51) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°, 515 (i); 2°*, 2406; in Com., 4082, 4741; 3°*, 4746 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 40.)

BILL (No. 52) Further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Martin.*)
1°*, 515 (i).

BILL (No. 53) Respecting the Manitoba and North-west Loan Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com., 1967; 3°*, 2292 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 86.)

BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Ottawa and Aylmer Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Robillard.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1924 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 58.)

BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; M. for Com., 1924: in Com., 1959; 3° on div., 2352 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 53.)

BILL (No. 56) To incorporate the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Fraser.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; M. for Com., 1731; in Com., 1924; 3°*, 1959 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 91.)

BILL (No. 57) To incorporate the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 616, 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 67.)

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Red Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 60.)

BILL (No. 59) To amend the Act to incorporate the School Savings Bank.—(Mr. *Pelletier.*)
1°*, 616; 2°*, 736 (i).

BILL (No. 60) Respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Niagara, Hamilton and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the "Alliance Nationale."—(Mr. *Lachapelle.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i).

BILL (No. 62) Respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Lowell.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 70.)

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 62.)

BILL (No. 64) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 617; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

BILL (No. 65) To amend "The Railway Act," by providing greater security for passengers and employees, and in other respects.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°, 617 (i).

BILL No. 66) Further to amend the Penitentiary Act.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°, 618; 2° and in Com., 2165 (i); 3°*, 2406 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 41.)

BILL (No. 67) Further to amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 618 (i); 2°, 2574; in Com., 2593; 3°*, 2607 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 27.)

BILL (No. 68) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°, 768 (i); 2° and in Com., 3921; 3° m., 4065; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to recom., 4066; 3°*, 4072 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 13.)

BILL (No. 69) Respecting the Voters' Lists of 1895.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°, 768 (i); 2° m., 3628; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3636; neg. (Y. 39, N. 82) 3656; 2° and in Com., 3657; 3°*, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 12.)

BILL (No. 70) Respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. *McAlister.*)
1°*, 839; 2°*, 919; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 65.)

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Camp Harmony Angling Club.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 839; 2°*, 919; in Com., 1732; 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 93.)

BILL (No. 72) To consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Imperial Trusts Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 839; 2°*, 919 (i).

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Calgary and Lethbridge Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 839; 2°*, 919 (i); wthdn., 4186 (ii).

BILL (No. 74) Further to amend the Act to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 839 (i); 2° and in Com., 3086; 3°, 3087 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 29.)

BILL (No. 75) To revive and amend the Act respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. *Northrup.*)
1°*, 918; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 52.)

BILL (No. 76) In further amendment of the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*)
1°, 918 (i).

BILL (No. 77) To amend the Act to incorporate the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 75.)

BILL (No. 78) To incorporate the Permanent Reserve Life Association of Canada.—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°*, 1,000; 2°*, 1121 (i).

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate "Gilmour and Hughson, Limited."—(Mr. *Edwards.*)
1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121; in Com. and 3°*, 2353 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 89.)

BILL (No. 80) To incorporate the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hughes.*)
1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i); Sen. Amts., 4774 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 54.)

BILL (No. 81) To incorporate the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 83.)

BILL (No. 82) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Co.—(Mr. *Metcalfe.*)
1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3948 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 51.)

BILL (No. 83) Respecting the Eastern Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Fraser.*)
1°*, 1078; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 81.)

BILL (No. 84) To amend the Act incorporating the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters.—(Mr. *Northrup.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii).

BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); M. for Com., 2698; in Com., 2704; 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 86) To incorporate the Canada Insurance Promotion Association (Limited).—(Mr. *Choquette.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1357 (i).

BILL (No. 87) To incorporate the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725; Sen. Amts., 4777 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 50.)

BILL (No. 88) Respecting the South Shore Railway Company (Limited).—(Mr. *White, Shelburne.*)
1°*, 1179; 2° objected to, 1310, 1357; 2°*, 1733 (i); M. for Com., 4286; in Com., 4392, 4615, 4771; 3°*, 4771 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 89) Respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); wthdn., 2570 (ii).

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Oshawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Smith, Ont.*)
1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 56.)

BILL (No. 91) To amend the Law respecting the Lobster Fishery.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 1179 (i); 2° and in Com., 3095, 3659; recom., 3672; 3°*, 3716 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 28.)

BILL (No. 92) Further to amend the Insurance Act.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 1352 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3112; 3°*, 3122; Sen. Amts., 3716 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 20.)

BILL (No. 93) Respecting the discharge of a mortgage to Her Majesty, known as the Markland Mortgage.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 1352; Res. prop., 1883 (i); in Com., 2408; B. wthdn, 2408 (ii).

BILL (No. 94) Further to amend the Post Office Act.—(Sir *Hector Langevin.*)
1°, 1353 (i).

BILL (No. 95) To incorporate the Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. *McAlister.*)
1°*, 1452; 2°*, 1733; in Com. and 3°*, 2354 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 77.)

BILL (No. 96) To incorporate the International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. *Masson.*)
1°*, 1548; 2°*, 1733 (i); in Com., 3583, 3748, 3938; 3°*, 3947 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 49.)

BILL (No. 97) Respecting the Clifton Suspension Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Northrup.*)
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1733 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 2293 (i); in Com., 4772; 3°*, 4474 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 59.)

BILL (No. 99) To repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and amending Acts.—(Mr. *Pelletier.*)
1°, 1696 (i).

BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Dominion Trusts Company.—(Mr. *Smith, Ont.*)
1°*, 1818; 2°*, 1968 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 84.)

BILL (No. 101) To incorporate the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 1818; 2°*, 1968 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 94.)

BILL (No. 102) Further to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 1818 (i); dschgd., 4861 (ii).

BILL (No. 103) To amend "The Copyright Act"—(*from the Senate*).—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°*, 1881 (i); 2°* and in Com., 4081; 3°*, 4082 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 37.)

BILL (No. 104) Further to amend the Civil Service Act—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 1881 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3932 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 14.)

BILL (No. 105) To incorporate the Ottawa Land and Security Company.—(Mr. *McKay.*)
1°*, 1959 (i); 2°*, 3150; in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 87.)

BILL (No. 106) In further amendment of the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *Lavergne.*)
1°, 2024 (i).

BILL (No. 107) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°, 2136 (i).

BILL (No. 108) Respecting the assignment and attachment of the salaries of public employees.—(Mr. *Béchard.*)
1°, 2136 (i).

BILL (No. 109) Further to amend "The Indian Act"—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°*, 2351; 2°, 3932; in Com. and 3°*, 3938 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 35.)

BILL (No. 110) For the relief of Mary Bradshaw Falding—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 2570; 2° on div., 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 96.)

BILL (No. 111) Better to secure the Independence of Parliament.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 2257 (i).

BILL (No. 112) To amend the law relating to conspiracies and combinations formed in restraint of trade.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°*, 2259 (i).

BILL (No. 113) To amend Chapter 10 of the Statutes of 1892, respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 2259; 2°* and in Com., 3270 (i); 3°*, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 114) To amend the Act respecting roads and road allowances in the Province of Manitoba. —(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°, 2405; 2°* and in Com., 4072; 3°*, 4074 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 115) For the relief of Helen Woodburn Jarvis—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°*, 2506; 2° on div., 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 116) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°, 2507; 2°* and in Com., 3270; 3°*, 3271; Sen. Amts., 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 117) Respecting *La Chambre de Commerce du District de Montréal.*—(Mr. *Lépine.*)
1°*, 2670; 2°*, 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3948 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

BILL (No. 118) To amend the Fisheries Act as respects the Salmon Fishery.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 2919; dschgd., 4861 (ii).

BILL (No. 119) Respecting the Shore Line Railway Company—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Gillmor.*)
1°*, 3078; M. to place on Order paper for 2°, 3111; 2°*, 3407; in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 63.)

BILL (No. 120) To Amend the North-west Irrigation Act.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°, 3079; 2°* and in Com., 4767; 3°*, 4768 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 121) Further to amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°; 3080; 2°* and in Com., 4074, 4117; 3° m., 4120; deb. adjd., 4121; rsmd., 4630, 4762; 3°*, 4763 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 122) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°, 3080; 2°* and in Com., 3459; 3°*, 3463 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 123) Further to amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. *Ouimet.*)
1°, 3082; 2° and in Com., 3267; 3°*, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 124) Further to amend the Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Ouimet.*)
1°, 3082; 2°* and in Com., 3270; 3°, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 125) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th day of June, 1895, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res., 2815; 1°* of B., 3085; 2°*, 3111; 3°*, 3266 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 126) Respecting Commercial Treaties affecting Canada.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 3085; 2°, 3558; in Com., 3564; 3° m., 3820; 3° on div., 3848 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 127) Further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 1883; in Com., 2180; 1°* of B., 3086; 2°* and in Com., 3722; 3° m., 3916; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3916; neg. (Y. 57, N. 90) 3919; 3°, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 128) to amend the Act respecting certain Female Offenders in the Province of Nova Scotia —(*from the Senate*).—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°*, 3556; 2°, 3716; in Com., 3719; 3°*, 3720 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 129) to amend the Law respecting the Superannuation of Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 2165 (i); in Com., 3088; 1°* of B., 3122; 2°* and in Com., 4252; 3°*, 4254 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 130) Further to amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Montague.*)
1°, 3190; 2° m., 3769; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h., 3742; neg., 3746; 2° and in Com., 3746, 3762; 3°*, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 131) to amend the Acts respecting Penitentiaries.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°, 3190; 2°* and in Com., 4366; 3°*, 4470; Sen. Amts., 4877 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 132) to revive and amend the Acts to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. *Martin.*)
1°*, 3266; 2°*, 3407; in Com. and 3°*, 3947 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 133) to again amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Lavergne.*)
1°, 3266 (ii).

BILL (No. 134) to legalize payments heretofore made to the General Revenue Fund of the North-west Territories, of certain fines, penalties, and forfeitures.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
Res. prop., 2573; in Com., 3122; 1°* of B., 3267; 2°* and in Com., 3720; 3°*, 3721 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 135) further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Daly.*)
1°*, 3455; 2°, 3930; in Com., 3931; 3°*, 3932; Sen. Amts., 4770 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 136) Respecting the discharge of a mortgage to Her Majesty known as the Markland Mortgage.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 1883 (i); M. for Com., 2406; in Com., 2408; 1°* of B., 3558; 2°, 3928; in Com., 3930; 3°, 4063 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 137) to amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade—(*from the Senate*). —(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°*, 3621; 2°, 3721: in Com. and 3°*, 3722 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 138) to amend The Companies' Act—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°*, 3707; 2° m., 4778; agreed to (Y. 50, N. 24) 4780; in Com., 4781; 3°*, 4786 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 121.)

BILL (No. 139) for the relief of Julia Ethel Chute—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1°*, 3815; 2° on div., 3948; 3° on div., 4154 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 95.)

BILL (No. 140) Further to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Wallace*.)
1°, 3913; 2°, 4125; in Com., 4127, 4164; consdn. of B., 4471; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to recom., 4473; Amt. neg. (Y. 59, N. 115) 4486; 3°, 4496 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 22.)

BILL (No. 141) For the settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and British Columbia, relating to lands in the Railway Belt, British Columbia—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°*, 3993: 2°, 4078; in Com., 4079; 3°*, 4081 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 4.)

BILL (No. 142) To encourage Silver-lead smelting.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop. and in Com., 3925; 1°* of B., 4065; 2°* and in Com., 4123; recom., 4763; 3°*, 4767 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 7.)

BILL (No. 143) Further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. prop., 3915; in Com., 4062; conc., 4121; 1°* of B., 4123; 2°* and in Com., 4470; 3°*, 4751 ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 9.)

BILL (No. 144) Further to amend "The Winding Up Act."—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*.)
1°, 4353; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4751 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 18.)

BILL (No. 145) To authorize the Treasury Board to exempt certain Societies from the operation of the Insurance Act.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°, 4354; 2°, 4768. in Com. and 3°*, 4770 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 19.)

BILL (No. 146) To amend the Customs Tariff, 1894.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. in Com., 4847; 1°* of B., 4861; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 23.)

BILL (No. 147) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville*.)
1°*, 4861; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 25.)

BILL (No. 148) Respecting the bounty on Beet-root Sugar.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
1°*, 4861; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 6.)

BILL (No. 149) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1896, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Foster*.)
Res. in Com., 4862: 1°*, 4863; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4877 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

BILL (No. 150) Respecting the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Haggart*.)
Res. prop., 4819; M. for Com., 4863; in Com., 4869; conc. and 1°* of B., 4876; 2° m., 4877; 2° and in Com., 4890; 3°*, 4893 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 8.)

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT: 3575, 4909 (ii).

BINDER TWINE, GOVT. SALES BELOW COST: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 3818 (ii).

—— MANUFACTURED IN KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2355 (i).

—— PRISON-MADE, SHIPMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3707 (ii).

—— MANUFACTURED AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Grieve*) 2022 (i).

BLEAKNEY AND FARROW, MESSRS., CUSTOMS DEPTL. IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2754 (ii).

Boards of Trade incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 137 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 3621; 2°, 3721; in Com. and 3°*, 3722 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 17.)

BONAVENTURE COUNTY PILOT EXAMINERS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 339 (i).

BOOTH, GEN., PROPOSED CAN. SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 426 (i).

—— GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2361 (i).

BOUNTY, FISHING, FRAUDS, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2335 (i).

—— ON PIG IRON MADE IN CAN.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 2022 (i).

BOSTON P. O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1267 (i).

BOURASSA, PHILIPPE S., SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1970 (i).

BOWELL, SIR MACKENZIE, LETTER TO MR. MCNEILL, M.P., *re* SENATE: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 480 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 482 (i).

BRAMPTON INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 1182.

—— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 2298 (i); conc., 2672 (ii).

BRIGADE CAMP, NO. 1 DISTRICT: Remarks (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2608 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

ASHCROFT AND CARIBOO MAIL SERVICE AND B.C. EXPRESS CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3708 (ii).

—— SUBSIDY PAID TO B.C. EXPRESS CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 932 (i).

BEACON HILL, VICTORIA, POWDER MAGAZINE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 919 (i).

BEHRING SEA. *See* general heading.

CABINET REPRESENTATION: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*, &c.) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4786.

C.P.R. QUARANTINED CHINAMEN, GOVT. CHARGES FOR FEEDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 693 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 3189 (ii).

FRASER RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3533 (ii).

KOOTENAY AND SPOKANE REGISTERED MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 1182 (ii).

NEW WESTMINSTER DRILL SHED; in Com of Sup, 4461 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Continued.*
PENITENTIARY; in Com. of Sup., 2669 (i).
—— JUSTICE DRAKE'S INSTRUCTIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Corbould*) 297 (i).
—— JAMES FITZSIMMONS'S SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 204 (i).
—— KEARY, WM. H. RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 308 (i).
—— MCBRIDE, ARTHUR H., RETIREMENT; Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 308 (i).
—— NEW BUILDING SITE: Remarks (Mr. *Corbould*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4820 (ii).
ROSSLAND CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 2022 (i).
SALMON FISHERIES: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4839 (ii).
"SAN PEDRO," REMOVAL OF WRECK: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 933 (i), 3708 (ii).
TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 3542 (ii).
VANCOUVER PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 2302.
VICTORIA DRILL HALL AND P.O.: in Com. of Sup. 3509 (ii).
WEST KOOTENAY CUSTOMS RETURNS, 1890 TO 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 321 (i).
[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

BROCKVILLE, CORNWALL AND STRATHROY PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).

BUDGET, THE, Annual Stmt. (Mr. *Foster*) 517; (explanation) 620;
—— Reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 553, 622; Amt., 655; neg. (Y. 71, N. 117) 1816 (i).
Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) 655; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 679; (Mr. *Dickey*) 860; (Mr. *Martin*) 879; (Mr. *Masson*) 933; (Sir *James Grant*) 982; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 954; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1002; (Mr. *Northrup*) 1019; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1057; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1084; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1092; (Mr. *Craig*) 1113; (Mr. *Edwards*) 1114, 1129, 1261; (Mr. *Wallace*) 1140, 1259; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1187; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1222; (Mr. *Legris*) 1246; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1262; (Mr. *Casey*) 1263; (Mr. *Flint*) 1303; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1340; (Mr. *Semple*) 1362; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 1379; (Mr. *McIsaac*) 1392; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1408; (Mr. *Perry*) 1416; (Mr. *Cameron*) 1429; (Mr. *Dawson*) 1436; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1454; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1469; (Mr. *McDonald, Victoria*) 1507; (Mr. *Bruneau*) 1521; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1539; (Mr. *Rider*) 1568, 1589; (Mr. *Kenney*) 1553; (Mr. *Ryckman*) 1593; (Mr. *Gibson*) 1602; (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1613; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1622; (Mr. *Davin*) 1661; (Mr. *Montague*) 1698, 1733; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1754; (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 1775; (Mr. *Casey*) 1794.
—— *See* "TARIFF," "WAYS AND MEANS."

Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *Lowell*). 1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 70.)

BURNS, SENATOR, SESSIONAL INDEMNITY; in Com. of Sup., 4460 (ii).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, BILLS REPORTED, &C.: M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4740 (ii).
—— PRECEDENCE OF DEB. ON ADDRESS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 78 (i).
—— *See* "Govt. Business."

BUTTER PURCHASES BY GOVT. DURING 1895: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 199 (i).
—— SHIPMENTS TO GREAT BRITAIN ON GOVT. ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1180 (i).

BUTTER SHIPMENTS TO ENGLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4824 (ii).
—— TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2511 (ii).

CABINET REPRESENTATION FOR B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*, &c.) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4786 (ii).

Calgary and Lethbridge Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 839; 2°*, 919 (i); wthdn., 4186 (ii).

Camp Harmony Angling Club's incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 839; 2°*, 919; in Com., 1732; 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 93.)

CANALS, DEPTH OF WATER AND PROPOSED CHANNEL AT CHICAGO: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 921 (i).

CANALS:
CORNWALL, GOVT. SEWER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i), 3703 (ii).
DEPTH OF WATER AND PROPOSED CHANNEL AT CHICAGO: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 921 (i).
FARRAN'S POINT: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
GALOPS RAPIDS, EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2509 (ii).
IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS TO COMPLETE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 306 (i).
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON WATERWAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) 3456 (ii).
LACHINE. *See* general heading.
LANGEVIN, H# & CO., CLAIM AGAINST GOVERNMENT FOR DRAINAGE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023.
LUMBER CONTRACTS, WELLAND CANAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lowell*) 2363 (i).
MCDONALD, PATRICK, EMPLYMT. ON LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3934 (ii).
"OCEAN" STR., CLAIMS AGAINST FOR DAMAGES RE LOCK 12 BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023 (i).
ST. PETER'S, ARTICLE IN NORTH SYDNEY *Herald*: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 4580 (ii).
—— OPENING FOR NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 307 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Lister*) 2023 (i).
—— CONTRACTORS' CLAIMS FOR EXTRAS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 272 (i).
—— PERMANENT STAFF, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1972 (i).
—— AND C. P. R. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1973 (i).
SHEIK'S ISLAND DAMS: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Lister*) 2023 (i).
—— COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3198 (ii).
TAY, REVENUE AND MAINTENANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).
TRENT, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies (Mr. *Somerville*) 2406 (i).
—— CONTRACTS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).
—— COST SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 481 (i).
WELLAND, CONTRACT FOR LUMBER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lowell*) 2363 (i).
YAMASKA EMBANKMENT AND LOCK: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2406 (i).

CANALS—*Continued.*
YAMASKA AND ST. OURS LOCK, CHARGES ON VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2735 (ii).
—— RIVER, LOCK AND DAM, COST OF REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 1697 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2229, 2270 (i), 3699, 4707 (ii).
[*See* PROVINCES, "SUPPLY," &c.]
CANAL IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS TO COMPLETE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 306 (i).
Can. and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (*title changed*) **B. No. 36** (Mr. *Ingram*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (i) (58-59 *Vic., c.* 71.)
CAN. MUTUAL LIFE ASSOCIATION: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Sproule*) 221 (i).
CAN. AND NEWFOUNDLAND, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette re* CONFEDERATION: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 270 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 343 (i).
CAN. NEWS CO. AND I.C.R. CONTRACT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 222 (i).
CAN., FRANCE AND BELGIUM SS. LINE, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Lépine*) 3197 (ii).
Can. Ins. Promotion Ass. incorp. B. No. 86 (Mr. *Choquette*). 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1357 (i).
Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Ingram*). 1°*, 617; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 46.)
Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 107 (Mr. *Flint*). 1°, 2136 (i).
CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT, EXPEND.: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Can. Benevolent Society's incorp. B. No. 31 (Mr. *Moncrieff*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 80.)
C.P.R. AND SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1973 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 3674 (ii).
—— QUARANTINED CHINAMEN, GOVT. CHARGES FOR FEEDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 698 (i).
Can. Order of Foresters incorp. B. No. 47 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 573; in Com. and 3°, 2293 (i).
CAN. TROOPS FOR ENGLAND, HIGH COMMISSIONER'S PUBLIC STATEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1180 (i).
CAPE BRETON MAILS, CONTRACT FOR CARRYING: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).
CAPE BRETON RY., CAPITAL EXPEND., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1551 (i).
—— FREIGHT AND PASSENGER CASH RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1587, 2354 (i).
—— POINT TUPPER TERMINUS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Cameron*) 340 (i).
CARAQUET RY., GROSS EARNINGS AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 273 (i).
CARLETON (N.B.) BONDED WAREHOUSE, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 2357 (i).
CARLING BREWERY PROPERTY, LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 573 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2022 (i).
CARRIERE, LAINE & CO., CONTRACT FOR NEW DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (ii).
CASAULT, CHIEF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).
CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2358 (i).
CATTLE EMBARGO, GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Innes*) 209 (i).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 296 (i).
—— RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 773, 1830 (i.)
—— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4831 (ii).
—— Removal: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4709 (ii).
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 581 (i).
CATTLE ENTERING CANADA FROM MONTANA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 322 (i).
—— EXPORTS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on adjnmt., &c., 142 (i).
—— QUARANTINE: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4840 (ii).
—— REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 144 (i)
—— SHIPMENTS TO BELGIUM: Ques. (Mr. *Lachapelle*) 4830 (ii).
—— TRAINS AND GOVT. CONDUCTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 207 (i).
—— TRANSPORT THROUGH U.S. FOR SHIPMENT: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McMillan*) 341, 477 (i).
CEDAR SLEEPERS FOR P.E.I. RAILWAY, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3084 (ii).
CENSUS AND AGRICULTURAL CLASSES: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3994 (ii).
—— CITY OF LONDON, RETS. RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 207 (i).
—— MAN., 1896: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 429 (i).
—— PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen* REFLECTING ON MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 423.
—— RET. RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1830 (i).
[*See* "INDUSTRIES," &c.]
CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION, CAN. COMMISSIONERS' EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2736 (ii).
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES REVISING OFFICER, APPNMT: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i), 3106 (ii).
CHATHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2406 (i).
CHARLEBOIS, J. A., CLAIM *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACT; Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 933 (i).
—— CLAIMS FOR EXTRAS ON LANGEVIN BLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1970 (i).
—— AND LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACT, RET. RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 773 (i).
CHEESE FACTORIES IN P.E.I., MANUFACTURES AND SALES: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2023 (i).
CHENIER, DR., CUSTOMS DUTIES ON MONUMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3712, 4115 (ii).
CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., ARTICLE IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: Remarks (Mr. *Welsh*) 1354 (i).
CHINAMEN QUARANTINED IN B.C., CHARGES BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 698 (i).

Church of England. *See* "DOMESTIC," &c.

Chute, Julia Ethel. *See* "DIVORCE."

CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, JUDGES, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 3107 (ii).

"CITY OF MIDLAND" STR., SEIZURE AT COLLINGWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4708 (ii).

CIVIL EMPLOYEES (MILITIA) SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 19 (Mr. *Reid*). 1°. 222 (i).

—— **B. No. 104** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 1881 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3932 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

—— **B. No. 130** (Mr. *Montague*). 1°, 3190; 2° m., 3769; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 m. h., 3742; neg., 3746; 2° and in Com., 3746, 3762; 3°*, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

—— **Superannuation Act Amt. B. No. 102** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 1818 (i); dschgd., 4861 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE BOARD OF EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 3100 (ii).

—— EXAMINATION FRAUDS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3994 (ii).

—— EXAMINERS' REP.: Presented (Mr. *Montague*) 2570 (ii).

—— PAYMENTS TO TEMPORARY CLERKS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1585 (i).

—— PROMOTION EXAMINATIONS, ABOLITION: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 482 (i).

—— SUPERANNUATION OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 4116 (ii).

—— TEMPORARY CLERKS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3995 (ii).

Civil Service. *See* "SUPERANNUATION."

CLARKE AND PAISLEY, MESSRS., CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 305 (i).

Clifton Suspension Bridge Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. *Northrup*). 1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1733 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

CLOTHING AND NECESSARIES (MILITIA): in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).

COAL CONTRACT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4709 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4817 (ii).

COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S (N.S.): M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Flint*) 3202, 3375, 4031 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3210, 3378, 4039; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 3215, 3374, 4033; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3377; (Mr. *Gillies*) 3382; (Mr *Fraser*) 3392; (Mr. *Cameron*) 3402, 3418; (Mr. *McIsaac*) 3445; (Mr. *Borden*) 3451; (Mr. *Mulock*) 4031; (Mr. *McDougall*) 4033 (ii).

COCKBURN, MR., M.P., EXPENSES AT COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2727 (ii).

COLE'S WHARF, BEDEQUE (P.E.I.) DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 3196 (ii).

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS AS BROKERS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1358, 1971 (i).

COLLECTION OF REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i), 2502, 4276, 4462 (ii).

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, BALANCE OF EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2489 (ii).

COLONIES AND THE EMPIRE: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4894 (ii).

COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION, CAN. EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3710 (ii).

—— EXPENSES IN CONNECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1361 (i).

—— MEDALS AND DIPLOMAS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 84 (i).

—— MR. LARKE'S SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 205 (i).

—— *See* "World's Fair."

COMMITTEES.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: List of Members 228 (i).

BANKING AND COMMERCE: List of Members, 227 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP., 1ST REP.: Presented (Mr. *LaRivière*) 268 (i).

—— 2ND REP. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 696 (i).

—— 3RD REP. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 3110 (ii).

—— 4TH REP. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3544 (ii).

—— 5TH REP. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4255 (ii).

—— DISTRIBUTION: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 231 (i).

—— M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Sel. Com., 180 (i).

—— TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Legris*) 359 (i).

EXPIRING LAWS: List of Members, 224 (i).

LIBRARY: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 223 (i).

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS: List of Members, 225 (i).

PRINTING: List of Members, 226 (i).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: List of Members, 223.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, EMPLYMT. OF SHORTHAND WRITER: M. (Mr. *Baker*) 1267 (i).

—— IRREGULARITY OF MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 1829 (i), 2943 (ii).

—— List of Members, 226 (i).

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES: List of Members, 224 (i).

—— REDUCTION OF QUORUM: M. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3545 (ii).

—— MEETINGS DURING SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3909 (ii), 4113 (ii).

—— 8TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3265 (ii).

—— 12TH REP. *re* LAKE MAN RY., &C., CO.: M. (Mr. *Martin*) to ref. back, 4113 (ii).

SELECT STANDING: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 4 (i).

—— COM. TO PREPARE LISTS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 180 (i).

—— M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to add Names, 767 (i).

—— Lists presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 223 (i).

STANDING ORDERS: List of Members, 226 (i).

COMMUTATION IN LIEU OF REMISSION OF DUTIES: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

Commercial Treaties affecting Can. B. No. 44 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 479 (i); Order for 2 dschgd., 3085 (ii).

—— *See* "TREATY WITH FRANCE."

Companies' Act Amt. B. No. 138 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 3707; 2° m., 4778; agreed to (Y. 50, N. 24) 4780; in Com., 4781; 3°*, 4786 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 121.)

COMPANIES. *See.*

"ALLIANCE NATIONALE."

BUFFALO AND FORT ERIE BRIDGE CO.

COMPANIES—*Continued.*
CAMP HARMONY CAMPING CLUB.
CAN. AND MICHIGAN TUNNEL CO.
CAN. INSURANCE PROMOTION ASSOCIATION.
CANADIAN ORDER OF FORESTERS.
CLIFTON SUSPENSION BRIDGE CO.
DESCHENES BRIDGE CO.
DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN MISSIONARY SOCIETY (CHURCH OF ENGLAND).
DOMINION TRUSTS CO.
EASTERN ASSURANCE CO.
GILMOUR AND HUGHSON CO.
GRAND FALLS WATER POWER AND BOOM CO.
HAMILTON AND LAKE ERIE POWER CO.
HAMILTON DISTILLERY CO.
HAMILTON PROVIDENT AND LOAN SOCIETY.
IMPERIAL TRUSTS CO.
INDEPENDENT ORDER OF FORESTERS (SUPREME COURT).
INSURANCE SOCIETIES.
JAMES MACLAREN CO.
LA CHAMBRE DE COMMERCE DU DISTRICT DE MONTREAL.
MAN. AND NORTH-WEST LOAN CO.
NOVA SCOTIA STEEL CO.
ONTARIO ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO.
OTTAWA LAND ARD SECURITY'S CO.
PERMANENT RESERVE LIFE ASSOCIATION.
SABLE AND SPANISH BOOM AND SLIDE CO.
ST. JOHN RIVER BRIDGE CO.
SCHOOL SAVINGS BANK.
TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RY. CO.
[*See* "RAILWAYS."]

CONNOLLY, MESSRS., PROCESS OF EXECUTION: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 233 (i).

CONNOR, JOHN, OF ST. JOHN (N.B.) EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grieve*) 3993 (ii).

CONSOLID. FUND, REVENUE AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 427, 1082 (i).

Conspiracies and Combinations in Restraint of Trade Act Amt. B. No. 112 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°*, 2259 (i).

Contracts. *See* "ALIENS."

CONTRACTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204, 230 (i).

——— TRENT VALLEY CANAL: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).

CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS: Ques. of Priv. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4709 (ii).

Deb. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4712; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4714; (Mr. *Davin*) 4716; (Mr. *Casey*) 4718; (Mr. *Devlin*) 4723; (Mr. *Martin*) 4727; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4730; (Mr. *Dickey*) 4735 (ii).

——— PRIVATE SECRETARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1550 (i).

Copyright Act Amt. B. No. 103 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). 1°*, 1881 (i); 2°* and in Com., 4081; 3°*, 4082 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c. 37.*)

COPYRIGHT, BERNE CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2683 (ii).

CORN IMPORTS BY W. W. OGILVIE, CLAIM FOR DRAWBACKS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4357 (ii).

CORNWALL CANAL: GOVT. SEWER, TELEPHONE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i), 3703 (ii).

COURTWRIGHT CUSTOMS OFFICER, RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3359 (ii).

COWAN, MILES, ALLOWANCE FOR EXTRA SERVICES; in Com. of Sup, 2505 (ii).

COW BAY BREAKWATER; in Com. of Sup., 3510 (ii).

CREAMERY AND CHEESE FACTORIES IN N.W.T., ENCOURAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2401 (i).

CREASE AND DAVIE, CHIEF JUSTICES; in Com. of Sup., 1947 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. Bill No. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°, 196 (i); 2° m., 2542; deb. adjd., 2569 (ii).

——— **B. No. 133** (Mr. *Lavergne*). 1°, 3266 (ii).

——— **(Disorderly Houses, &c.) B. No. 106** (Mr. *Lavergne*). 1°, 2024 (i).

——— **(Schedule) B. No. 51** (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*) 1°*, 515; (i); 2°*, 2406; in Com., 4082, 4741; 3°*, 4746 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 40.)

——— **(Seduction and Abduction) B. No. 3** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 79; 2° m., 2145; Amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6 m. h., 2147; agreed to, 2152 (i).

——— **(Union Labels, &c.) B. No. 24** (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°, 269 (i).

CRIMINAL CODE, JOINT COM., REDUCTION OF QUORUM: M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3266 (ii).

CRONK, MR., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3359 (ii).

CUSTOMS:
ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2754.
AMERICAN-MADE MILK-CANS, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3515 (ii).
AUSTRALIA, EXPORTS FROM CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 84 (i).
BLEAKNEY AND FARROW, MESSRS., CUSTOMS DEPTL. IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2754 (ii).
COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS AS BROKERS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1358, 1971 (i).
COLLECTIONS ON THEATRICAL PRINTING, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2022 (i).
COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, PRIVATE SECRETARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1550 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4709 (ii).
CORN IMPORTS BY W. W. OGILVIE, CLAIM FOR DRAWBACKS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4357 (ii).
CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 2710 (ii).
DUTIES ON SPIRITS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 698 (i).
EMPLOYEES, RECENT APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 3191 (ii).
FREE LUMBER AND SAW-LOGS: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2031 (i).
FREE GOODS IMPORTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2571 (ii).
GRANITE AND FREESTONE, DRESSED, IMPORTED FROM GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 306 (i).
GRANITE (RED) IMPORTED FROM GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 306 (i).
HARVESTERS, SELF-BINDING, EXPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2734 (ii).
IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, GROSS AMOUNT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 425 (i).
——— M. for Stmnts* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 222 (i)

CUSTOMS--*Continued.*

IMPORTS, DUTIABLE GOODS, DUTY COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 576 (i).

IMPORTATIONS UNDER CUSTOMS ACT AMT., 1894: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1357 (i).

LUMBER, SAWN, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4850 (ii).

MILK-CANS, AMERICAN-MADE, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3515 (ii).

MILK, &c., CONDENSED: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4856 (ii).

PIG-IRON, IMPORTS FROM ALABAMA: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 932 (i).

——— BOUNTY, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr *Edgar*) 2022 (i).

PIPING, DUTY ON IMPORTS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3708 (ii).

RICE IMPORTATIONS, UNCLEANED, &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1585 (i).

ROSSLAND (B.C.) Customs Officer, Appnmt.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 2022 (i).

SPECIAL EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2164 (i).

SUGAR IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1357 (i).

——— (RAW) IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 307 (i).

——— RAW AND REFINED: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 922 (i).

——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 768 (i).

——— IMPORTS INTO MONTREAL AND HALIFAX: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1000 (i).

TARIFF, THE, INCREASED DUTIES ON ITEMS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 335 (i).

——— STATEMENTS RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 265 (i).

U. S. CUSTOMS BOARD OF APPRAISERS: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1826 (i).

VALUATIONS AND DEPTL. EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1826 (i).

WEST KOOTENAY CUSTOMS RETURNS, 1890 TO 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 321 (i).

[*See* "INLAND REVENUE," PROVINCES, &c.]

Customs Act Amt. B. No. 140 (Mr. *Wallace*). 1°, 3913; 2°, 4125; in Com., 4127, 4164; consdn of B., 4471; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy* to recom., 4473; neg. (Y. 59, N. 115) 4486; 3°, 4496 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 22.)

CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 2710 (ii).

Customs Tariff (1894) B. No. 146 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., 4847; 1°* of B., 4861; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 23.)

CULLERS, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, NUMBER EMPLOYED: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 577 (i).

——— REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 927 (i).

——— QUEBEC, ABOLITION: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 579 (i).

——— INSPECTION DUES, AMOUNT OWING: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1548 (i).

——— SUPERVISOR, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1359 (i).

CULLING TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 4282, 4462 (ii).

DAIRY COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2031 (i).

Dairy Products Act (1893) Amt. B. No. 21 (Mr. *McLennan*). Res. prop., 208; in Com., 234; 1°* of B., 240 (i); trnsfd. to Govt. Orders, 4187 (ii).

DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i), 3350, 4465 (ii).

DAIRYING IN N.W.T., ENCOURAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4011 (ii).

DAWSON, F., RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 2272 (i).

DARNLEY BASIN (P.E.I.) BUOYS AND RANGE LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 580 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP. *See* "COMMITTEES."

DE BLOIS (P.E.I.) MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771 (i).

DEPTL. REPORTS, DISTRIBUTION FROM 1888 TO 1895: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 362 (i).

DENOMINATIONAL LAND GRANTS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

Deschenes Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 30 (Sir *James Grant*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 919 (i). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 73.)

Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. No. 12 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°*, 81.

DETROIT AND ST. CLAIR RIVERS, &c., FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McGregor*) 2356 (i).

DICKEY, HON. ARTHUR RUPERT, MEMBER FOR CUMBERLAND, N.S.: Introduced, 571 (i).

DINGMAN, ABSOLAM, APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF INDIAN AGENCIES: Ques. (Mr. *Boston*) 4186 (ii).

DISFRANCHISEMENT OF PROVINCIAL OFFICIALS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 587 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 596; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 601; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 605; (Mr. *Curran*) 608; (Mr. *Casey*) 609; (Mr. *Northrup*) 611; (Mr. *Fraser*) 614 (i).

DIVISIONS:

COMPANIES ACT AMT. B. 138 (Mr. *Foster*): 2° agreed to (Y. 50, N. 24) 4728 (ii).

CUSTOMS ACT AMT. B. 140: on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) Board of Customs, 4474; neg. (Y. 59, N. 115) 4486 (ii).

DAIRYING IN THE N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) Bonus on Butter Exports, 4011: Amt. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 4014; M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn. deb., agreed to (Y. 62, N. 57) 4021 (ii).

ENFRACHISEMENT OF WOMEN: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1867; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 719; neg. (Y. 47, N. 101) 2143; Res. neg. (Y. 47, N. 105) 2144 (ii).

EXPENDITURE ON PUBLIC WORKS: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 655; neg. (Y. 71, N. 117) 1816 (i).

GOVT. ORDERS, PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2026; agreed to (Y. 87, N. 55) 2029 (ii).

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS ACT (SALARIES) AMT. B. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) neg. (Y. 57, N. 90) 3919 (ii).

LACHINE CANAL BRIDGE CONTRACT: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P. E.I.*) 2838; neg. (Y. 65, N. 102) 3077 (ii).

LIEUT.-GOVERNORS' TENURE OF OFFICE: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Mills Bothwell*) 4256; neg. (Y. 66, N. 105) 4271 (ii).

MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 4392; neg. (Y. 70, N. 114) 4457 (ii).

DIVISIONS—*Continued.*

MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS *re* RUMOURED RESIGNATIONS: on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4190; neg. (Y. 82, N. 116) 4251 (ii).

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 2789; Amt. (Mr. *Guillet*) 2809; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2809; neg. (Y. 51, N. 70) 2811; Amt. agreed to (Y. 68, N. 57) 2812.

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3271; neg. (Y. 57, N. 87) 3339 (ii).

RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS, RUMOURED: on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4050; neg. (Y. 72, N. 111) 4061 (ii).

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMT. B. 5: on M. (Mr. *Mulock*) for 2°, 483; neg. (Y. 46, N. 100) 2518 (ii).

SENATE VACANCIES, SIR MACKENZIE BOWELL'S LETTER TO MR. MCNEILL, M.P.: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3854; neg. (Y. 55, N. 95) 3855 (ii).

THOMPSON, LADY, CONTRIBUTION TO FUND: on conc., Amt. (Mr. *McDonald, Huron*) to strike out. Vote, neg. (Y. 39, N. 76) 2682 (ii).

THOMPSON, LATE SIR J. S. D., FUNERAL EXPENSES: on conc., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) M. to strike out Vote, 2673; neg. (Y 48, N. 68) 2681.

VOTERS' LISTS B. 69: on M. (Mr. *Montague*) for 2°, Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to repeal Franchise Act, 3636; neg. (Y. 39, N. 82) 3656 (ii).

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RY. CO.'S B. 34: on M. (Mr. *Coatsworth*) for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 2 cents per mile rate, 5144; neg. (Y. 39, N. 112) 4163 (ii).

Divorce (Helen Woodburn Jarvis) B. No. 115 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°*, 2506; 2° on div,, 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 97.)

Divorce (Julia Ethel Chute) B. No. 139 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 3815; 2° on div., 3948; 3° on div., 4154 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 95.)

Divorce (Mary Bradshaw Falding) B. No. 110 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 2570; 2° on div., 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 96.)

DOM. AND ALLAN SS. LINES, MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 921 (i).

DOM. AND P. O. SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITS M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 332 (i).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co's. incorp. B. No. 48 (Mr. *Stairs*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 573 (i); in Com., 2695; 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 47.)

DOM. BANK, PETER VANLUVEN'S DECLARATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).

——— CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 3189 (ii).

——— DAY, ADJOURNMENT: M. (Mr. *Foster.*) 3545.

——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3456 (ii).

Dom. Eections Act Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 197 (i).

——— **B. No. 68** (Mr. *Montague*). 1°, 768 (i); 2° and in Com., 3921; 3° m., 4065; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to recom., 4066; 3°*, 4072 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 13.)

——— **B. No, 76** (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1°, 918 (i).

——— **Elections (Employees Voting) B. No. 42** (Mr. *Rider*). 1°, 478 (i).

Dom. Franchise Act Amt. B. No. 20 (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°, 222 (i).

DOM. GOVT. CREDIT IN CAN. BANKS: Ques. (Sir Richard *Cartwright*) 204 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 116 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°, 2507; 2°* and in Com., 3270; 3°*, 3271; Sen. Amts., 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 34.)

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 4317 (ii).

——— LOAN (OCTOBER, 1894) BY WHOM NEGOTIATED: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1181 (i).

Dom. Notes Act Amt. B. No. 22 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 268 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3087 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 16.)

DOM. POLICE, COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 229 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

——— REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

——— RYS., AID TO BUILDING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

Dom. Trusts Co.'s, incorp. B. No. 100 (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 1°*, 1818; 2°*, 1968 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 84.)

Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society's (Church of England) incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 1818; 2°*, 1968 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 94.)

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3176.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RY. LINES: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Casey*) 208 (i).

Drainage. *See* "RY. LANDS."

DRAKE, JUSTICE, SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i), 2669 (ii).

DREDGE "LAVAL." CONTRACT AND TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 428 (i).

——— NEW, CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (ii).

——— "PRINCE EDWARD," WORK IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 700 (i).

DRILL, CITY CORPS AND FIELD BATTERIES: in Com. OF SUP., 4460 (i).

DRILL HALL, TORONTO, ESTIMATE AND COST: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1362 (i).

DROUTH IN ONTARIO: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4582.

Drugs. *See* "ADULTERATION OF FOOD."

DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA, ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).

"DUART CASTLE" MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

DUROCHER'S BALLOT PAPER: in Com. of Sup., 2093.

DUVAR ROAD (P.E.I.) FLAG STATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).

DYNAMITE FACTORY, LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 1080 (i).

Eastern Ass. Co. of Can. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Fraser*). 1°*, 1078; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 81.)

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, PREPARATION OF MAPS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (i).

——— LISTS, REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 576 (i).

Electoral. *See* "FRANCHISE," "DOMINION," "VOTERS' LISTS," &c.

EMBARGO. *See* "Cattle."

ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 701; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 717; neg. (Y. 47, N. 101) 2143 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Montague*) 716; (Mr. *Charlton*) 716, 1875; (Mr. *Sproule*) 719; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 720; (Mr. *McMullen*) 722, 1874; (Mr. *Craig*) 723; (Mr. *Lachapelle*) 726; (Mr. *Maclean, York*), 729; (Mr. *Amyot*) 730; (Mr. *McInerney*) 734; (Mr. *Foster*) 735, 1867; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1873; (Mr. *Denison*) 1875; (Mr. *McDonald, Victoria*) 1876; (Mr. *McIsaac*) 1878; (Mr. *Gillies*) 1879: (Mr. *Dupont*) 2141 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 3189 (ii).

ESTIMATES, THE, 1896: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 331 (i).

——— SUPPL. (1895-96): Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4352.

——— (1894-95): Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1539 (i).

——— Ques. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 572, 1182 (i).

EXCHANGE BANK AND MR. OGILVIE'S GUARANTEE: Que.. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3368, 3455 (ii).

EXCISE DUTY ON SPIRITS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 698 (i).

EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1810 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM: in Com. of Sup., 3350, 3501 (ii).

——— PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTING REPS.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Grieve*) 2406 (i).

EXPIRING LAWS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 224 (i).

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Stmnts.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 222; Ques., 425 (i).

EXPORTS TO AUSTRALIA: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 84 (i).

EXPORT OF SHEEP TO GREAT BRITAIN: on M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Featherston*) 2385 (i).

FABRE, MR., SALARY AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

Falding, Mary Bradshaw. *See* "DIVORCE."

FARRAN'S POINT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i); conc., 2672 (ii).

FARM LANDS IN ONT., VALUE: Explanation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 772 (i).

Female Offenders in Nova Scotia Act Amt. B. No. 128 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). 1°*, 3556; 2°, 3716; in Com., 3719; 3°*, 3720 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 43.)

FENELON FALLS, AUTHORITY FOR FILLING ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4581 (ii).

Fertilizers. *See* "ADULTERATION OF FOOD."

FINANCE:

ASST. RECEIVER GEN'S OFFICE, CHARLOTTETOWN: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).

AUDITOR GENERAL, PET., *re* ESTIMATES OF DEPT.: Presented (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2132; remarks, 2260 (i).

BUDGET, THE: Financial Stmnt., (Mr. *Foster*) 517 (i).

——— Explanation (Mr. *Foster*) 620 (i).

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i), 3106 (ii).

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, BALANCE OF EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2489 (ii).

FINANCE—*Continued.*

CONSOLID. FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 427, 1082 (i).

DOM. AND P.O. SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 332 (i).

DOM. LOAN (OCTOBER, 1894) BY WHOM NEGOTIATED: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1181 (i).

ESTIMATES. *See* general heading.

EXCHANGE BANK, AND MR. OGILVIE'S GUARANTEE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3368, 3455 (ii).

GOVT. CREDIT IN CAN. BANKS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 85 (i).

MARKLAND MORTGAGE, KINGSTON: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1267 (i), 3557 (ii).

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR APRIL: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 427 (i).

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS, GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 332 (i).

——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2508 (ii).

——— STAMPS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lépine*) 2024 (i).

SUBSIDIZED STEAMERS TO WEST INDIES, &C., RET. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3819 (ii).

SUPERANNUATION LIST, DATES OF APPNMTS. AND RETIRING ALLOWANCES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 273 (i).

——— RETS. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen* 774 (i), 3819 (ii).

——— SINCE 1ST JAN., 1895, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3994 (ii).

VANLUVEN, PETER, DECLARATIONS *re* DOM. BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).

[*See* "SUPPLY," &C.]

FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).

——— MINISTER'S PRIVATE SECRETARY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1360 (i).

Fines and Forfeitures. *See* "GENERAL REVENUE FUND."

FINLAY, W., OF COURTWRIGHT, APPNMT. IN CUSTOMS SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2139 (i).

FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3621 (ii).

FISHERIES:

BEHRING SEA CONFERENCE, GREAT BRITAIN AND U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1185 (i).

——— EXPENSES *re* ARBITRATION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 426 (i).

——— SEAL FISHERIES, SEALING OF ARMS, &C.; Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1083.

——— SEIZURE OF SEALERS BY RUSSIAN CRUISERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3369 (ii).

——— COMPENSATION FOR SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 83 (i).

——— SEIZURES BY U.S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 215 (i).

FISHING BOUNTY FRAUDS, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2335 (i).

FISHERIES DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2704, 2721 (ii).

——— OF THE GREAT LAKES: Remarks (Mr. *Allan*) on M. for Com. of Sup. 3948 (ii).

FISHERY OVERSEER, JOS. P. KINNEY, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 573 (i).

——— KENT DISTRICT, ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 698.

FISH IMPORTATIONS FROM FRANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1550 i).

FISHERIES—*Continued.*
FISHING GUARDIANS ON THE MIRIMACHI: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 1081 (i).
FISHING LICENSES PAID TO NEWFOUNDLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1551 (i).
FISHING RIGHTS IN MATANE RIVER, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2397 (i).
GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).
INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3083 (ii).
LOBSTER FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3360 (ii).
—— INDUSTRY, ESTABLISHMENT OF HATCHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1551 (i).
LOBSTERS, REGULATIONS AS TO SIZE OF CATCH: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 574 (i).
MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2397 (i).
NOBLE BROS. FISHING FLEET, SEIZURE AND WITHDRL. OF LICENSE: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1979 (i).
ST. JOHN RIVER (N.B.) FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 430 (i).
[*See* PROVINCES, &c.]
Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 67.—(Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 618 (i); 2°, 2574; in Com., 2593; 3°*, 2607 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c. 27.*)
—— **(Salmon) B. No. 118.**—(Mr. *Costigan*). 1°*, 2919; dschgd., 4861 (ii).
FISHERIES ACT, STREAMS EXEMPT UNDER: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2335 (i), 3618 (ii).
FISHERIES OF THE GREAT LAKES: Remarks (Mr. Allan) 3948 (ii).
Fishing Vessels. *See* "SEA FISHERIES."
FITZSIMMONS, JAS., SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 204 (i).
FLEMING, WM., AND HOMESTEAD ENTRY IN MAN: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 2364 (i).
FOREIGN POWERS AND THE FRENCH TREATY, PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1697 (i).
Foresters. *See* "CAN. ORDER," "INDEPENDENT."
FORT ERIE CUSTOMS OFFICERS, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3815 (ii).
FOSTER, H. S., AND RICHELIEU RIVER LANDS, PURCHASE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2406 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3195 (ii).
Franchise (Electoral) Act Repeal B. No. 14 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 182 (i).
—— **B. No. 99** (Mr. *Pelletier*). 1°, 1696 (ii).
FRANCO-CAN. TREATY, RATIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).
FRASER RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3533.
FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S RY. BRIDGE CO., AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 438, 483 (i).
FREE LUMBER AND SAW-LOGS: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2031 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2047; (Mr. *Martin*) 2054; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2058; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2063; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2065; (Mr. *Charlton*) 2067; (Mr. *Bennett*) 2076; (Mr. *Amyot*) 2080; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 2083 (i).
FREIGHT RATES IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4022 (ii).
FRENCH TREATY, ADDITIONAL COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).
—— *See* "TREATY WITH FRANCE."
FURNESS LINE SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2332.
GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3704 (ii).
—— RAPIDS, EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2509 (ii).
GARDNER'S CREEK BREAKWATER (N.B.) TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (ii).
GASPÉ BASIN, &c., AND DALHOUSIE N.B. SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3598 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 122 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°*, 3080; 2°*, and in Com., 3459; 3°*, 3463 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c. 24.*)
General Revenue Fund of N.W.T. B. No. 134 (Mr. *Daly*). Res. prop., 2573; in Com., 3122; 1°* of B., 3267; 2°* and in Com., 3720; 3°*, 3721 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c. 32.*)
GEOFFRION, C. A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR VERCHÈRES: Introduced, 301 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 2488, 2723 (ii).
—— MADOC AND MARMORA: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2943 (ii).
—— REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 181 (i).
—— SUMMARY REP.: Presented (Mr. *Daly*) 181 (i).
GENDREAU, TÉLESPHORE, CHARGES AGAINST, INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i), 3712 (ii).
GIBSON, W. W., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).
GILBERT DREDGING AND BLASTING CO., CLAIM *re* CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2509 (ii).
Gilmour and Hughson Co.'s incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *Edwards*). 1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121; in Com. and 3°*, 2353 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c. 89.*)
"GOLDEN CITY," REFUND OF FINES: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i).
GOVT. BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2026 (i).
—— WEDNESDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 3621 (i).
—— MONDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 4254 (ii).
—— TWO SITTINGS DAILY: prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 4579, 4708, 4770 (ii).
GOVT. CREDIT IN CAN. BANKS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).
—— IMPORTS OF FREE GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2571 (ii).
—— INSPECTORS OF WHEAT AT FORT WILLIAM: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 431 (i).
—— LAND ON RICHELIEU RIVER, SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Bechard*) 1969 (i).
Govt. Liability; Labour, &c., on Public Works, B. No. 11 (Mr. *McLennan*). 1°, 80.
GOVT. OF N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).
—— PENSIONS, PAR. IN PETERBOROUGH *Examiner*: prop. Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 923 (i).
—— SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2508 (ii).
Governor General, Reduction of Salary, B. No. 4 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 79 (i); 2°*, 3246.
GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 384, 1912 (i).
—— WARRANTS: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 85 (i).

Grand Falls Water Power and Boom Co.'s B. No. 95 (Mr. *McAlister*). 1°*, 1452; 2°*, 1733; in Com. and 3°*, 2354 (i). 58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

GRAND FALLS WATER POWER, &c., CO.'S PET.: M (Mr. *McAlister*) Suspension of Rules, 1117 (i).

GRAND ETANG (B.C.) OPENING OF NEW CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2141 (i).

—— CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3709 (ii).

GRANITE AND FREESTONE, DRESSED, IMPORTED FROM GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 306.

—— (RED) IMPORTED FROM GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 306 (i).

GREAT EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3359 (ii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Sir *James Grant*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 572; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 48.)

GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3707 (ii).

—— COLLECTOR OF TOLLS: Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 4357 (ii).

GREY, LIEUT. COL. JOHN, APPMNT. AS INSPECTOR OF STORES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358 (ii).

GROCERIES CONTRACT, QUEBEC CITADEL: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82, 201 (i).

GUILBAULT, EDWD., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 305 (i).

GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).

GUY, CHARLES, OF PETERBOROUGH, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1452 (i).

GUYSBORO' INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS, RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 774 (i).

HALIFAX DEEP WATER TERMINUS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3817 (ii).

—— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 3877 (ii).

—— TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2357 (i).

—— FREIGHT SHED, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2727 (ii).

HALLIWELL, J. L., OF STERLING, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1969 (i).

Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *McKay*). 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); M. for Com., 2698; in Com., 2704: 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 78.)

—— **Distillery Co.'s incorp. B. No. 38** (Mr. *McKay*). 1°*, 478; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1732 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 92.)

—— **Provident and Loan Society's incorp. B. No. 39** (Mr. *McKay*). 1°*, 478; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

HARASS, NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 3349 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i), 3510 (ii).

Harbour Commissioners. *See* "THREE RIVERS."

HATCH, MR., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1078 (i).

HEIR APPARENT, BIRTH: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 85 (i).

HERBERT, MAJOR-GEN., RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2137 (i).

HICKEY, G. N., APPNMT. ON RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3711 (ii).

HICKEY, C. E., APPNMT. ON WILLIAMSBURG CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3711 (ii).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3097 (ii).

HILTON WHARF (ONT.) AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.; Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2362 (i).

HOMESTEADING LEASED LANDS IN MAN.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 2364 (i).

HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Bennett*) 5; seconded (Mr. *Belley*) 14 (i).

—— REPLY: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 3191 (ii).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 3575, 4909 (ii).

BOWELL, SIR MACKENZIE, LETTER TO MR. MCNEIL, M.P. *re* SENATE: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 481 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 462 (i).

BURNS, SENATOR, SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 4460 (ii).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, BILLS REPORTED, &C.: M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4740 (ii).

—— PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 2026 (i).

—— WEDNESDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 3621 (ii).

—— MONDAYS: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 4254 (ii).

—— TWO SITTINGS DAILY: prop. M. (Mr. *Foster*) 4579, 4708, 4770 (ii).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP. *See* "Committees."

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex. presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

LIBRARY, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (i).

MEMBERS' INDEMNITY, &C., MONEYS PAID OUTSIDE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 331 (i).

MEMBERS, NEW: 1, 2, 143, 222, 268, 301 (i).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION, ARTICLE IN *Canada Farmer's Sun*: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4813 (ii).

—— VOTES ON DIVISION: Remarks (Mr. *Boyle*) 4358 (ii).

PRIVATE BILLS, PRESENTATION: M. (Mr. *Masson*) Extension of Time, 1175 (i).

PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4709 (ii).

—— MR. SPEAKER'S RULING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2512 (ii).

PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4876, 4903 (ii).

—— Mess. from His Ex. by Black Rod, 4909 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4738 (ii).

RETURNS, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2507 (ii).

READING ROOM, U.S. FRENCH CAN. PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3194 (ii).

SENATE, VACANT SENATORSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 480 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 482 (i).

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, DELAY IN OPENING: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2607 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE: 2 (i), 4911 (ii).
SUTHERLAND, MR., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i).
VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1827 (i).
[*See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE," page lxxxvii."]

House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 301 (i).

—— READING ROOM, U. S. FRENCH CAN. PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3194 (ii).

—— **Representation Act Amt. B. No. 124** (Mr. *Ouimet*). 1°, 3082; 2°* and in Com., 3270; 3°, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

House of Commons. *See* "INDEMNITY," "SENATE," &c.

Hours of Labour. *See* "LABOURERS," &c.

HUDSON BAY RY., ADVANCES BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on Adjnmt. 181 (i).

—— O. C., *re* SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 207, 516 (i).

—— SUBSIDIES: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1082 (i).

HULL POST OFFICE APPNMT. OF LETTER CARRIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1586 (i).

HURON INDIANS. *See* "Bastien."

HURTEAU, YULE AND RIDDELL'S ACCOUNT: in Com. of Sup., 2261 (i).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).

ILLICIT DISTILLERIES, SEIZURES BY MR. BOURINOT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3357 (ii).

ILLICIT STILL, L'ISLET STATION; Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i), 4115 (ii).

Immigration, Foreign. *See* "ALIEN CONTRACTS," &c.

—— MICHIGAN TO ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 429 (i).

—— TRANSPORT OF JEW PEDLARS FROM U.S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 241 (i).

IMPERIAL HONOURS TO CANADIANS, GOV. GEN'S. RECOMMENDATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1823, 1973.

—— TITLES TO CANADIAN SUBJECTS: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1589 (i).

Trusts Co. of Can. Acts Amt. B. No. 72 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 839, 2°*, 919 (i).

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, GROSS AMOUNT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 425 (i).

—— EXPORTS: M. for Stmnts.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 222 (i).

—— DUTIABLE GOODS, DUTY COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 576 (i).

Indemnity. *See* "SENATE," &c.

—— **To Members, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 143** (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 3915; in Com., 4062; conc., 4121; 1°* of B., 4123; 2°* and in Com., 4470; 3°*, 4751 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 9).

Independence of Parliament B. No. 111 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 2257 (i).

Independent Order of Foresters (Supreme Court) incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 84 (Mr. *Northrup*). 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii).

Indian Act Amt. B. No. 109 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 2351; 2°, 3932; in Com. and 3°*, 3938 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)

INDIAN AFFAIRS, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Daly*) 181 (i).

—— DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 1918, 1938 (i), 2690, 3101 (ii).

INDIANS:
BASTIEN, AGENT, AND HURON INDIANS OF LORETTE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1975, 2022 (i).
DINGMAN, ABSOLAM, APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF INDIAN AGENCIES: Ques. (Mr. *Boston*) 4186 (ii).
INDIAN AFFAIRS, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 1918, 1938 (i), 2690, 3101 (ii).
INDIANS, EXPENDITURE: Remarks (Mr. *Daly*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3283 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2483, 3813, 3874 (ii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c., INDIANS: in Com. of Sup. 2484, 3874 (ii).
REED, HAYTER AMTS. PAID, &c. (1879-94) MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 266 (i).
—— Ret. *re* inquiry (Mr. *McMullen*) 1829 (i), 2814 (ii).
ROBINSON TREATY, ANNUITIES UNDER: in Com. of Sup., 2483 (ii).
ST. PETER'S RESERVE (MAN.) INDIANS, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 4007 (ii).
[*See* PROVINCES, "INTERIOR," &c.]

INDUSTRIES IN CHATHAM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Campbell*) 2406 (i).

—— IN QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 326 (i).

—— IN WINGHAM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2406 (i).

—— IN BRAMPTON, DESCRIPTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 1182 (i).

INLAND REVENUE.
ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 4308 (ii).
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).
SEIZURE OF ILLICIT STILL AT L'ISLET: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i), 4115 (ii).
—— DISTILLERY BY MR. BOURINOT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3357 (ii).
PATTON, JAS., APPNMT. AS CHIEF INSPECTOR OF CULLERS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1359 (i),
SPIRITS, CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES ON STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 698 (i).
TOBACCO, CAN. DUTY COLLECTED IN 1894, &c: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Two Mountains*) 1587 (i).
—— PROTECTION AGAINST FOREIGN LEAF: Remarks (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 2030 (i).
—— ISLE VERTE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 697 (i).
WARNER, LEVI, COMPENSATION. in Com. of Sup., 2503 (ii).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2503, 4285, 4301 (ii).
WHEAT INSPECTION AT FORT WILLIAM, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 431 (i).
[*See* "CUSTOMS," &c.]

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°*, 4861; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4863 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 25.)

INLAND REVENUE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2718 (ii).

INLAND REVENUES OF THE DOM., REPS.: Presented (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 181 (i).

Inspection. *See* "General."

Insurance Act Amt. B. No. 92 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 1352 (i); 2°* and in Com., 3112; 3°*, 3122; Sen. Amts., 3716 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 20.)

——Act (Societies Exemption) B. No. 145 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 4354; 2°, 4768; in Com. and 3°*, 4770 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 19.)

INS. COMPANIES, ABSTRACT STATEMENTS: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1829 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 4894 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RY.:

BURNING OF SHEDS AT RICHMOND: Remarks (Mr. *Stairs*) 1354 (i).

CAP ST. IGNACE, NEW SIDING: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2571) (ii).

—— STOPPAGE OF EXPRESS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1973 (i).

COST OF MAINTENANCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 430.

DISCHARGED EMPLOYEES AT CHAUDIERE CURVE: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 575 (i).

DISMISSAL OF CONDUCTOR MCCULLY: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Colchester*) 2140 (i).

EMPLOYEES' SUMMER VACATION: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2511 (ii).

HALIFAX, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3682 (ii).

NEWSPAPER SALES, CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 222.

RIVER INHABITANTS, SIDING OR FLAG STATION: M. for Ret., &c.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 343 (i).

SUMMER TIME TABLES, CHANGE: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 1970 (i).

THEFTS AT RIVIERE DU LOUP, INQUIRY *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 272 (i).

TIME TABLES *re* P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1828 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2571 (ii).

[*See* "MANITOBA," "N.W.T.," &c.]

INTEREST COMPUTING: in Com. of Sup. 3099 (ii).

INTERIOR:

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, NAMES OF OWNERS, &C.; M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 322 (i).

BOOTH, GEN., PROPOSED CAN. SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 426 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2361 (i).

DENOMINATIONAL LAND GRANTS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

DOMINION LANDS: in Com. of Sup. 4317 (ii).

FLEMING, WM., AND HOMESTEAD ENTRY IN MAN., M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 2364 (i).

FOSTER AND RICHELIEU RIVER LANDS PURCHASE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2406 (i).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY. *See* general heading.

—— MADOC AND MARMORA: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2943 (ii).

HOMESTEADING LEASED LANDS IN MAN.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 2364 (i).

INTERIOR—*Continued.*

IMMIGRATION, MICHIGAN TO ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 429 (i).

—— TRANSPORT OF JEW PEDLARS FROM U.S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 241 (i).

INTERIOR DEP.: in Com. of Sup., 420 (i); 2688 (ii).

LAND GRANTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T. DENOMINATIONAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

LANDS UNPATENTED IN MORRIS, MAN.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2024 (i).

LOW, HENRY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1179 (i).

MAPS OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, PREPARATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (i).

PARADIS, REV. FATHER, GOVT. AID TO COLONIZATION SCHEME: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 429 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3197 (ii).

PRE-EMPTION LOTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T. PAYMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *La Rivière*) 3198 (ii).

RICHELIEU RIVER, SALE OF LANDS ON BANKS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 2406 (i).

SALVATION ARMY PROPOSED CAN. SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 426 (i).

THOUSAND ISLANDS, SALES FROM 1874 TO 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1974 (i).

UNPATENTED LANDS IN MORRIS, MAN.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *La Rivière*) 2024 (i).

[*See* "MANITOBA," "N.W.T.," &c.]

INTERIOR DEPT. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Daly*) 1083 (i).

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 5 (i).

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, RESOLUTION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) 773 (i).

—— COMMISSION ON WATERWAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) 3456 (ii).

—— CONVENTION *re* INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 2403 (i).

—— FISHERIES COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3083 (ii).

—— FRATERNAL ALLIANCE ASS. CO., REGISTRATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3995 (ii).

International Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 96 (Mr. *Masson*). 1°*, 1548; 2°*, 1733 (i); in Com., 3583, 3748, 3938; 3°*, 3947 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 49.)

Irrigation. *See* "NORTH-WEST."

ISLE AUX NOIX, GOVT. LAND SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2510, 3195 (ii).

James' Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp B. No. 87 (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*). 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725; Sen. Amts. 4777 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 50.)

Jas. Maclaren Co.'s incorp. B. No. 29 (Sir *James Grant*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1357 (i). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 90.)

Jarvis, Helen Woodburn. *See* "DIVORCE."

JENKINS, S. J., PRIVATE SECRETARY TO FIN. MINISTER: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1360 (i).

JEW PEDLARS, TRANSPORT FROM CHICAGO TO N.W.T.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 241 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts (Salaries) B. No. 127 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). Res. prop., 1883; in Com., 2180; 1°* of B., 3086; 2°* and in Com., 3722; 3° m., 3916; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3916; neg. (Y. 57, N. 90) 3919; 3°, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

—— **(Superannuation) B. No. 129** (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). Res. prop., 2165 (i); in Com., 3088; 1°* of B., 3122; 2°* and in Com., 4252; 3°*, 4254 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

JUSTICE.

B. C. Penitentiary, Justice Drake's Instructions: M. for copy (Mr. *Corbould*) 297 (i).

Binding Twine manufactured at Kingston Penitentiary: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Grieve*) 2022 (i).

Casault, Chief Justice: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).

Circuit Allowances, Judges, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3107 (ii).

Connolly, Messrs., Process of Execution: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 233 (i).

Copyright, Berne Convention: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82 (i).

Crease and Davie, Chief Justices: in Com. of Sup., 1947 (i).

Criminal Code, Joint Com., Reduction of Quorum: M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3266 (ii).

Dom. Police: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

Drake's, Justice Services: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i), 2669 (ii).

Foreign Powers and the French Treaty, Privileges: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1697 (i).

Justice, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 1947 (i), 3106 (ii).

—— Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 407, 1913 (i).

Larkin, Connolly & Co., Suit against: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 203 (i).

Official Arbitrators: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 408, 1913 (i).

School Legislation, Man (1890) Judicial Decisions, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Charlton*) 221

Supreme Court of Can.: in Com. of Sup., 3108 (ii).

Toronto Ry. Co., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 2502 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, High Court Judges: in Com. of Sup., 1947 (i), 3107 (ii).

Watters, T. J., Offence and Punishment: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 920 (i).

[*See* "Manitoba Schools," Provinces, &c.]

Kaministiquia River: in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).

Keary, Wm. H., Retirement from Service: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 308 (i).

Kemptville Postmaster, Complaints against: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 697 (i).

Kent (Ont.) Fishery Overseer: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 698 (i).

Kildare (P.E.I.) Station, Appnmt. of Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2511 (ii).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. *Metcalfe*). 1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3948 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

Kingston Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

Kinney, J. P., Dismissal as Fishery Overseer: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 573 (i).

Kootenay and Spokane Registered Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 1182 (i).

LACHINE CANAL BRIDGE CONTRACT: Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2815; deb. adjd., 2917; rsmd., 2947; neg. (Y. 65, N. 102) 3077 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2839; (Mr. *Gibson*) 2848; (Mr. *Masson*) 2855; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2867; (Mr. *McLennan*) 2874; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2888; (Mr. *Haggart*) 2900; (Mr. *Foster*) 2917; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2917; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2918; (Mr. *Costigan*) 2919; (Mr. *Martin*) 2947; (Mr. *Curran*) 2968; (Mr. *Tarte*) 2981; (Mr. *Davin*) 2991; (Mr. *Casey*) 3002; (Mr. *Mulock*) 3007; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 3026, 3075; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3047; (Mr. *Foster*) 3060; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3070; (Mr. *Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 3067; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3075 (ii).

—— Remarks, &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2608 (ii).

—— Commission *re* Bridge, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2229 (i).

—— Canal: in Com. of Sup., 2229 (i).

Labourers, &c., on Public Works (Hours of Labour, &c.) B. No. 43 (Mr. *Lépine*). 1°*, 478 (i).

"La Chambre de Commerce du District de Montreal" B. No. 117 (Mr. *Lépine*). 1°*, 2670; 2°*, 2726; in Com. and 3°*, 3948 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

La Jeune Lorette, Indian Agent Bastien: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 1975, 2022 (i).

Lake Etchemin and Ste. Rose de Watford Mail Contract: Ques. (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 575 (i), 3715 (ii).

—— M. for copies (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1974 (i).

Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s revival Act Amt. B. No. 75 (Mr. *Northrup*). 1°*, 918; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)

Lake St. John Ry., Earnings and Expenditure, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1974 (i).

Land Damages, Rideau Canal: in Com. of Sup., 2256 (i).

Land Grants in Man. and N.W.T., Denominational: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

Lands in Railway Belt, B.C., Settlement B. No. 141 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 3993; 2°, 4078; in Com., 4079; 3°*, 4081 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

Lands unpatented in Morris, Man.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2024 (i).

Landry, Philippe Robt., Papers respecting: M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier*) 2406 (i).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55 (Mr. *McDonald, Assiniboia*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; M. for Com., 1924; in Com., 1959; 3° on div., 2352 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

Langevin Block. *See* "Charlebois," "Mallette," &c.

Langevin, H., Claim against Govt. for Damages: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023 (i).

LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE ELECTORAL LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (ii).

——— CAMP, TENDERS FOR GROCERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3193 (ii).

LARKE, MR., SERVICES *re* WORLD'S FAIR: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 205 (i).

LARKIN, CONNOLLY & CO., SUIT AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 203 (i).

LAURENTIDES P.O., LEASE OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3360 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Lavergne*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4800 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 3083 (ii).

"LAVAL" DREDGE, CONTRACT AND TOTAL COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 428 (i).

LEDUC, CHARLES, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 4356 (ii).

LEGER, PIERRE, GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i).

LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 1949. 2086 (i), 2669, 3341, 4460 (ii).

——— *re* ALIEN LABOUR IN CAN.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lowell*) 2405 (i).

——— *re* MAN. SCHOOLS, JUDICIAL DECISIONS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Charlton*) 221 (i).

——— LENKLETTER (P.E.I.) POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1179 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

——— SEL. COM., JOINT: M. (Mr. *Foster*) 223 (i).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii).

LIEUT.-GOV. SCHULTZ AND DR. BOURINOT'S LETTER *re* MAN. SCHOOLS: Remarks 774 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to adjn. Hse., 774 (i). Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 783; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 788; (Mr. *Dickey*) 793; (Mr. *Martin*) 797; (Mr. *Daly*) 811; (Mr. *Fraser*) 822; (Mr. *Ives*) 827; (Mr. *Casey*) 830; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 836 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *McCarthy*) 735 (i).

LIEUT.-GOVS.' TENURE OF OFFICE: Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4256; neg. (Y. 66, N. 105) 4271 (ii).

LIEUT.-GOV. OF MAN., VACANCY AND APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3710 (ii).

Lieut.-Governor's Salaries B. No. 37 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°*, 425 (i).

Life Association. *See* "BANKERS."

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i), 3617 (ii).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Muttawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 80 (Mr. *Hughes*). 1°*, 1,000; 2°*, 1121; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i); Sen. Amts., 4774 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 54.)

LIQUOR TRAFFIC, ROYAL COMMISSION APNMT.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Casey*) 210 (i).

——— EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Flint*) 2024.

——— NUMBER OF MEETINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 3084 (ii).

——— EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 83, 204 (i).

LIQUOR TRAFFIC, ROYAL, COMMISSION, FURTHER EXPEND.: in Com. of Sup., 2491, 2611; conc., 2673 (ii).

——— REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 208 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 85 (i).

——— COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 1083, 1959 (i).

LITTLE HOPE ISLAND BELL BUOY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2401 (i).

LITTLE RIVER ST. FRANCOIS, CLEARING CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1361 (i).

LIVERPOOL HARBOUR (N.S.) ENGINEER'S SURVEYS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Forbes*) 325 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 91 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 1179 (i); 2° and in Com., 3093, 3659; recom., 3672; 3°*, 3716 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)

LOBSTER FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2573, 3360 (ii).

——— INDUSTRY, ESTABLISHMENT OF HATCHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1551 (i).

——— PACKING, LICENSE FEES, EXTENSION OF TIME: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).

——— REGULATIONS AS TO SIZE OF CATCH: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 574 (i).

LOCOMOTIVE BOILERS, GOVT. INSPECTION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 3199 (ii).

LOISELLE, PAPERS *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 481 (i), 3713 (ii).

LOISELLE *vs.* GUILLET, DELAYED RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).

LONDON MILITARY SCHOOL, SEWAGE DISCHARGE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1359 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 79; 2°, 465; in Com., 737; M. to restore to Order paper, 766; again in Com., 1841 (i); Order for Com. read, 2517 (ii). Deb. in Com. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 737; (Mr. *Curran*) 739; (Mr. *Charlton*) 741, 758, 1841; (Mr. *Amyot*) 745; (Mr. *Masson*) 748; (Mr. *Lister*) 752; (Mr. *Hazen*) 754; (Mr. *Foster*) 756; (Mr. *Dickey*) 759; (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 760; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 765; (Mr. *Langelier*) 1844; (Mr. *Mara*) 1847; (Mr. *Bergin*) 1852; (Mr. *Masson*) 1844, 1853; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1854; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1856; (Mr. *Beckard*) 1858; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1860; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*), 1861; (Mr. *Montague*) 1863; (Mr. *Corbould*) 1864; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1865 (i).

LOTBINIERE ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 771 (i).

LOUISBOURG, PROP. MONUMENT BY U.S. CITIZENS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 925 (i).

LOW, HENRY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1179 (i).

LUMBER AND SAW-LOGS, FREE: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2031 (i).

LUMBER CONTRACTS, WELLAND CANAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lowell*) 2363 (i).

LUMBER, SAWN, &C.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4850 (ii).

Maclaren Co. *See* "JAMES."

McBRIDE, ARTHUR H., RETIREMENT FROM OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 308 (i).

McCLORY AND EDGRAFT, RETIRING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 2272 (i).

McCULLY, GEO., CONDUCTOR, DISMISSAL FROM I.C.R. SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Patterson, Colchester*) 2140.

McDONALD, PATRICK, EMPLYMT. ON LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3994 (ii).

McDONALD, RODERICK, BALANCE OF ACCOUNT SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2333 (i).

McGREEVY, THOS., ESQ., MEMBER FOR QUEBEC WEST: Introduced, 344 (i).

McGREGOR'S CREEK, CHATHAM, SHEET PILING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 577 (i).

McINTYRE'S STATION AND SYDNEY (C.B.) MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1971 (i).

McISAAC, COLIN F., ESQ., MEMBER FOR ANTIGONISH: Introduced, 223 (i).

McMURRAY, L. J. A., EMPLYMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 1001 (i).

MADOC AND MARMORA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2943 (ii).

MADUXNEKEAG (N.B.) FISH-WAY, DAM AT MOUTH OF STREAM: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 699 (i).

MAGOG WHARF, DISPOSITION OF VOTE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1968 (i).

——— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2572 (ii).

MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 275 (i).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2331 (i), 3597 (ii).

MALLETTE, LOUIS Z., AND LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1180 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monet*) 2406 (i).

MALIGNANT COVE AND MERIGOMISH MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 2140 (i).

MANITOBA:

BRANDON INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 2298 (i); conc., 2672 (ii).

CENSUS OF 1896: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 429 (i).

DENOMINATIONAL LAND GRANTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

HOMESTEADING LEASED LANDS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 2364 (i).

LIEUT.-GOVERNOR OF MANITOBA AND DR. BOURINOT'S LETTER: Remarks (Mr. *McCarthy*) 735, 774 (i).

——— VACANCY AND APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3710 (ii).

MAN. PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

MORRIS, UNPATENTED LANDS IN MUNICIPALITY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2024 (i).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P.O. SITE, PURCHASE: M. for O. C. (Mr. *Martin*) 2376 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 4894 (ii).

PRE-EMPTION LOTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T., PAYMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3198 (ii).

RESD, HAYTER, AMTS. PAID, &c. 1879-94: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 366 (i).

ST. PETER'S RESERVE INDIANS, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 4007 (ii).

SCHOOL LEGISLATION (1890) JUDICIAL DECISIONS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Charlton*) 221 (i).

MANITOBA—*Continued.*

"STANLEY" STR., EXPLORATION OF HUDSON'S STRAITS: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 4905 (ii).

TOWNSHIP 16, RANGE 16, W., NEW SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2138 (i).

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RY. CO., O.C. *re* GRANT: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 928 (i).

[*See* "INDIANS," "INTERIOR," "N.W.T.," &c.]

Man. and North-west Loan Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com., 1967; 3°*, 2292 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 86.)

Manitoba and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *LaRivière*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 573; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (i). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 55.)

MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4379; Neg. (Y. 70, N. 114) 4458 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) 4403; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4420; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 4435; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4437; (Mr. *Dupont*) 4442; (Mr. *Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 4451; (Mr. *Belley*) 4455 (ii).

——— Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4496, 4545; deb. adjd., 4579; rsmd., 4583; neg., 4707 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4496, 4568; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4545, 4570; (Mr. *Foster*) 4568; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4573; (Mr. *Martin*) 4573; (Mr. *Daly*) 4576; (Mr. *Casey*) 4578; (Mr. *Wallace*) 4631; (Mr. *Weldon*) 4640; (Mr. *Masson*) 4658; (Mr. *Davin*) 4667; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 4677; (Mr. *Craig*) 4679; (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 4682; (Mr. *Hughes*) 4684; (Mr. *Costigan*) 4684); (Mr. *Baker*) 4696; (Mr. *Bennett*) 4697; (Mr. *Laurier*) 4699; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 4702 (ii).

——— ARTICLE IN *La Presse* NEWSPAPER: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 577 (i).

——— BISHOP GRAVEL'S COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3360 (ii).

——— COMMUNICATION WITH HIS EX.: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2572 (ii).

——— JUDGMENT *re* BARRETT: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 571 (i).

——— JUDGMENT OF IMP. PRIVY COUNCIL: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 85 (i).

——— MEMORIAL OF LEGISLATURE: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4186 (ii).

——— PAPERS *re* JUDICIAL COMMITTEE'S PROCEEDINGS: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1453 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 4187 (ii).

——— REMEDIAL ORDER: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 578 (i), 3373, 3458, 3716 (ii).

——— Statement (Mr. *Foster*) 3997 (ii).

MAPS OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, PREPARATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (i).

MARINE:

"ALPHA AND BETA" MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. *Davies P.E.I.*), 2023 (i).

BELL BUOY FOR LITTLE HOPE ISLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2401 (i).

"GOLDEN CITY," REFUND OF FINES: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).

MARINE—*Continued.*
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i), 3617 (ii).
LITTLE HOPE ISLAND BELL BUOY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2401 (i).
MARINE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2721 (ii).
MASTERS AND MATES, EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 3615 (ii).
PILOT EXAMINERS IN BONAVENTURE COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 339 (i).
ST. JOHN WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, TOLLS: M. for O. C., &c.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (ii).
SAW-DUST DEPOSITS, RIVERS EXEMPT IN N.S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1975 (i).
SHIPPING REGULATIONS ON THE GREAT LAKES, U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2361 (i).
TIDAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).
TIGNISH HARBOUR WHARF, NAMES, &c., OF VESSELS WHICH PAID DUES: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. *Perry*) 2406 (i).
[*See* PROVINCES, "PUBLIC WORKS, &c.]

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 768 (i), 2569 (ii).
MARINE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2721 (ii).
MARITIME PROVINCES, PUB. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2305 (i), 3536 (ii).
MARKLAND MORTGAGE, KINGSTON: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1267 (i), 3557 (ii).

Markland Mortgage Discharge B. No. 93 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 1352; Res. prop., 1883 (i); in Com., 2408; B. wthdn., 2408 (ii).

——— **B. No. 136** (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1883 (i); M. for Com., 2406; in Com., 2408; 1°*, of B., 3558; 2°, 3928; in Com., 3930; 3°, 4063 (ii). (58 59 *Vic., c.* 5.)

MARYSVILLE (N.B.) P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 3489, 3922.
MASSACHUSETTS BENEFIT ASSOCIATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Sproule*) 221 (i).
MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 3615 (ii).
MATANE AND STE. ANNE DES MONTS MAIL SERVICE: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Joncas*) 2023 (i).
MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2397 (i).
MATTICE, LIEUT.-COL. G., RETIREMENT AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358 (ii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c., INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 2484, 3874 (ii).
MEDICINE HAT GENERAL HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 2499 (ii).
MEGANTIC, &c., ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).
MEMBERS' INDEMNITY, &c., MONEYS PAID OUTSIDE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 331 (i).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.
DICKEY, HON. ARTHUR R.: Cumberland, N.S., 571.
GEOFFRION, C. A., ESQ.: Verchères, 301 (i).
MCGREEVY, THOS., ESQ.: Quebec West, 344 (i).
MCISAAC, COLIN F., ESQ.: Antigonish, 223 (i).
MONTAGUE, WALTER H., ESQ.: Haldimand, 143.

MEMBERS, NEW: 1, 2, 143, 222, 268, 308 (i)
Mercantile Agencies. *See* "DETECTIVE."

METAPEDIA AND CAPLAN MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 305 (i).
METEGHAN, MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques (Mr. *Bowers*) 3192 (ii).
METHYLATED SPIRITS: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (ii).
"MEXICO" SS., WRECK, OFFICIAL INFORMATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4359 (ii).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE:
ACTIVE MILITIA FORCE, SAVING BY REDUCTION IN STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3355 (ii).
CAN. TROOPS FOR ENGLAND, HIGH COMMISSIONER'S PUBLIC STATEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1180 (i).
CARLING BREWERY PROPERTY, LONDON PURCHASE, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2022 (i).
CIVIL EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).
CLOTHING AND NECESSARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3185.
DOM. CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 3189 (ii).
DRILL, CITY CORPS AND FIELD BATTERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4460 (ii).
GREY, LIEUT.-COL. JOHN, APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF STORES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358 (ii),
HERBERT, MAJOR-GEN., RESIGNATION; Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2137 (i).
LANDRY, PHILIPPE ROBT., PAPERS RESPECTING: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier*) 2406 (i).
MATTICE, LIEUT.-COL. G., RETIREMENT AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358.
MILITARY PROPERTY, STORES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).
——— RIDING SCHOOL, MONTREAL: M for Stmt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).
MILITIA, ANNUAL DRILL, 1895: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 573.
——— AND DEFENCE: in Com. of Sup., 2197 (i), 3100 3177, 3731, 4460 (ii).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dickey*) 571 (i).
MILITIA, ANNUAL DRILL, 1895: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 573.
MILITARY COLLEGE CADETS, NUMBER AND ATTENDANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1973 (i).
———BOARD OF VISITORS: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 1588 (i).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Denison*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3781; neg., 3813 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3731 (ii).
PERMANENT CORPS, PAY AND ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 2197 (i), 3177 (ii).
QUEBEC CITADEL, GROCERIES CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82, 201 (i).
QUEEN'S PRIZE WINNER AT BISLEY: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*, &c.) 4904 (ii).
ROYAL STANDARD, HOISTING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2137 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Dickey*) 2354 (ii).
SECRETAN, J. A., AMOUNT PAID BY MILITIA DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358 (ii).
SUTTON, MR., APPNMT. IN ROYAL CAN. DRAGOONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1972 (i), 2919 (ii).
TOTAL STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2362 (i).
VOLUNTEERS' LONG SERVICE MEDALS: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*, &c.) 4906 (ii)
WARLIKE AND OTHER STORES: in Com. of Sup., 3184.
[*See* PROVINCES, &c.]

MILK CANS, AMERICAN-MADE, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3515 (ii).
MILK, &c., CONDENSED: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4856 (ii).

MILTON (N.S.) POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 324 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 304 (i).

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER (P. E. I.) EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).

MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 354 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 354, 376; (Mr. *Laurier*) 356, 375; (Mr. *Edgar*) 361; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 367; (Mr. *Casey*) 370; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 377; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 378; (Mr. *McDonald, P.E.I.*) 383 (i).

——— RESIGNATIONS, RUMOURED: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to adjn. Hse., 4055; neg. (Y. 72, N. 111) 4061 (ii).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster, &c.*) 4187 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 4190; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4192; (Mr. *Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 4194; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4195; (Mr. *Dupont*) 4197; (Mr. *Lachapelle*) 4208; (Mr. *Weldon*) 4213; (Mr. *Joncas*) 4213; (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 4214; (Mr. *Amyot*) 4216; (Mr. *McNeill*) 4216; (Mr. *Denison*) 4216; (Mr. *Taylor*) 4224; (Mr. *Belley*) 4236; (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 4243 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4116 (ii).

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS' SPEECH IN MONTREAL *Herald's* REP.: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 925.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 2489; conc., 2673, 3905 (ii).

——— PRIVATE BILLS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 225 (i).

MOIR, GEO., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3196 (ii).

MONTAGUE, WALTER H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALDIMAND: Introduced, 143 (i).

MONTANA CATTLE ENTERING CANADA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 322 (i).

MONTMAGNY HARBOUR MASTER, INQUIRY INTO CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i).

MONTREAL CITY P.O., REPAIRS, &c., AMOUNT PAID: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).

——— CUSTOMS, COLLECTORSHIP, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 205 (i).

——— P.O., LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

MORDEN (N.S.) PIER, PETS., &c., RELATING TO: M. for copies* (Mr. *Borden*) 477 (i).

MORRIS (MAN.) UNPATENTED LANDS IN MUNICIPALITY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2024 (i).

Mortgage. *See* "MARKLAND."

MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 2482 (ii).

MULLEN, JOHN, LOCKMAN, GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i).

NAPIERVILLE ELECTORAL LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3514.

NEW BRUNSWICK:

ASST. RECEIVER GENERAL, ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1360 (i).

CARAQUET RY. GROSS EARNINGS AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 273 (i).

CARLETON BONDED WAREHOUSE, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 2357 (i).

CONNOR, JOHN, OF ST. JOHN, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grieve*) 3993 (ii).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Continued.*

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3170.

FISHING GUARDIANS ON THE MIRIMACHI: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 1081 (i).

FISHERY REGULATIONS, ST. JOHN RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 273, 430 (i).

GARDNER'S CREEK BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (ii).

HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i).

MARYSVILLE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 3489, 3922 (ii).

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3514 (ii).

ST. JOHN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 2273 (i).

——— RIVER, IMPROVED NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3359 (ii).

——— PILOTAGE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 2360 (i).

SALMON FISHING LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3455 (ii).

TOBIQUE VALLEY RY., DOM. BONUS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2941 (ii).

——— OPENING FOR TRAFFIC: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2755 (ii).

TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

YARMOUTH BAR BREAKWATER, CONDITION, COST, &c.: M. for Cor.,* &c., (Mr. *Flint*) 2023 (i).

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

NEWFOUNDLAND, PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 270, 343, 840, 919, 1183 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 842, 852; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 844; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 845; (Mr. *Montague*) 847; (Mr. *Laurier*) 849; (Mr. *Foster*) 852; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 855; (Mr. *Ives*) 857; (Mr. *McMullen*) 859 (i).

——— REFUND OF FISHING LICENSE FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1551 (i).

NEW WESTMINSTER DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 4461 (ii).

NIAGARA FALLS, CUSTOMS COLLECTORSHIP, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Lovell*) 574 (i).

Niagara, Hamilton, &c. *See* "ST. CATHARINES."

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

ARTESIAN BORINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).

BANFF HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

BATTLEFORD AND SASKATOON MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 2024 (i).

CREAMERY AND CHEESE FACTORIES ENCOURAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2401 (i).

DAIRYING, ENCOURAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4011 (ii).

GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).

MEDICINE HAT, GENERAL HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 2499 (ii).

QU'APPELLE VALLEY, INDIAN RESERVES, LEASE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1550 (i).

REBELLION, SCRIP FOR SCOUTS, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2400 (i).

REGINA JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, DISCARDED RIFLES: Ques. (Mr. *Bergin*) 1078 (i).

[*See* "INDIANS," "INTERIOR," "MANITOBA," &c.]

North-west Irrigation Act Amt. B. No. 120 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°, 3079; 2°* and in Com., 4767; 3°*, 4768 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 33.)

N.W.T. Acts Amt. B. No. 17 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 197 (i.)

N.W.T. Acts Amt. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Martin*). 1°*, 515 (i).

N.W.T. Acts Amt. B. No. 135 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 3455; 2°, 3930; in Com., 3931; 3°*, 3932; Sen. Amts., 4770 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°, 3080; 2°* and in Com., 4074, 4117; 3° m., 4120; deb. adjd., 4121; rsmd., 4630, 4762; 3°*, 4763 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

NOBLE BROS. FISHING FLEET, SEIZURE AND WITHDRL. OF LICENSE: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1979 (i).

NORTH CAYUGA TOWNSHIP CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 2266.

NORTH CAPE (P.E.I.) WHISTLING BUOY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, BORINGS FOR TUNNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).

——— *See* "Prince Edward Island."

NOVA SCOTIA:

ANNAPOLIS MILITARY GROUND, LEASE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2139 (i).

ANTIGONISH ANG SHERBROOKE MAIL ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2510 (ii).

CAPE BRETON MAILS, CONTRACT FOR CARRYING: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).

CAPE BRETON RY., CAPITAL EXPEND., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1551 (i).

——— POINT TUPPER TERMINUS: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Cameron*) 340 (i).

——— FREIGHT AND PASSENGER CASH RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1587, 2354 (i).

CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., ARTICLE IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: Remarks (Mr. *Welsh*) 1354 (i).

COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S OF N.S.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Flint*) 3202, 4031 (ii).

COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3510 (ii).

DICKEY, HON. ARTHUR RUPERT, MEMBER FOR CUMBERLAND, N.S.: Introduced, 571 (i).

DISTILLERIES, SEIZURES BY MR. BOURINOT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3357 (ii).

FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S RY. BRIDGE CO., AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 438 (i).

GRAND ETANG, OPENING OF NEW CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2141 (i).

——— WORKS, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3709.

GUYSBORO' INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS, RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 774 (i).

HALIFAX DEEP WATER TERMINUS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3817 (ii).

——— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 3477 (ii).

——— TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2357 (i).

——— FREIGHT SHED, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2727 (ii).

I.C.R. *See* general heading.

KINNEY, J. P., DISMISSAL AS FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 573 (i).

LITTLE HOPE ISLAND BUOY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2401 (i).

LIVERPOOL HARBOUR, ENGINEER'S SURVEY'S, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Forbes*) 325 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Continued.*

LOUISBOURG, PROP. MONUMENT BY U.S. CITIZENS; Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 925 (i).

MCINTYRE'S STATION AND SYDNEY (C.B.) MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1971 (i).

MCISAAC, COLIN F., ESQ., MEMBER FOR ANTIGONISH: Introduced, 223 (i).

MADUXNEKEAG FISHWAY, DAM AT MOUTH OF STREAM: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 699 (i).

MALIGNANT COVE AND MERIGOMISH MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 2140 (i).

METEGHAN, MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 3192 (ii).

MORDEN PIER, PETS., &c., RELATING TO: M. for copies* (Mr. *Borden*) 477 (i).

PORT DE BERT, APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 305 (i).

QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE INDUSTRIES, RET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2031 (i), 2670 (ii).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 326 (i).

ST. PETER'S CANAL, ARTICLE IN NORTH SYDNEY *Herald*: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 4580 (i).

——— OPENING FOR NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 307 (i).

SAW-DUST DEPOSITS, RIVERS EXEMPT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1975 (i).

SEAL ISLAND LIFE-BOAT STATION: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).

SHELBURNE, &c., INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS PET.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2670 (ii).

SHELBURNE HARBOUR, IRON CAN BUOYS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 700 (i).

SHIELDS, F., EX-POSTMASTER OF MILTON, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 304 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 324 (i).

SOUTH INGONISH WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 2304 (i).

SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1078 (i).

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

Nova Scotia Steel Co.'s incorp. B. No. 56 (Mr. *Fraser*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; M. for Com., 1731; in Com., 1924; 3°*, 1959 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)

Oaths. *See* "ADMINISTRATION," "SEDITIOUS," &c.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2333 (i), 3615 (ii).

"OCEAN" STR., CLAIMS AGAINST FOR DAMAGES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023.

OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

OGILVIE, MR., GUARANTEE TO EXCHANGE BANK: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3368, 3455 (ii).

OGILVIE, W. W., CLAIM FOR DRAWBACK ON CORN IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4357 (ii).

OKA INDIANS, TRANSFER TO MUSKOKA, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Two Mountains*) 1358 (i).

ONTARIO:

ANDERSON, JAS., OF SUTTON, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. Ques. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 306, 479 (i).

ARNPRIOR P.O., CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

ATHLONE-TOTTENHAM MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1587 (i), 3193 (ii).

BEALTON, P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1268 (i).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

BINDER TWINE, GOVT. SALES BELOW COST: Ques. (Mr. *Featherstone*) 3818 (ii).
——— MANUFACTURED IN KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2355 (i).
——— SHIPMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3707 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Grieve*) 2022 (i).
BOSTON P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1267 (i).
BRAMPTON INDUSTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 1182 (i).
BROCKVILLE, CORNWALL AND STRATHROY PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
CARLING BREWERY PROPERTY, LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 573 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2022 (i).
CENSUS OF CITY OF LONDON, RETS. RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 207 (i).
CHATHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Campbell*) 2406 (i).
"CITY OF MIDLAND" STR., SEIZURE AT COLLINGWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4708 (ii).
CLARKE AND PAISLEY, MESSRS., CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES, TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 305 (i).
CORNWALL CANAL, GOVT. SEWER, TELEPHONE, &C.: in Com., of Sup., 2262 (i), 3703 (ii).
COORTWRIGHT, CUSTOMS OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2139 (i), 3359 (ii).
CRONK, MR., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 3359 (ii).
DETROIT AND ST. CLAIR RIVERS, &C., FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McGregor*) 2356 (i).
DOM. BANK, PETER VANLUVEN, DECLARATION BY: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).
DROUTH IN PROVINCE: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4582 (ii).
FARRAN'S POINT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i); conc., 2672 (ii).
FARM LANDS IN ONT., VALUE: Explanation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 772 (i).
FENELON FALLS, AUTHORITY FOR FILLING ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4581 (ii).
FORT ERIE, CUSTOMS OFFICERS, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 3815 (ii).
GALOPS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3704 (ii).
——— RAPIDS, EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2509 (ii).
GOVT. PENSIONS, PAR. IN PETERBOROUGH *Examiner*: prop. Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 922 (i).
GUY, CHARLES, OF PETERBOROUGH, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1452 (i).
HALLIWELL, J. L., OF STIRLING, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1969 (i).
HICKEY, G. N., APPNMT. ON RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3711 (ii).
HICKEY, C. E., APPNMT. ON WILLIAMSBURG CANAL; Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3711 (ii).
HILTON WHARF, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2362 (i).
KAMINISTIQUA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).
KEMPTVILLE POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 697 (i).
KENT FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 698 (i).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).
——— *See* "Binder Twine."
LAND DAMAGES, RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2256.

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

LONDON MILITARY SCHOOL, SEWAGE DISCHARGE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1359 (i).
MCGREGOR'S CREEK, CHATHAM, SHEET PILING: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 577 (i).
MADOC AND MARMORA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2943 (ii).
MOIR, GEO., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3196 (ii).
MONTAGUE, WALTER H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALDIMAND: Introduced, 143 (i).
NIAGARA FALLS, CUSTOMS COLLECTORSHIP, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Lowell*) 574 (i).
NOBLE BROS. FISHING FLEET, SEIZURE AND WTHDRL. OF LICENSE: M. for O. C., &c., (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1979 (i).
NORTH CAYUGA, TOWNSHIP'S CLAIM; in Com. of Sup., 2266.
OTTAWA AND KINGSTON MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 839 (i).
PLUMMER'S WHARF, SAULT STE. MARIE, GOVT. TITLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2363 (ii).
PORT ROWAN WHARF, AMOUNT VOTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 2360 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii).
ROSA'S BRIDGE OVER OTONABEE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2261 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. SUBSIDIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 333 (i).
ST. THOMAS POST OFFICE, EMPLOYEES' SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2163, 2357 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL. *See* general heading.
SAW-LOGS IN GEORGIAN BAY AND LAKE HURON, TOWING: prop. Res. (Mr. *Macdonnell, Algoma*) 2405 (i).
SHEIK'S ISLAND DAMS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3198 (ii).
——— M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Lister*) 2023 (i).
SIX NATION INDIANS AND DEPTL. REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 429 (i).
SMITH, HENRY, OF CHATHAM, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 596, 926 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4116 (ii).
SUGAR ISLAND, SALE BY INDIAN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grieve*) 3359 (ii).
SUTTON, MR., APPNMT. TO ROYAL CAN. DRAGOONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1972 (i), 2919 (ii).
TAY CANAL, REVENUE AND MAINTENANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).
THOUSAND ISLANDS, RESERVATION FOR NATIONAL PARK: prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3997 (ii).
——— SALES FROM 1874 TO 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1974 (i).
TORONTO DRILL HALL, ESTIMATE AND COST: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1362 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).
——— COST SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 481 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3705 (ii).
——— TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Somerville*) 2406 (i).
VALLEYFIELD SEWER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2509 (ii).
WEIR, MR., OF KEENE, PENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1453 (i).
WELLAND CANAL. CONTRACT FOR LUMBER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lowell*) 2363 (i).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*
WEST RIDEAU LAKE DAM, LAND DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).
WHEAT INSPECTION AT FORT WILLIAM, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 431 (i).
WINGHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2406 (i).
[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c."]

Ontario Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 81 (Mr. *Moncrieff*). 1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3149 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

OPEN ACCOUNT: in Com. of Sup., 2661 (ii).

ORANGE PROCESSION THROUGH PARLT. GROUNDS: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 4255 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c. *See* page lxxxvii.

Oshawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310; in Com. and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

Ottawa and Aylmer Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. *Robillard*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1924 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

OTTAWA AND KINGSTON MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 839 (i).

OTTAWA AND MARITIME PROVINCES MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Stairs*) 2359 (i).

Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s B. No. 32 (Mr. *Featherston*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1310 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

Ottawa Land and Security's Co.'s incorp. B. No. 105 (Mr. *McKay*). 1°*, 1959 (i); 2°*, 3150; in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 87.)

OTTAWA PUBLIC BUILDINGS, PROTECTION AGAINST STORMS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 2573 (ii).
——— *See* "Coal Contracts."

OVERSEERS AND GUARDIANS (FISHERY) SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3618 (ii).

PAPINEAUVILLE AND CHENEVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 580 (i).

PARADIS, REV. FATHER, GOVT. AID TO COLONIZATION SCHEME: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 429 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3197 (ii).

PARLIAMENT, 7TH. 5TH SESSION: Opening, 1; Prorogation, 4909 (ii).

PASSAMAQUODDY BAY, &c., BOUNDARY SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).

"PATENT RECORD:" in Com. of Sup., 3345 (ii).

PATTON, JAS., APPNMT. AS CHIEF INSPECTOR OF CULLERS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1359 (i).

PEDLARS. *See* "Jew."

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 66 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). 1°, 618; 2° and in Com., 2165 (i); 3°*, 2406 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. No. 131 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). 1°, 3190; 2°* and in Com., 4366; 3°*, 4470; Sen. Amts., 4877 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

PENITENTIARIES, B.C., JAMES FITZSIMMONS'S SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 204 (i).
——— MCBRIDE AND KEARY'S RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 308 (i).
——— NEW BUILDING SITE: Remarks (Mr. *Corbould*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4820 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 408, 1913 1948 (i), 2669 (ii).

PENITENTIARIES REP.: Presented (Mr. *Curran*) 1353 (i).
——— *See* SUPPLY.

PERMANENT CORPS, PAY AND ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 2197 (i), 3177 (ii).
——— TOTAL STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2362 (i).

Permanent Reserve Life incorp. B. No. 78 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Article in *Canada Farmer's Sun*: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4813 (ii).
——— PAR. IN *Mail-Empire re* CARRIAGE OF MAILS: Remarks (Mr. *Perry*) 517 (i).
——— (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2031.
——— VOTES ON DIVISIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Boyle*) 4358 (ii).

PHILADELPHIA EXHIBITION (1876): Expenses of Can. Commission: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2736 (ii).

PHOTOGRAPHIC EXHIBITION AT IMP. INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 3351 (ii).

PICAUD *vs.* PICAUD, LETTER FROM AGENT BASTIEN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Laurier*) 2022.

PICKFORD AND BLACK'S SS. CONTRACT, HALIFAX, &c., AND W. INDIES: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 922 (i).

PICTOU, N.S., &c., AND GEORGETOWN, &c., P.E.I., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 3599.

PILON, THEORET, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DAMAGES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023 (i).

PILOT EXAMINERS IN BONAVENTURE COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 339 (i).

PIG IRON, IMPORTS FROM ALABAMA: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 932 (i).
——— BOUNTY, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 2022 (i),

PIPING, DUTY ON IMPORTS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3708 (ii).

PLUMMER'S WHARF, SAULT STE. MARIE, GOVT. TITLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2363 (i).

POINT TUPPER TERMINUS, CAPE BRETON RY.: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Cameron*) 340 (i).

PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO., REPS. TO GOVT.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Devlin*) 2405 (i).
——— SUBSIDY, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1586.
——— CONDITION OF ROAD: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 574.
——— EARNINGS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Devlin*) 211 (i).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P. O. SITE, PURCHASE: M. for O. C.; (Mr. *Martin*) 2376 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 3547, 3628, 3715, 4894 (ii).

PORT DE BERT (N.S.) APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 305 (i).

PORT ROWAN WHARF, AMOUNT VOTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 2360 (i)

PORT MULGRAVE, ARICHAT, &c., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 3600 (ii).

POST OFFICE:

ALLAN AND DOMINION SS. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 921 (i).

ANTIGONISH AND SHERBROOKE MAIL ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2510 (ii).

ATHLONE-TOTTENHAM MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1587 (i), 3193 (ii).

BATTLEFORD AND SASKATOON (N. W. T.) MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 2024 (i).

BAIE ST. PAUL AND CHICOUTIMI MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

BEALTON P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1268 (i).

BOSTON P.O., CHANGE OF NAME: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1267 (i).

CAPE BRETON MAILS, CONTRACT FOR CARRYING: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).

DE BLOIS (P.E.I.) MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771 (i).

DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1697.

EXPENDITURE, TOTAL FOR NINE MONTHS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 926 (i).

HULL POST OFFICE, APPNMT. OF LETTER CARRIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1586 (i).

INTEREST, COMPUTING: in Com. of Sup., 3099 (ii).

KEMPTVILLE POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 697 (i).

KILDARE STATION, APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2511 (i).

LAKE ETCHEMIN AND STE. ROSE DE WATFORD MAIL CONTRACT: M. for copies (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 1974 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Vaillancourt*) 575 (i), 3715 (i).

LAURENTIDES P.O., LEASE OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3360 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Lavergne*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4800 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 3083 (ii)

LENKLETTER (P.E.I.) P.O., ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1179 (i).

LOISELLE *vs.* GUILLET, DELAYED RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).

—— *See* "Ste. Angele de Monnoir."

MCINTYRE'S STATION AND SYDNEY (C.B.) MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 1971 (i).

MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 275 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2333 (i).

MALIGNANT COVE AND MERIGOMISH MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 2140 (i).

MATANE AND STE. ANNE DES MONTS MAIL SERVICE; M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Joncas*) 2023 (i).

METAPEDIA AND CAPLAN MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 305 (i).

METEGHAN MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 3192 (ii).

MILTON (N.S.) POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 324 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 304 (i).

MONTREAL DISTRICT INSPECTOR, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 482 (i).

OTTAWA AND KINGSTON MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 839 (i).

OTTAWA AND MARITIME PROVINCES MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Staire*) 2359 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*

PAPINEAUVILLE AND CHENEVILLE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 580 (i).

PORT DE BERT, APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 305 (i).

POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2505, 2719, 3922, 4312.

RICHMOND STATION AND DENISON MILLS MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).

STE. ANGELE DE MONNOIR, EX-POSTMASTER, PAPERS *re* DISMISSAL: Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3627.

—— Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3713 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 481 (i).

ST. THOMAS POST OFFICE, EMPLOYEES SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2163, 2357 (i).

ST. LOUIS (P.E.I.) P.O., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771, 2359 (i).

ST. LOUIS STATION AND PALMER ROAD, &c. (P.E.I.) MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 699 (i).

TRANS-ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE, FAST: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 305 (i).

TROIS PISTOLES POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4708 (ii).

WAKEFIELD AND RUPERT MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1585) (i).

WINTER MAIL SERVICE (P.E.I.): in Com. of Sup., 2333 (i).

[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS," PROVINCES, &c.]

Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 94 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 1353 (i).

PRE-EMPTION LOTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T., PAYMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3198 (ii).

PRIDHAM, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, GRENVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 4357 (ii).

PRINCE COUNTY (P.E.I.) RY. ACCOMMODATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).

"PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE, WORK IN CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 700 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2358 (i).

CEDAR SLEEPERS FOR P.E.I. RY., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3084 (i).

CHEESE FACTORIES, MANUFACTURES AND SALES: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *McMillan*) 2023 (i).

COLE'S WHARF, BEDEQUE, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 3196 (ii).

DARNLEY BASIN, BUOYS AND RANGE LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 580 (i).

DE BLOIS MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771 (i).

DUVAR ROAD, FLAG STATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).

KILDARE STATION, APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2511 (ii).

LENKLETTER P. O., ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1179 (i).

LOBSTER FISHING, EXTENSION OF SEASON: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2573 (ii).

—— PACKING, LICENSE FEES, EXTENSION OF TIME: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).

MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 275 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2331 (i), 3597 (ii).

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Continued.*

NORTH CAPE WHISTLING BUOY: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).

"PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE, WORK IN CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 700 (i).

PRINCE COUNTY RY. ACCOMMODATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).

RUSTICO BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 699 (i).

RY. SYSTEM IN P.E.I., EXTENSION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2756 (ii).

ST. LOUIS POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771, 2359 (i).

ST. LOUIS STATION AND PALMER ROAD, &c., MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 699 (i).

STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND, PREPARATION FOR BORINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3711 (ii).

—— SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (i).

—— BOARINGS FOR TUNNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1361 (i).

—— WHARFINGER'S RET. TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 430, 931, 2358 (i), 3714 (ii).

—— HARBOUR WHARF, NAMES, &c., OF VESSELS THAT PAID DUES; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 2406.

WEST POINT WHARF, BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).

WOOD ISLAND, &c., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

PRINCESS PIER AT LÉVIS, TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 575 (i).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 410, 418 (i); 3101 (ii).

—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Montague*) 3190.

PRINTING BUREAU, PLANT.: in Com. of Sup., 3907.

—— REPORTS, BILLS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 309 (i).

PRINTING, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 226 (i).

—— LITHOGRAPHS, &c., COMPANIES VISITING CAN.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2022 (i).

—— MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).

—— PAPER AND BINDING: in Com. of Sup., 3342.

PRIVATE BILLS, PRESENTATION: M. (Mr. *Masson*) Extension of Time, 1175 (i).

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 223 (i).

PRIVILEGE, Ques. of, Controller of Customs (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4709 (ii).

—— MR. SPEAKER'S RULING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2512 (ii).

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com of Sup., 386 (i).

PROHIBITION. *See* "Liquor Traffic."

PROROGATION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4738 (ii).

—— COMNS. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4876 and 4903 (ii).

—— Mess. from His Ex. by Black Rod, 4909 (ii).

Provincial Courts. *See* "JUDGES."

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., EMPLYMT. OF SHORTHAND WRITER: M. (Mr. *Baker*) 1267 (i).

—— IRREGULARITY OF MEETINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 1829 (i), 2943 (ii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS OF CAN.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 181 (i).

—— REF. TO SEL. COM.: M. (Mr. *Baker*) 425 (i).

—— SEL. COM.: List of Members, 226 (i).

Public Employees. *See* "SALARIES."

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3271; neg. (Y. 57, N. 87) 3339 (ii).

PUBLIC HEALTH IN QUARANTINE DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

Public Works Act Amt. B. No. 123 (Mr. *Ouimet*). 1°, 3082; 2° and in Com., 3267; 3°*, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic., c.* 36.)

PUBLIC WORKS DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1829 (i).

—— (INCOME) AMOUNT TO COMPLETE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3712 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2273 (i), 2722, 3102, 3464, 3922, 4276 (ii).

Public Works. *See* "LABOUR."

PUBLIC WORKS:

ALIEN LABOUR IN CAN., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lowell*) 2405 (i).

ALIEN LABOUR LAW, U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 4908 (ii).

ARNPRIOR P. O., CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

BAIE ST. PAUL, PIER, CONTRACTOR FOR BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

BROCKVILLE, CORNWALL AND STRATHROY PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2236 (i).

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2358 (i).

CHARLEBOIS, J. A., CLAIM *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 933 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1970 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 773 (i).

COAL CONTRACTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4709 (ii).

—— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 4817 (ii).

COLE'S WHARF, BEDEQUE, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 3196 (ii).

CONTRACTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Sir. *Richard Cartwright*) 204, 230 (i).

COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3510 (i).

DREDGE "LAVAL," CONTRACT AND TOTAL COST; Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 428 (i).

DREDGE, NEW, CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (ii).

DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD," WORK IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 700 (i).

DRILL HALL, TORONTO, ESTIMATE AND COST: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1362 (i).

GARDNER'S CREEK BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hazen*) 2942 (i).

GILBERT DREDGING AND BLASTING CO., CLAIM *re* CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2509 (ii).

GRAND ETANG WORKS, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3709 (ii).

HALIFAX DEEP WATER TERMINUS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3817 (ii).

—— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 3477 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

HALIFAX DRILL HALL, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3357.

—— FREIGHT SHED, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2727 (ii).

HILTON WHARF, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2362 (i).

HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i).

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).

LIVERPOOL HARBOUR (N.S.) ENGINEER'S SURVEYS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Forbes*) 325 (i).

MAGOG WHARF, PURCHASE OF PROPERTY; Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2572 (ii).

MALLETTE, LOUIS O., AND CONTRACT *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monet*) 2406 (i).

MALLETTE, LOUIS Z., AND LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1180 (i).

MEDICINE HAT GENERAL HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).

MONTREAL CITY P.O., REPAIRS, &c., AMOUNT PAID: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).

—— LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

MORDEN (N.S.) PIER, PETS., &c., RELATING TO: M. for copies* (Mr. *Borden*) 477 (i).

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3514.

NEW WESTMINSTER DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 4461 (ii).

OTTAWA PUBLIC BUILDINGS, PROTECTION AGAINST STORMS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 2573 (ii).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P.O. SITE, PURCHASE: M. for O. C. (Mr. *Martin*) 2376 (i); Remarks 4896 (ii).

PORT ROWAN WHARF, AMOUNT VOTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 2360 (i).

PRINCESS PIER AT LÉVIS, TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 575 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., NON-PERMANENT EMPLOYEES: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS (INCOME) AMOUNT TO COMPLETE; Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3712 (ii).

REGINA JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 3142 (ii).

RICHMOND P.O. AND CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).

RIMOUSKI P.O. AND CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3493 (ii).

ROSSA'S BRIDGE OVER OTONABEE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2261 (i).

RUSTICO BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 699 (i).

ST. JOHN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 2273 (i).

ST. JOHN WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, TOLLS: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i)

ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 4355)ii).

SOUTH INGONISH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i).

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR, TOTAL COST TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier* (3995 (ii).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER. *See* general heading.

TOLLS ON PUBLIC WHARFS, COLLECTION: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).

TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

WEST POINT WHARF, BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).

WOOD ISLAND, &c., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).

YAMASKA DAM AND LOCK, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 1697, 2359 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*

YAMASKA EMBANKMENT AND LOCK: M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *Mignault*) 2359 (ii).

YARMOUTH BAR BREAKWATER, CONDITION, COST, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Flint*) 2023 (i).

[*See* PROVINCES, "SUPPLY," &c.]

QU'APPELLE VALLEY INDIAN RESERVES, LEASE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1550 (i).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).

QUEBEC CITADEL, CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82, 201 (i).

—— FOR CORDWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2726.

QUEBEC:

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1359 (i).

—— NAMES OF OWNERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 322 (i).

BAIE ST. PAUL AND CHICOUTIMI MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

—— PIER, CONTRACTOR FOR BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 3816 (ii).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i); conc., 2672 (ii).

BEDARD, CHARLES, APPNMT. AS REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3993 (ii).

BERTRAND, CHARLES, TOBACCO SEIZED FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480, 697 (i).

BOURASSA, PHILIPPE, SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1970 (i).

CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES REVISING OFFICER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

CHARLEBOIS, J. A., CLAIM *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 933 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 773 (i).

CHENIER, DR., CUSTOMS DUTIES ON MONUMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3712, 4115 (ii).

CULLERS, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC. *See* general heading.

DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).

DYNAMITE FACTORY, LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. (*Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 1080 (i).

FISHING RIGHTS IN MATANE RIVER, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2397 (i).

GENDREAU, TELESPHORE, CHARGES AGAINST, INQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i), 3712 (ii).

GEOFFRION, C. A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR VERCHÈRES: Introduced, 301 (i).

GREAT EASTERN RY. SUBSIDY, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 3359 (ii).

GRENVILLE CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS: Ques. (Mr. *Christie*) 4357 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 3707 (ii).

GILBAULT, EDWD., EMPLYMT. BY PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 305 (i).

GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 427 (i).

I. C. R. *See* general heading.

ILLICIT STILLS, SEIZURES AT L'ISLET: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138 (i), 4115 (ii).

ISLE AUX NOIX, GOVT. LAND SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2510, 3195 (ii).

LACHINE CANAL. *See* general heading.

LAKE ST. JOHN RY. EARNINGS AND EXPENDITURE, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Lavergne* 1974 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

LANDRY, PHILLIPE ROBT., PAPERS RESPECTING: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier*) 2406 (i).

LANGEVIN, H., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DRAINAGE: M. for Car.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023 (i).

LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE ELECTORAL LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

—— APPNMT. of REVISING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

—— CAMP, TENDERS FOR GROCERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3193 (ii).

LEDUC, CHARLES, EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 4356 (ii).

L'ISLET, ILLICIT STILLS, SEIZURES; Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2138, 4115 (ii).

LITTLE RIVER ST. FRANCOIS, CLEARING CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1361 (i).

LOTBINIERE ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 771 (i).

MCDONALD, PATRICK, EMPLYMNT. ON LACHINE CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3994 (ii).

MCGREEVY, THOS., ESQ., MEMBER FOR QUEBEC WEST: Introduced 344 (i).

MAGOG WHARF, DISPOSITION OF VOTE: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1968 (i).

—— PURCHASE OF PROPERTY: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2572 (ii).

MALLETTE, LOUIS Z., AND LANGEVIN BLOCK CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 1180 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monet*) 2406 (i).

MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS, CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 2397 (i).

MEGANTIC, &c., ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).

"MEXICO" SS. WRECK, OFFICIAL INFORMATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4359 (i).

MILITARY RIDING SCHOOL, MONTREAL: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).

MONTMAGNY HARBOUR MASTER, INQUIRY INTO CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2136.

MONTREAL CITY P.O., REPAIRS, &c., AMOUNT PAID: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 343 (i).

—— CUSTOMS COLLECTORSHIP, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 205 (i).

—— P.O., LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

NAPIERVILLE ELECTORAL LISTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

OKA INDIANS, TRANSFER TO MUSKOKA, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Two Mountains*) 1358.

PASSAMAQUODDY BAY, &c., BOUNDARY SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).

PILON, THEORET, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DAMAGES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2023 (i).

PILOT EXAMINERS IN BONAVENTURE COUNTY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 339 (i).

MONTREAL DISTRICT, INSPECTOR, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 482 (i).

PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. *See* general heading.

PRINCESS PIER AT LÉVIS, TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 575 (i).

QUEBEC CITADEL, CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 82, 201 (i).

—— CONTRACT FOR CORDWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2726 (ii).

RICHELIEU RIVER, GOVT. LAND SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Bechard*) 1969 (i).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 2406 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3195 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*

RICHMOND P.O. AND CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).

RIMOUSKI P. O., CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3494 (ii).

RIVIÈRE DU SUD.: in Com. of Sup., 2331 (i).

ST. JEAN AND IBERVILLE REVISING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

ST. JOHN WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, TOLLS: M. for O. C., &c.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).

ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 4355 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE NORTH SHORE TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 3542 (ii).

—— RIVER WATER LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *Reid*) 1549(i).

—— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3464 (ii).

ST. LOUIS, EMMANUEL. *See* general heading.

ST. ROCH DES AULNETS LIGHTSHIP, CORDWOOD CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2726 (ii).

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY; in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).

SEIGNIORY OF SOREL, TENANTS ON GOVT. LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 304 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii).

THIBAULT, CHAS., PAYMENTS TO SUPERANNUATION FUND: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 577 (i).

THREE RIVERS, CONSTRUCTION OF HAY SHED BY C.P.R. CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2358 (i).

—— CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 574 (i).

—— HARBOUR COMMISSION, REVENUE AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 4356 (ii).

—— TOTAL COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3995 (ii).

TOBACCO SEIZURE IN ST. LOUIS DE HA HA: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480 (i).

—— TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480 (i).

TROOPS IN QUEBEC, REDUCTION IN STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2361 (i).

TURENNE, AUZIAS, EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1181 (i).

VALLEYFIELD DRAIN, BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).

VOTERS' LISTS, LOTBINIERE, PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 771 (i).

—— MEGANTIC, &c., PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).

YAMASKA AND ST. OURS LOCKS. *See* general heading.

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. No. 98 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°*, 1584; 2°*, 2293 (i); in Com., 4772; 3°*, 4472 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE (N.S.) INDUSTRIES, RET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2031 (i).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 326 (i).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, ADJNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1355 (i).

—— M. (Mr. *Foster*) 1452 (i).

—— STATE FESTIVITIES: M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn. Hse., 2030 (i).

QUEEN'S PRIZE WINNER AT BISLEY: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 4904 (ii).

RAILWAYS.

ATLANTIC AND SUPERIOR RY. CO., GOVT. GUARANTEE: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 2920 (ii).
CAPE BRETON RY. *See* general heading.
COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S OF N.S.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Flint*) 3202, 4031 (ii).
CATTLE TRAINS AND GOVT. CONDUCTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 207 (i).
DOM. RYS., AID TO BUILDING, &c., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).
C.P.R. *See* general heading.
DUVAR ROAD (P.E.I.) FLAG STATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).
FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S RY. BRIDGE CO., AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 438, 483 (i).
FREIGHT RATES, IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4922 (ii).
HUDSON BAY RY. *See* general heading.
I. C. R. *See* general heading.
LAKE ST. JOHN RY., EARNINGS AND EXPENDITURE, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1974 (i).
LOCOMOTIVE BOILERS, GOVT. INSPECTION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 3199 (ii).
P.E.I. RY. *See* general heading.
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. *See* general heading.
PRINCE COUNTY (P.E.I.) RY. ACCOMMODATION: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Perry*) 2385 (i).
RAILWAYS AND DRAINAGE: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Casey*) 208 (i).
—— VOTED DURING 1894: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).
RY. SYSTEM IN P.E.I., EXTENSION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2756 (ii).
RIVER INHABITANTS, INVERNESS, PETS., &c., FOR FLAG STATION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Cameron*) 343.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. SUBSIDIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 333 (i).
SUBSIDIES, TO RYS., PROVINCES, MILES BUILT, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4007 (ii).
—— PAID, 1894-95: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1079 (i).

RAILWAYS. *See also:*

ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
CALGARY AND LETHBRIDGE RY. AND IRRIGATION CO.
CANADA SOUTHERN RY. CO.
DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO.
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.
INTERNATIONAL RADIAL RY. CO.
JAMES BAY RY. CO.
KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.
LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.
LANGENBURG AND SOUTHERN RY. CO.
LINDSAY, HALIBURTON AND MATTAWA RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
OSHAWA RY. CO.
OTTAWA AND ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.
OTTAWA AND AYLMER RY. AND BRIDGE CO.
QUEBEC, MONTMORENCY AND CHARLEVOIX RY. CO.
RED MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
ST. CLAIR AND ERIE SHIP CANAL CO.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.
SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.
SOUTH SHORE SUBURBAN RY. CO.
TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.
THOUSAND ISLANDS RY. CO.
TRAIL CREEK AND COLUMBIA RY. CO.

RAILWAYS—*Continued.*

TRANS-CANADIAN RY. CO.
WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RY. CO.
WINNIPEG AND GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.
[*See* "COMPANIES."]

Railway Act Amt. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Bryson*). 1°, 269 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. (Security for Passengers, &c.) B. No. 65 (Mr. *Casey*). 1°, 617 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS DEPT: in Com. of Sup., 2723.
—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 515 (i).
RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 224 (i).
—— *See* "SELECT COM. ON RYS."
RAILWAY EMPLOYEES, PAYMENT OF WAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Bryson*) 4359 (ii).

Railway Employees Safety Promotion B. No. 13 (Mr. *Maclean, York*). 1°, 143 (i).

Railway Lands. Drainage on and across, B. No. 40 (Mr. *Casey*). 1°, 477 (i).

RAILWAYS OF THE DOM., AID TO, &c., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).
RAILWAY RATES COMMISSION: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 839 (i).

Railway Return Fare Tickets, Sale, B. No. 10 (Mr. *McLennan*). 1°, 80 (i).

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES, PAID 1894-5: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1079 (i).
—— VOTED DURING 1894: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii).
REBELLION IN N.W.T., SCRIP FOR SCOUTS, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2400 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1082 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 2024 (i).
RECEIVER GENERAL, ASST., ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1360 (i).

Red Mountain Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c*, 60.)

REED, HAYTER, AMTS. PAID, &c. (1879-94) MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 266 (i).
—— RET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1829 (i), 2814.
REID, GEO., TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i).
REGINA JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).
REMEDIAL ORDER: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 578 (i), 3373, 3458, 3716 (ii).

Representation. *See* "N.W.T.", "HOUSE OF COMMONS," "INDEPENDENCE."

REPORTS PRESENTED:

AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Montague*) 229 (i).
AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. *Foster*) 309 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS (Mr. *Montague*) 2570 (ii).
DOMINION POLICE (Mr. *Costigan*) 229 (i).
EXCISE, &c. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 181 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SUMMARY REP. (Mr. *Daly*) 181.
INDIAN AFFAIRS (Mr. *Daly*) 181.
INLAND REVENUES OF THE DOM. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 151 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED—*Continued.*

INS. CO.'S, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENTS (Mr. *Foster*) 1829 (i).
INTERIOR (Mr. *Daly*) 1003 (i).
LIQUOR TRAFFIC, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: (Mr. *Foster*) 208 (i).
MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. *Costigan*) 768 (i) 2569 (ii).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. *Dickey*) 571 (i).
PENITENTIARIES (Mr. *Curran*) 1353 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY (Mr. *Montague*) 3190 (ii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS OF CAN. (Mr. *Foster*) 181 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1829 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Haggart*) 515 (i).
RAILWAY RATES COMMISSION (Mr. *Haggart*) 839 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE (Mr. *Foster*) 4854 (ii).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 181 (i).

RETURNS, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2507 (ii).

——— DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).

Return-Fare Tickets. *See* "RY."

RETURNS: Inquiries for, 1083, 1185 (i), 3818, 3913, 4256, 4358 (ii).

——— RETURN *re* SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1083 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.:

ALIEN LABOUR IN CAN. LEGISLATION RESPECTING*: Mr. *Lovell*, 2405 (i).
"ALPHA" AND "BETA" MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).
ANTICOSTI ISLAND, NAMES OF OWNERS, &c.: Mr. *Forbes*, 322 (i).
BASTIEN, AGENT, AND HURON INDIANS OF LORETTE: Mr. *Laurier*, 1975 (i).
——— LETTER *re* PICARD *vs.* PICARD*: Mr. *Laurier*, 2022 (i).
BATTLEFORD AND SASKATOON (N.W.T.) MAIL CONTRACTS*: Mr. *Martin*, 2024 (i).
B.C. PENITENTIARY, JUSTICE DRAKE'S INSTRUCTIONS: Mr. *Corbould*, 297 (i).
BEHRING SEA, SEIZURE OF SHIPS BY U.S.: Mr. *Laurier*, 215 (i).
BELL BUOY FOR LITTLE HOPE ISLAND: Mr. *Forbes*, 2401 (i).
BINDING TWINE MANUFACTURED AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY*: Mr. *Grieve*, 2022 (i).
BONAVENTURE COUNTY PILOT EXAMINERS: Mr. *Fauvel*, 339 (i).
BOUNTY ON PIG IRON MADE IN CAN.*: Mr. *Edgar*, 2022 (i).
CAN. NEWS CO. AND I.C.R. CONTRACT*: Mr. *Choquette*, 222 (i).
CAN. MUTUAL LIFE ASSOCIATION*: Mr. *Sproule*, 221.
CAPE BRETON RY., POINT TUPPER TERMINUS: Mr. *Cameron*, 340 (i).
CARLING BREWERY PROPERTY, LONDON, PURCHASE, &c.: Mr. *McMullen*, 2022 (i).
CATTLE EMBARGO, GREAT BRITAIN: Mr. *Innes*, 209 (i).
——— Mr. *Mulock*, 296 (i).
CATTLE ENTERING CANADA FROM MONTANA: Mr. *Mulock*, 322 (i).
CATTLE TRANSPORT THROUGH U.S. FOR SHIPMENT: Mr. *McMillan*, 341, 477 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

CHATHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS*: Mr. *Campbell*, 2406 (i).
CHEESE FACTORIES IN P.E.I., MANUFACTURES AND SALES*: Mr. *McMillan*, 2023 (i).
COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S OF N.S.: Mr. *Flint*, 3202, 4031 (ii).
CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS ON THEATRICAL PRINTING, &c.*: Mr. *Rosamond*, 2022 (i).
CUSTOMS RETURNS, WEST KOOTENEY, 1890 to 1894: Mr. *Mara*, 321 (i).
DENOMINATIONAL LAND GRANTS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *Charlton*, 209 (i).
DEPTL. REPORTS, DISTRIBUTION FROM 1888 TO 1895: Mr. *Charlton*, 312 (i).
DOM. AND P.O. SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: Mr. *McMullen*, 332 (ii).
DOM. RYS., AID TO BUILDING, &c., &c.*: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).
DRAINAGE ACROSS RY. LINES: Mr. *Casey*, 208 (i).
"DUART CASTLE," MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.*: Mr. *Davies*, (*P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).
DUVAR ROAD (P.E.I.) FLAG STATION: Mr. *Perry*, 2385 (i).
EMBARGO. *See* "Cattle."
EXPERIMENTAL FARM REPS., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION*: Mr. *Grieve*, 2406 (i).
EXPORT OF SHEEP TO GREAT BRITAIN: Mr. *Featherston*, 2385 (i).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 222 (i).
FISHING RIGHTS IN MATANE RIVER, CONTRACTS: Mr. *Laurier*, 2397 (i).
FLEMING, WM., HOMESTEAD ENTRY IN MAN.: Mr. *Martin*, 2364 (i).
FOSTER, H. S., AND RICHELIEU RIVER LANDS PURCHASE*: Mr. *McMullen*, 2406 (i).
FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S RY. BRIDGE CO., AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &c.: Mr. *McMullen*, 438, 483 (i).
——— RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *McMullen*, 2024 (i).
FRENCH TREATY, ADDITIONAL COR.*: Mr. *Laurier*, 221 (i).
GOVT. INSPECTORS OF WHEAT AT FORT WILLIAM: Mr. *Martin*, 431 (i).
HOMESTEADING LEASED LANDS IN MAN.: Mr. *Martin*, 2364 (i).
HURON INDIANS OF LORETTE AND AGENT BASTIEN: Mr. *Laurier*, 1975 (i).
I. C. R. *See* general heading.
IMMIGRATION. TRANSPORT OF JEW PEDLARS FROM U.S.: Mr. *Martin*, 241 (i).
IMPORTS AND EXPORTS*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 222.
INDIANS, HAYTER REED'S SERVICES IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *McMullen*, 266 (i).
INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE: Mr. *Forbes*, 326 (i).
——— IN WINGHAM*: Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*, 2406 (i).
——— IN CHATHAM*: Mr. *Campbell*, 2406 (i).
JEW PEDLARS, TRANSPORT FROM CHICAGO TO N.W.T.; Mr. *Martin*, 241 (i).
LA JEUNE LORETTE, INDIAN AGENT BASTIEN*: Mr. *Laurier*, 2022 (i).
LAKE ETCHEMIN AND ST. ROSE DE WATFORD MAIL CONTRACT: Mr. *Vaillancourt*, 1974 (i).
LAKE ST. JOHN RY., EARNINGS AND EXPENDITURE, &c.: Mr. *Lavergne*, 1974 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

LAND GRANTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T., DENOMINATIONAL: Mr. *Charlton*, 209 (i).

LANDS UNPATENTED IN MORRIS, MAN.*: Mr. *LaRivière*, 2024 (i).

LANDRY, PHILIPPE ROBT., PAPERS RESPECTING*: Mr. *Langelier*, 2406 (i).

LANGEVIN, H., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DAMAGES*: Mr. *Bergeron*, 2023 (i).

LEGISLATION *re* ALIEN LABOUR IN CAN.*: Mr. *Lovell*, 2405 (i).

LEGISLATION *re* MAN. SCHOOLS, JUDICIAL DECISIONS*: Mr. *Charlton*, 221 (i).

LIQUOR TRAFFIC, ROYAL COMMISSION APPNMT.: Mr. *Casey*, 210 (i)

—— EXPENDITURE*: Mr. *Flint*, 2024 (i).

LITTLE HOPE ISLAND BELL BUOY: Mr. *Forbes*, 2401.

LIVERPOOL (N.S.) HARBOUR ENGINEER'S SURVEYS, &c.: Mr. *Forbes*, 325 (i).

LUMBER CONTRACTS, WELLAND CANAL: Mr. *Lovell*, 2363 (i).

MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Perry*, 275 (i).

MALLETTE, LOUIS Z., AND CONTRACT *re* LANGEVIN BLOCK*: Mr. *Monet*, 2406 (i).

MASSACHUSETTS BENEFIT ASSOCIATION*: Mr. *Sproule*, 221 (i).

MATANE AND STE. ANNE DES MONTS MAIL SERVICE*: Mr. *Joncas*, 2023 (i).

MATANE RIVER FISHING RIGHTS, CONTRACTS: Mr. *Laurier*, 2397 (i).

MEMBERS' INDEMNITY, &c., MONEYS PAID OUTSIDE: Mr. *McMullen*, 331 (i).

MILITARY RIDING SCHOOL, MONTREAL*: Mr. *Tarte*, 343 (i).

MILTON (N.S.) POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Mr. *Forbes*, 324 (i).

MONTANA CATTLE ENTERING CANADA: Mr. *Mulock*, 322 (i).

MONTREAL CITY P.O., REPAIRS, &c., AMOUNT PAID*: Mr. *Tarte*, 343 (i).

MORDEN (N.S.) PIER, PETS., &c.*: Mr. *Borden*, 477 (i).

MORRIS (MAN.) UNPATENTED LANDS IN MUNICIPALITY*: Mr. *LaRivière*, 2024 (i).

NOBLE BROS., FISHING FLEET, SEIZURE AND WITHDRAWAL OF LICENSE: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1979 (i).

"OCEAN STR." CLAIMS AGAINST FOR DAMAGES TO BEAUHARNOIS CANAL*: Mr. *Bergeron*, 2023 (i).

"OLD CARLING BREWERY," PURCHASE OR LEASE BY GOVT.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 2022 (i).

PICARD *vs.* PICARD, LETTER TO INDIAN COMMISSNR. FROM AGENT BASTIEN*: Mr. *Laurier*) 2022 (i).

PIG IRON MADE IN CAN., BOUNTY, &c.*: Mr. *Edgar*, 2022 (i)

PILON, FELIX, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DAMAGES*: Mr. *Bergeron*, 2023 (i).

PILOT EXAMINERS IN BONAVENTURE COUNTY: Mr. *Fauvel*, 339 (i).

POINT TUPPER TERMINUS, CAPE BRETON RY.: Mr. *Cameron*, 340 (i).

PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO., REPS. TO GOVT.*: Mr. *Devlin*, 2405 (i).

PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY., EARNINGS: Mr. *Devlin*, 211 (i).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P.O. SITE, PURCHASE: Mr. *Martin*, 2376 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

PRE-EMPTION LOTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T., PAYMENTS: Mr. *LaRivière*, 3198 (ii).

PRINCE COUNTY (P.E.I.) RY. ACCOMMODATION; Mr. *Perry*, 2385 (ii).

PRINTING, LITHOGRAPHS, &c., COMPANIES VISITING CAN.*: Mr. *Rosamond*, 2022 (i).

PROHIBITION. *See* "Liquor Traffic."

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., NON-PERMANENT EMPLOYEES*: Mr. *Tarte*, 343 (i).

QUEEN'S AND SHELBURNE (N.S.) INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS: Mr. *Forbes*, 326 (i).

RAILWAYS AND DRAINAGE: Mr. *Casey*, 208 (i)

RAILWAYS OF THE DOM., AID TO, &c., &c.*: Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*, 2023 (i).

REED, HAYTER, AMTS. PAID, &c.* (1879-94) MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *McMullen*, 266 (i).

RICHELIEU RIVER, SALE OF LAND ON BANKS*: Mr. *McMullen*, 2406 (i).

RIVER INHABITANTS, INVERNESS, PETS., &c., FOR FLAG STATION*: Mr. *Cameron*, 343 (i).

ROSSLAND (B.C.) CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT.*: Mr. *Mara*, 2022 (i).

RY. SYSTEM IN P.E.I., EXTENSION: Mr. *Macdonald*, (*King's*) 2756 (ii).

ST. JOHN WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, TOLLS*: Mr. *Laurier*, 221 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. SUBSIDY: Mr. *Bergeron*, 333 (i).

ST. PETER'S RESERVE (MAN.) INDIANS, MEMORIALS, &c.: Mr. *Laurier*, 4007 (ii).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL*: Mr. *Lister*, 2023 (i).

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS, GOVT.: Mr. *McMullen*, 332 (i).

SAVINGS BANKS STAMPS*: Mr. *Lépine*, 2024 (i).

SAW-DUST DEPOSITS, RIVERS EXEMPT IN N.S.: Mr. *Forbes*, 1975 (i).

SCHOOL LEGISLATION, MAN. (1890) JUDICIAL DECISIONS, &c.*: Mr. *Charlton*, 221 (i).

SEALERS IN BEHRING SEA, ILLEGAL SEIZURES: Mr. *Laurier*, 215 (i).

SENATE SPEAKER, LAW OFFICERS' OPINION *re* ACT*: Mr. *Mills*, (*Bothwell*) 221 (i).

SHEEP EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN: Mr. *Featherston*, 2385 (i).

SHEIK'S ISLAND DAM*: Mr. *Lister*, 2023 (i).

SHIELDS, FRANCIS, EX-POSTMASTER AT MILTON: Mr. *Forbes*, 324 (i).

SHOW PRINTING, LITHOGRAPHS, &c., DUTIES COLLECTED*: Mr. *Rosamond*, 2022 (i).

SOUTH SHORE AND COAST RY. CO.'S OF N.S.: Mr. *Flint*, 3202, 4031 (ii).

STANLEY, STR., MAIL SERVICE P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Perry*, 275 (i).

STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK, PRINTING, &c.: Mr. *Casey*, 217 (i).

SUBSIDES TO RYS., PROVINCES, MILES SUBSIDIZED, BUILT, &c., &c.: Mr. *McMullen*, 4007 (ii).

SUBSIDIZED SS., CONTRACTS, MAR. PROVS. AND WEST INDIES*: Mr. *Davies*, (*P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

SUPERANNUATION, DATES, APPNMTS. AND RETIRING ALLOWANCES: Mr. *McMullen*, 273 (i).

TARIFF, THE, INCREASED DUTIES ON ITEMS, &c.: Mr. *Edgar*, 335 (i).

—— STATEMENT RESPECTING: Mr. *Amyot*, 265, 266.

"TAYMOUTH CASTLE," MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.*: Mr. *Davies*, (*P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
THEATRICAL PRINTING, CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS*: Mr. *Rosamond*, 2022 (i).
THÉORET, ALEX., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. FOR DAMAGES*: Mr. *Bergeron*, 2023 (i).
THOUSAND ISLANDS, SALES FROM 1874 TO 1894: Mr. *Taylor*, 1974 (i).
TIGNISH HARBOUR WHARF, NAMES, &C., OF VESSELS WHICH PAID DUES*: Mr. *Perry*, 2406 (i).
TOLLS ON PUBLIC WHARFS, COLLECTION*: Mr. *Laurier*, 221 (i).
TREATY WITH FRANCE*, Mr. *Laurier*, 221 (i).
TRENT CANAL, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION*: Mr. *Somerville*, 2406 (i).
UNPATENTED LANDS IN MORRIS, MAN.*: Mr. *La-Rivière*, 2024 (i).
WAR EAGLE GOLD MINING CO., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT ROSSLAND, B.C.: Mr. *Rosamond*, 2022 (i).
WELLAND CANAL, CONTRACT FOR LUMBER: Mr. *Lowell*, 2363 (i).
WEST KOOTENAY CUSTOMS RETURNS, 1890 TO 1894: Mr. *Mara*, 321 (i).
WHEAT INSPECTORS AT FORT WILLIAM, NAMES, &c.: Mr. *Martin*, 431 (i).
WINGHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS*: Mr. *Macdonald* (*Huron*) 2406 (i).
YAMASKA EMBANKMENT AND LOCK*: Mr. *Mignault*, 2406 (i).
YARMOUTH BAR BREAKWATER, CONDITION, COST, &c.*: Mr. *Flint*, 2023 (i).
YEAR-BOOK (STATISTICAL) INSTRUCTIONS *re* PRINTING, &c.: Mr. *Casey*, 217 (i).

Reserve Life. *See* "PERMANENT."

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR APRIL: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 427 (i).

REVISING OFFICERS, AUTHORITY FOR APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 1080 (i).

—— LAPRAIRIE, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930.

RICE IMPORTATIONS, UNCLEANED, &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 1585 (i).

RICHELIEU RIVER, GOVT. LAND SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Bechard*) 1969 (i).

—— SALE OF LANDS ON BANKS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 2406 (i).

RICHMOND P.O. AND CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).

RICHMOND STATION AND DENISON MILLS MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).

RIMOUSKI P.O, CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3494 (ii).

RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS (N.W.T.) DISCARDED RIFLES: Ques. (Mr. *Beryin*) 1078 (i).

RIVER INHABITANTS, INVERNESS, PETS., &c., FOR FLAG STATION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Cameron*) 343 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU SUD: in Com. of Sup., 2331 (i).

Roads and Road Allowances (Man.) Act Amt. B. No. 114 (Mr. *Daly.*) 1°, 2405; 2°* and in Com., 4072; 3°*, 4074 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 30.)

ROBINSON TREATY, ANNUITIES UNDER: in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, COMS. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 3455, 4969 (ii).

ROYAL CANADIAN DRAGOONS. *See* "Sutton, Mr."

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 3781 (ii).

—— BOARD OF VISITORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1588.

—— *See* "Military College."

ROYAL STANDARD, HOISTING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2137 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Dickey*) 2354 (i).

ROSA'S BRIDGE OVER OTONABEE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).

ROSSLAND (B.C.) CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mara*) 2022 (i).

RUSTICO BREAKWATER (P.E.I.) TENDERS FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 699 (i).

STE. ANGELE DE MONNIOR, EX-POSTMASTER, PAPERS *re* DISMISSAL: Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3627.

—— Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3713 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 481 (i).

STE. ROSE DE WATFORD AND LAKE ETCHEMIN MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Vaillancourt.*)
See "Lake Etchemin."

St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co. (*title changed*) **B. No. 60** (Mr. *McKay*). 1°*, 617; 2°*, 736 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 1000; 2°*, 1121 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2725 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 75.)

ST. JEAN AND IBERVILLE REVISING OFFICERS, APPNMT. Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).

ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX *via* YARMOUTH SS. SERVICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3598 (ii).

—— &c., AND WEST INDIES SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3597 (ii).

—— DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS SS. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3599 (ii).

—— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 2273 (i).

St. John River Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 28 (Mr. *McAlister*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1732 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

ST. JOHN (N. B.) RIVER, FISHERY REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 273, 430 (i).

—— IMPROVED NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3359 (i).

—— PILOTAGE COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 2360 (i).

ST. JOHN WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, TOLLS: M. for O. C.'s, &c.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).

ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 4355 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. *Sproule*). 1°*, 617; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 62.)

—— SUBSIDIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 333 (i).

St. Lawrence River North Shore Telegraph Line: in Com. of Sup., 3542 (ii).

—— Water Lots: Ques. (Mr. *Reid*) 1549.

—— Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 3464 (ii).

St. Louis, Emmanuel, Civil Proceedings against: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1588 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3457 (ii).

—— Judge Desnoyers' Decision: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1552 (i).

—— Prosecution *re* Curran Bridge Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 926 (i).

St. Louis (P.E.I.) P.O., Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 771, 2359 (i).

—— Station and Palmer Road, &c. (P.E.I.) Mail Contract: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 699 (i).

St. Rochs des Aulnets Lightship, Cordwood Contract: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2726 (ii).

St. Thomas P.O., Employees Salaries: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 2163, 2357 (i).

St. Peter's Canal, Article in North Sydney *Herald*: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 4580 (ii).

—— Opening for Navigation: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 307 (i).

St. Peter's Reserve (Man.) Indians, Memorials, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 4007 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 1948 (i).

Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Co of Algoma B. No. 33 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; in Com. and 3°*, 1357 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

Salaries of Public Emplcyees Assignment, &c., B. No. 108 (Mr. *Bechard*) 1°, 2136 (i).

Salary Reduction. *See* "Governor General."

Salmon Fishing, B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4839 (ii).

—— N.B., Licenses: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3455 (ii).

Salmon. *See* "Fisheries Act."

Salvation Army, proposed Can. Settlement: Ques. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 426 (i).

—— *See* "Booth, Genl."

San Jose "Scale" Pest in U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 926 (i).

"San Pedro," Removal of Wreck: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 933 (i), 3708 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal and C.P.R. Steamers: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1973 (i).

—— Contractors' Claims for Extras: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 272 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 4707 (ii).

—— M. for O.C. (Mr. *Lister*) 2023 (i).

—— Permanent Staff, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1972 (i).

Savings Banks Deposits, Govt.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 332 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2508 (i).

—— Stamps: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lépine*) 2024 (i).

Saw-dust Deposits, Rivers Exempt in N.S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1975 (i).

Saw-Logs in Georgian Bay and Lake Huron, Towing: prop. Res. (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 2405.

Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i), 3617 (ii).

School Legislation, Man. (1890) Judicial Decisions, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Charlton*) 221 (i).

School Savings Bank incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 59 (Mr. *Pelletier*). 1°*, 616: 2°*, 736 (i).

Sea Fisheries Development, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 839 (i); 2° and in Com., 3086; 3°, 3087 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

Sealers in Behring Sea, Illegal Seizures: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 215 (i).

Seal Fisheries, Compensation for Seizures: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 83 (i).

—— Sealing of Arms and Implements: Ques (Mr. *Prior*) 1083 (i).

—— *See* "Behring Sea."

Seal Island Life-boat Station: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).

Secretan, J. A., Amount Paid by Militia Dept.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3358 (ii).

SECRETARY OF STATE:

Alien Labour in Can., Legislation respecting: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lowell*) 2405 (i).

Civil Service Board of Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 3109 (ii).

—— Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3994 (ii).

—— Payments to Temporary Clerks: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1585 (i).

—— Promotion Examinations, Abolition: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 482 (i).

—— Superannuation of Employees: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 4116 (ii).

—— Temporary Clerks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 3995 (ii).

Deptl. Report, Distribution from 1888 to 1895: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Charlton*) 362 (i).

Durocher's Ballot Paper: in Com. of Sup., 2093 (i).

Electoral Districts, Preparation of Maps: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1081 (i).

—— Lists, Revision: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 576 (i).

Experimental Farm Reps. Printing and Distribution: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Grieve*) 2406 (i).

Printing and Stationery Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 410, 418 (i), 3101, 3907 (ii).

—— Reports, Bills, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 309 (i).

Printing, Miscellaneous: in Com. of Sup., 3905.

Printing, Paper and Binding: in Com. of Sup., 3342 (ii).

Revising Officers, Authority for Appnmt.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1080 (i).

Secretary of State's Dept.: in Com. or Sup., 410 (i), 3101 (ii).

Voters' Lists. *See* general heading.

Security for Passengers, &c. *See* "Ry. Act."

Seditious and Unlawful Associations and Oaths (*Chap. 10, Consolid. Statutes, L. C.*) **B. No. 7** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°, 79 (i); 2°, 2519; in Com. and 3°*, 2520 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)

Seduction. *See* "CRIMINAL CODE."

SEED GRAIN, PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 2661 (ii).

SEIGNIORY OF SOREL, TENANTS ON GOVT. LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 304 (i).

SEL. STANDING COMS.: Lists Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 223 (i).

——— M. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) to add Names, 767 (i).

——— RYS., &c., 8TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3265 (ii).

——— 12TH REP. *re* LAKE MAN. RY., &c., CO.: M. (Mr. *Martin*) to ref. back, 4113 (ii).

——— MEETINGS DURING SITTINGS OF HOUSE: M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3909, 4113 (ii).

——— REDUCTION OF QUORUM: M. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3545 (ii).

——— *See* "COMMITTEES."

SELF-BINDING HARVESTERS, EXPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2734 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 79; 2° neg. (Y. 46, N. 100) 2517 (ii).

Deb. on 2° (Mr. *Mulock*) 483, 495; (Mr. *Foster*) 486; (Mr. *Casey*) 485; (Mr. *Fraser*) 487; (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 488; (Mr. *Edgar*) 488; Mr. (*Ouimet*) 489; (Mr. *Charlton*) 490; (Mr. *Weldon*) 491; (Mr. *Flint*) 492; (Mr. *Denison*) 493; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 494; (Mr. *Laurier*) 495; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 496; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 498; (Mr. *Hazen*) 499; (Mr. *Lister*) 502; (Mr. *McMillan*) 504; (Mr. *McMullen*) 505; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 506; (Mr. *Ingram*) 507; (Mr. *Cameron*) 508; (Mr. *Baird*) 509; (Mr. *Sproule*) 509; (Mr. *Curran*) 512; (Mr. *Bruneau*) 513; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 514 (i).

SENATE SPEAKER, LAW OFFICERS' OPINION *re* ACT: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 221 (i).

——— VACANCIES, &c.: Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3848; neg. (Y. 55, N. 95) 3855 (ii).

——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 482 (i).

——— VACANT SENATORSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 480.

SHEEP EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Featherston*) 2385 (i).

SHEIK'S ISLAND DAMS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3198 (ii),

——— M. for O.C. (Mr. *Lister*) 2023 (i).

SHIELDS, F., EX-POSTMASTER OF MILTON (N.S.) REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 304 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 324 (i).

SHELBURNE, &c., INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2670 (ii).

——— HARBOUR, IRON CAN BUOYS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 700 (i).

SHIPPING REGULATIONS ON THE GREAT LAKES, U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2361 (i).

Shore Line Ry. Co.'s B. No. 119 (Mr. *Gilmor*) 1°*, 3078; M. to place on Order paper for 2°, 3111; 2°*, 3407; in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 63.)

SHOW PRINTING, LITHOGRAPHS, &c., DUTIES COLLECTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2022 (i).

Silver-Lead Smelting Encouragement B. No. 142 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop. and in Com., 3925; 1°* of B., 4065; 2°* and in Com., 4123; recom., 4763; 3°*, 4767 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.* *c.* 7.)

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, DELAY IN OPENING: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2607 (ii).

——— *See* "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

SIX NATION INDIANS AND DEPTL. REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 429 (i).

SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 3519 (ii).

SMITH, HENRY, OF CHATHAM, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 596, 926 (i).

SMITH, WM., GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i).

Societies, Exemption. *See* "INS. ACT."

SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii).

SOUTHAMPTON CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4116 (ii).

SOUTH INGONISH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2304 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 88 (Mr. *White, Shelburne*). 1°*, 1179; 2° objected to, 1310, 1357; 2°*, 1733 (i); M. for Com., 4286; in Com., 4392, 4615, 4771; 3°*, 4771 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

——— CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1078 (i).

——— M. for PETS., &c. (Mr. *Flint*) 3203, 4031 (ii).

South Shore Suburban Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Lachapelle*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548; M. to ref. back to Com., 1689 (i).

SPEAKER. *See* "Senate."

SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE, 2 (i), 4911 (ii).

SPENCER, J. R., GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 2334 (i).

SPIRITS, CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES ON STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 698 (i).

STANDING ORDERS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 226.

"STANLEY," STR., EXPLORATION OF HUDSON'S STRAITS: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 4905 (ii).

——— MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I., AND MAINLAND: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 275 (i).

STATE FUNERALS, LATE HON. THOS. WHITE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3193 (ii).

——— NAMES OF CANADIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2570 (ii).

"STATISTICAL ABSTRACT OF CANADA": in Com. of Sup., 3345 (ii).

——— YEAR-BOOK, PRINTING, &c.: M. for Instructions (Mr. *Casey*) 217 (i).

STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND, PREPARATION FOR BORING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3711 (ii).

——— SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).

STREAMS EXEMPT UNDER FISHERIES ACT (SAW-DUST): Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).

SUBSIDIES, RYS., PROVINCES, MILES BUILT, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4007 (ii).

——— PAID, 1894-95: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1079 (i).

——— VOTED TO RYS. DURING 1894: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).

SUBSIDISED SS. CONTRACTS, MAR. PROVS. AND WEST INDIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023.

——— STEAMERS TO WEST INDIES, &c., RET. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3819 (ii).

SUGAR ISLAND, SALE BY INDIAN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Oriere*) 3359 (ii).

SUGAR, RAW AND REFINED, IMPORTS INTO MONTREAL, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1000 (i).

——— IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1357 (i).

——— IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 307 (i).

——— RAW AND REFINED: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 768 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 922.

Sunday Observance. *See* "LORD'S DAY."

Superannuation Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°, 79; 2°* m., 2152 (i); deb. rsmd. and ruled out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, 2518 (ii).

SUPERANNUATION LIST, DATES OF APPNMTS. AND RETIRING ALLOWANCES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 273 (i).

——— PAYMENTS BY CHARLES THIBAULT: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 577 (i).

——— RETURNS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 774 (i), 3819 (ii).

SUPERANNUATIONS SINCE 1ST JAN., 1895, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3994 (ii).

Superannuation. *See* "CIVIL SERVICE," "JUDGES."

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*, &c.) Ministerial Explanations, 361; (Mr. *Brodeur*, &c.) Delayed Returns, 1885. Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) Free Lumber and Saw-logs, 2031 (i). Remarks (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*, &c.) Auditor Gen.'s Petition, 2408; (Mr. *Laurier*) Lachine Canal, Bridge Contract, 2608; (Mr. *Sutherland*, &c.) Brigade Camp, No. 1 District, 2608; (Mr. *Edgar*) Copyright, 2683. Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) Lachine Canal Bridge Contract, 2815; deb. adj., 2917; rsmd., 2947; neg. (Y. 65, N. 102) 3078. Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*, &c.) Atlantic and Superior Ry., 3123. Amt. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) Public Expenditure, 3271: neg. (Y. 57, N. 87) 3339. Amt. in Com. (Mr. *Denison*) Military College, 3781; neg., 3813. Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Senate Vacancies, &c., 3848; neg. (Y. 55, N. 95) 3855. Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) Behring Sea, Seizure of Sealers by Cruisers, 3856; (Mr. *Allan*) Fisheries of the Great Lakes, 3948. Amt. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) Lieut.-Governors' Tenure of Office, 4256; neg. (Y. 66, N. 105) 4271. Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*, &c.) Minister of Agriculture) 4273. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) Manitoba Schools Question, 4379; neg. (Y. 70, N. 114) 4458. Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) Manitoba Schools Question, 4496-4545; deb. adjd., 4579; rsmd., 4583; neg. 4707 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1895-96, 331 (i); Suppl., 4352 (ii); Suppl., 1894-95, 1539 (i).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

RES. (Mr. *Foster*) FOR COM., 180; MS., 361, 1884, 2031, 2197, 2260, (i) 2409, 2608, 2683, 2815, 3097, 3123, 3271, 3464, 3597, 3674, 3781, 3848, 3948, 4256, 4379, 4496 (ii).

IN COM.: 384, 1910, 1938, 2086, 2197, 2261 (i), 2482, 2611, 2688, 2704, 2815, 3097, 3141, 3150, 3341, 3464, 3597, 3674, 3781, 3874, 3992, 4276, 4301, 4459, 4757 (ii).

RES. IN COM. OF WAYS AND MEANS, 2815, 4862 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. *See* "Justice."

Agriculture:

Agricultural Societies, N.W.T., 3349.
Dairying Interests, 2108, 3350, 4465.
Experimental Farm Bulletin, 3350.
Haras National, 3349.

Arts and Statistics:

Archives, 3342.
"Patent Record," 3345.
Photographic Exhibition at Imp. Institute, 3351.
"Statistical Abstract of Canada," 3345.

Charges of Management:

Asst. Receiver Genl's Office, Charlottetown, 1910.
General Vote, 3106.

Civil Government:

Agriculture Dept., 2721.
Contingencies, Deptl.:
Agriculture, 3102.
Governor Gen's. Sec.'s Office, 1912.
High Commissioner's Office, 3097.
Indian Affairs, 3101.
Militia and Defence, 3100.
Post Office, 3922.
Printing and Stationery, 3101.
Public Works, 3102.
Secretary of State, 3101.
Trade and Commerce, 3106.
Unforeseen Expenses, 1917.
Civil Service Board of Examiners, 3100.
Customs Dept., 1912, 2710.
Finance Dept., 2704.
Fisheries Dept., 2704, 2721.
Geological Survey, 2723.
Governor General's Sec.'s Office, 384.
High Commissioner's Office, 3097.
Indian Affairs, 1918, 1938, 2650.
Inland Revenue Dept., 2718.
Interior Dept., 420, 2688.
Justice Dept., 407, 1913.
Penitentiaries Branch, 408, 1913.
Marine Dept., 2721.
Postmaster General's Dept., 2719.
Computing Interest, 3099.
Printing and Stationery Dept., 410, 418.
Privy Council Office, 386.
Public Works Dept., 2722.
Railways and Canals Dept., 2723.
Secretary of State's Dept., 410.
Trade and Commerce, 1912, 4459.

Collection of Revenues: 2270, 2502, 4276.

Adulteration of Food:
General Vote, 4308.
Canals:
Beauharnois:
Leger, Pierre, gratuity to widow, 2270.
Cornwall:
Dawson, F., retiring allowance, 2272.
Galops:
Mullen, John, lockman, 2270.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues—Continued.
Canals—*Continued.*
Lachine:
Maintenance and lighting Mill St., 2273.
Welland:
McClory and Edgraft, retiring allowances, 2272.
Williamsburg:
Reid, Geo., travelling expenses, 2270.
Cowan, Miles, allowance for extra services, 2502.
Culling Timber, 4282, 4462.
Excise. 4279.
Methylated Spirits, 4281.
Post Office, 2505, 4312.
Public Works, 4276.
Toronto Ry. Co., legal expenses, 2502.
Weights and Measures, &c.:
Inspection, 4285, 4301.
Werner, Levi, compensation, 2503.
Dominion Police: General Vote, 3141.
Dominion Lands: General Vote, 4317.
Fisheries:
Fishing Bounty Frauds, legal expenses, 2335.
Overseers and Guardians, N.S., salaries, &c., 3618.
——— B.C., salaries, &c., 3620.
——— Man., salaries, &c., 3619.
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 3621.
Geological Survey:
Artesian borings in N.W.T., 2488.
Government of N. W. T.: General Vote, 3905.
Indians:
British Columbia:
Medical attendance, &c., 2487.
Salaries, &c., 3874.
Manitoba and North-west Territories, 3814.
New Brunswick: salaries, &c., 3813.
Nova Scotia: Medical attendance, &c., 2484.
Ontario and Quebec:
Robinson Treaty, Annuities under, 2483.
Justice, Administration of:
British Columbia:
Chief Justices Crease and Davie, 1947.
Circuit Allowances, 3107.
Official Arbitrators, 3106.
Ontario:
Travelling Expenses, High Court Judges, 1947, 3107.
Quebec:
Chief Justice Casault, 1948.
Supreme Court of Can., 3108.
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Durocher's Ballot Slip, 2093.
Printing, Paper and Binding, 3342.
Sessional Indemnity, Senator Burns, 4460.
——— Mr. Sutherland, M.P., 2091.
———Senator Sutherland, 2105, 2669.
Voters' Lists, Revision, 1949, 2086, 3341.
Library:
Officers' salaries, 2341.
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Maintenance and Repairs to Lights, &c., 3617.
Smith, Wm., Gratuity to widow, 2334.
Militia:
Permanent Corps, Pay and Allowances, 2197, 3177.
Civil Employees, salaries, &c., 3178.
Military Property, Stores, &c., 3178.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Militia—Continued.
Clothing and Necessaries, 3185.
Dom. Cartridge Factory, 3189
Drill, City Corps and Field Batteries, 4460.
Esquimalt Defences, 3189.
Miscellaneous, 3188.
Military College, 3781.
Warlike and other Stores, 3184.
Mounted Police, 2482.
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Allan ss. Co., Ocean Mail Service, 3600.
Baddeck, Grand Narrows, &c., 3598.
Bay of Fundy ss. Co.'s services, 2332.
Furness Line, ss. services, 2332.
Gaspé Basin, &c., and Dalhousie, N.B., 3598.
McDonald, Roderick, balance of Account, 2333.
Pictou, N.S., Murray Harbour, Georgetown, &c., P.E.I., 3599.
Port Mulgrave, Arichat, &c., 3600.
Prince Edward Island and Mainland, 2331.
P.E.I. and Mainland, season of 1895, 3597.
St. John, &c., and West Indies, 3597.
St. John and Halifax *via* Yarmouth, &c., 3598.
St. John, Digby and Annapolis, 3599.
Yarmouth ss. Co.'s services, 2332.
Miscellaneous:
Academy of Arts, 3907.
Banff Hot Springs Reservation, 3907.
Canada Temperance Act, Expenditure, 3906.
Colonial Conference, balance of Expenses, 2489.
Commutation in Lieu of remission of Duties, 3906.
Fabre, Mr., Salary and Contingencies, 3906.
Liquor Traffic Commission, further Expenditure, 2491, 2611; conc., 2673.
Medicine Hat General Hospital, 2499.
Miscellaneous Printing, 3905.
Passamaquoddy Bay, &c., Boundary Survey, 3908.
Printing Bureau Plant, 3907.
Straits of Northumberland, Survey, 3908.
Thompson, late Sir John S. D., Funeral Expenses, 2500, 2632; conc., 2673.
Thompson, Lady, contribution to Fund, 2501; conc., 2682.
Ocean and River Service:
Masters and Mates, Examination, 3615.
Seal Island Life-boat Station, 3616.
Tidal Service, 3616.
Winter Mail Service, 2333.
Open Account:
Seed Grain, purchase and distribution, 2661.
Post Office. *See* "Collection of Revenues."
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 2669.
Justice Drake's services, 1948, 2669.
Dorchester, 3176.
Kingston, 3141.
Manitoba, 3141.
Regina Jail, 3141.
St. Vincent de Paul, 1948.
Gibson, W. W., Salary, 1948.
Public Works—Capital:*
Harbours and Rivers:
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 3464.
Kaministiquia River, 3465.

* *See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
New Westminster Drill Shed, 4461.
Vancouver Public Buildings, 2302.
Victoria Drill Hall and P. O., 3509.
Manitoba:
Brandon Industrial School, 2298; conc., 2672.
New Brunswick:
Marysville P.O., 3489, 3922.
St. John Custom House, 2273.
North-west Territories, 3508.
Nova Scotia:
Halifax Drill Hall, 3477.
Ontario:
Arnprior P. O. and Custom House, &c., 3505.
Brockville, Cornwall and Strathroy Public Buildings, 2296.
Dom. Reformatory, 3505.
Quebec:
Montreal P. O., Lighting, 2293.
Richmond P. O. and Custom House, 3402.
Rimouski P. O. and Custom House, &c., 3494.
Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c.:
Rideau Hall, Renewals, &c., Lighting Public Buildings, &c., 2302.
Dredging:
Maritime Provinces, 3536.
Experimental Farms, 3510.
Harbours and Rivers generally:
Maritime Provinces, Repairs, &c., 2305.
Harbours and Rivers.
British Columbia:
Fraser River Channel, 3533.
Nova Scotia:
South Ingonish Wharf, 2304.
Nova Scotia:
Cow Bay Breakwater, 3510.
New Brunswick;
Hopewell Cape Wharf, 2304.
Negro Point Breakwater, 3514.
Ontario:
General Vote, 3525.
Prince Edward Island:
Wood Island, &c., Breakwaters, 3512.
Quebec:
Rivière du Sud, 2331.
Generally, 3514.
Slides and Booms, 3519.
Telegraphs:
British Columbia, 3542.
St. Lawrence North Shore Line, 3542.
Quarantine:
Organized Districts, salaries, 3354.
Public Health in Quarantine Districts, 3354.
Tracadie Lazaretto, 3354.
Railways and Canals—Capital.*
Canals:
Cornwall, 3703.
Grenville, 3707.
Sault Ste. Marie, 4707.
Rapide Plat, 3703.
Galops, 3704.
Soulanges, 3699.

* *See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Railways and Canals—Capital—Continued.
Trent, 3705.
Railways:
Canadian Pacific, 3674.
Construction, Award, 3674.
Intercolonial, 3682.
Halifax, increased accommodation, &c., 3682.
Railways and Canal—Income.
Canals:
Beauharnois, 2257; conc., 2672.
Chambly, Hurteau, Yule and Riddell's accounts, 2261.
Cornwall, Govt. Sewer, Telephone, &c., 2262.
Farran's Point, 2264; conc., 2672.
Lachine, 2229; Commission *re* Bridge, salaries, &c., 2229.
Rideau, Land Damages, 2256.
Trent, Roser's Bridge over Otonabee River, 2265.
Welland Canal, North Cayuga Township's claim, 2266.
Scientific Institutions, 2334, 3617.
Hydrographic Surveys, 3617.
Trade and Commerce: 1912 (i), 3105, 4347, 4459.

CONCURRENCE:
Brandon Industrial School, 2672.
Farran's Point Canal, 2672.
Golden City, Refund of Fines, 2334.
Hydrographic Surveys, 3617.
Liquor Traffic Commission, further Expenditure, 2673.
Spencer, J. R., gratuity to widow, 2334.
Thompson, late Sir J. S. D., Funeral Expenses, 2673.
Thompson, Lady, contribution to Fund, 2682.
Valleyfield Drain, Beauharnois Canal, 2672.

Supply B. No. 125 (Mr. *Foster*). Res., 2815; 1°* of B., 3085; 2°*, 3111; 3°*, 3266 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

Supply B. No. 149 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., 4862; 1°* of B., 4863; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4877 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

SUPREME COURT OF CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3108 (ii).
SUTHERLAND, M.P., MR., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i).
—— SENATOR: in Com. of Sup., 2105 (i).
SUTTON, MR., APPNMT. IN ROYAL CAN. DRAGOONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1972 (i), 2919 (ii).
TARIFF, THE, CHANGES: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4847 (ii).
—— *See* "BUDGET," "WAYS AND MEANS."
—— INCREASED DUTIES ON ITEMS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 335 (i).
—— STATEMENTS RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 265 (i).
TAY CANAL, REVENUE AND MAINTENANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 230 (i).
"TAYMOUTH CASTLE," MANIFESTS OF CARGOES, SUBSIDIES EARNED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2023 (i).

Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. No. 70 (Mr. *McAlister*). 1°*, 839; 2°*, 919; in Com. and 3°*, 2292 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, c. 65.)

Temperance Act. *See* "CAN."

THEATRICAL PRINTING, CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2022 (i).
THIBAULT, ALPHONSE, TOBACCO SEIZED FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480 (i).
——— PAYMENTS TO SUPERANNUATION FUND: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 577 (i).
THOMPSON, LADY, CONTRIBUTION TO NATIONAL FUND: in Com. of Sup., 2501, 2682 (ii).
THOMPSON, LATE SIR J. S. D., FUNERAL EXPENSES, DETAILS: Ques. (Mr. *McDonald, Huron*) 2922 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2500, 2632; conc., 2673 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 2726 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2516 (ii).
——— *See* "DIVISIONS."
Thousand Islands Ry. Co.'s B. No. 89 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1179; 2°*, 1310 (i); wthdn., 2570.
THOUSAND ISLANDS, RESERVATIONS FOR NATIONAL PARK: prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3997 (ii).
——— SALES FROM 1874 TO 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1974 (i).
THREE RIVERS, CONSTRUCTION OF HAY SHED BY C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2358 (i).
——— CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 574 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners (*Chap.* 10, *Statutes* 1892) **Amt. B. No. 113** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 2259; 2°* and in Com., 3270 (i); 3°*, 3458 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)
THREE RIVERS, HARBOUR COMMISSION, REVENUE AND EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 4356 (ii).
——— TOTAL COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3995 (ii).
TIDAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER (P.E.I.) REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 1361 (i).
——— WHARFINGER'S RET.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2358 (i), 3714 (ii).
——— TO DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 931 (i).
——— NAMES, &C., OF VESSELS WHICH PAID DUES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 2406 (i).
——— WHARFINGER'S COLLECTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 430 (i).
TOBACCO, CAN., DUTY COLLECTED IN 1894, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard, Two Mountains*) 1587 (i).
——— PROTECTION AGAINST FOREIGN LEAF: Remarks (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 2030 (i).
——— ISLE VERTE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 697 (i).
——— SEIZURE IN ST. LOUIS DE HA HA: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480 (i).
——— SEIZURE IN TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 480 (i).
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY., DOM. BONUS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2941 (ii).
——— OPENING FOR TRAFFIC: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2755 (ii).
TOLLS ON PUBLIC WHARFS, COLLECTION: M. for O. C., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).
TORONTO DRILL HALL, ESTIMATE AND COST: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1383 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 425; 2°*, 548 (i); in Com., 3230, 3407, 3948; recom., 4030, 4154; 3° m., 4154; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) 4154; neg. (Y. 39, N. 113) 4163; 3°, 4164 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)
TORONTO RY. CO., LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2502 (ii).
TOWNSHIP 16, RANGE 16-W., NEW SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2138 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
TRADE AND COMMERCE, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4054 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 3105, 4347, 4459 (ii).
——— *See* "CUSTOMS," &c.
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: Presented (Mr. *Wallace*) 86 (i).
Trade Marks. *See* "CRIMINAL CODE."
Trade Restraint. *See* "CONSPIRACIES, &c."
Trail Creek and Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 616; 2°*, 736; in Com. and 3°*, 1733 (i). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 67.)
TRANS-ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE, FAST: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 305 (i).
Trans-Canadian Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Sir *James Grant*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 572 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4772 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, HIGH COURT JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 1947 (i), 3107 (ii).
Treaty with France B. No. 126 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 3085; 2°, 3558; in Com., 3564; 3° m. 3820; 3° on div., 3848 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)
TREATY WITH FRANCE, IMPORTATION OF GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1968 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 221 (i).
——— PRIVILEGES TO FOREIGN POWERS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1697 (i).
——— RATIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3356 (ii).
TRENT CANAL, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: M. for copies * (Mr. *Somerville*) 2406 (i).
——— CONTRACTS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 204 (i).
——— COST SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 481 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3705 (ii).
TROIS PISTOLES POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4708 (ii).
TROOPS FOR ENGLAND, HIGH COMMISSIONERS PUBLIC STATEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1180 (i).
TROOPS IN QUEBEC, REDUCTION IN STRENGTH: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2361 (i).
TURENNE, AUZIAS, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1181 (i).
UNFORESEEN EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).
Union Labels, &c. *See* "CRIMINAL CODE."
Unlawful Associations. *See* "SEDITIOUS."
UNPATENTED LANDS IN MORRIS, MAN.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2024 (i).

U.S. Customs Board of Appraisers: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1826 (i).
——— Shipping Regulations on the Great Lakes: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2361 (i).
Vacancies in the Senate: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 482 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 480 (i).
——— House of Commons: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
Vacancy in the Cabinet: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 4581.
Valleyfield Drain, Beauharnois Canal: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
——— Repairs: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2509 (ii).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2302.
Vanluven, Peter, Declarations *re* Dominion Bank: Ques. (Mr. *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).
Ventilation of the Chamber: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1827 (i).
Victoria Drill Hall and P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).
Voters' Lists (1895) B. No. 69 (Mr. *Montague*). 1°, 768 (i); 2° m., 3628; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3636; neg. (Y. 39, N. 82) 3656; 2° and in Com., 3657; 3°*, 3920 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)
Volunteers' Long Service Medals: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*, &c.) 4906 (ii).
Voters' Lists for Wright, Ottawa Co.: Remarks (Mr. *Devlin*) 2351 (i).
——— Outside Printing, Amount Paid: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 308 (i).
——— Cost of Revision: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 83, 229.
——— Revision: in Com. of Sup., 1949, 2086 (i), 3341 (ii).
——— Megantic, &c., Printing: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 769 (i).
——— Lotbinière, Printing: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 771 (i).
——— Revision: Correction (Mr. *Montague*) 1002 (i).
——— Laprairie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 930 (i).
——— Revision: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 576 (i).
Voting by Employees. *See* "Dom."
Wakefield and Rupert Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 1585 (i).
War Eagle Gold Mining Co. Cor. *re* Customs Collector at Rossland, B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2022 (i).
Warlike and Other Stores: in Com. of Sup., 3184.
Warner, Levi, Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 2503 (ii).
Watters, T. J., Offence and Punishment: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 920 (i).
WAYS AND MEANS: Res. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 180 (i).
——— Res. in Com., 2815, 4862 (ii).
——— M. for Com., 4786, 4819 (ii).
——— Tariff Changes, in Com., 4847 (ii).
——— *See* "Budget," "Supply."
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Wilson*). 1°, 80 (i).
Weights and Measures and Gas, Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 181 (i.)
——— in Com. of Sup., 2503, 4285, 4301 (ii).
Weir, Mr., of Keene, Pension: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1453 (i).
Welland Canal, Contract for Lumber: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lowell*) 2363 (i).
West Kootenay Customs Returns, 1899 to 1894: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 321 (i).
West Rideau Lake Dam, Land Damages: Ques. (Mr *Dawson*) 3996 (ii).
West Point (P.E.I.) Wharf, Rebuilding: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 206 (i).
Wheat Inspectors at Fort William, Names, &c., M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 431 (i).
Wheat Profits: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2051 (i).
Winding-up Act Amt. B. No. 144 (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*). 1°, 4353; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4751 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)
Windsor and Annapolis Ry. Co.'s B. No. 49 (Mr. *Stairs*). 1°*, 515; 2°*, 573 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2698 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)
Wingham Industrial Establishments: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2406 (i).
Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. Co., O.C. *re* Grant: Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 928 (i).
Winnipeg City Water Power revival Acts Amt. B. No. 132 (Mr. *Martin*). 1°*, 3266; 2°*, 3407; in Com. and 3°*, 3947 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)
Winnipeg Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 150 (Mr. *Haggart*). Res. prop., 4819; M. for Com., 4863; in Com., 4869; conc. and 1°* of B., 4876; 2° m., 4877; 2° and in Com., 4890; 3°*, 4893 (ii). (58-59 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)
Wood Island, &c., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).
World's Fair, Can. Commissioners' Expenses: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2727 (ii).
——— Can. Employees, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3710 (ii).
——— Expenses: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1361 (i).
——— Medals and Diplomas: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 84 (i).
——— Mr. Larke's Services: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 205 (i).
Yamaska Embankment and Lock: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Mignault*) 2406. (i).
——— and St. Our's Locks, Charges on Vessels: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2735 (ii).
——— River Obstructions, Removal: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 924 (i).
——— Lock and Dam, Cost of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 1697 (i).
——— Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2359 (i).
Yarmouth Bar Breakwater, Condition, Cost, &c.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Flint*) 2023 (i).
Yarmouth SS. Co.'s Service: in Com. of Sup., 2332.
Year-Book (Statistical) Instructions *re* Printing, &c.: M. for copy (Mr. *Casey*) 217 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3345 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE

ORDER :

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS IN COM.: Amt. prop. by Mr. *McLean* (*York*) objected to by Mr. *Tisdale* and Rule read, 3236; ruled by Mr. *Deputy Speaker* out of Order, no notice having been given, 3237 (ii).

ATTACKS ON PUBLIC OFFICIALS objected to by Mr. *Weldon* and an appeal to the Chair; Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 799.

BREACH OF PARLIAMENTARY RULES: Member called to Order by Mr. *Speaker* for using unparliamentary language; a withdrawal requested, 2944 (ii).

COAST AND SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.: Amt. prop. by Mr. *Gillies* declared out of Order by Mr. *Speaker*, the subject not being relevant to original motion, 3383 (ii).

INTERRUPTIONS BY MEMBERS AND PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*), 1029 (i).

MEMBER'S REMARKS AS TO VERACITY CHALLENGED BY MR. CASEY: Mr. *Speaker* appealed to, who asked withdrawal of same, 1266 (i).

MEMBER'S REMARKS CHALLENGED BY Mr. *Ives*, 826 (i).

MEMBER'S REMARKS CHECKED BY MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. *Perry*) 517; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1875; (Mr. *Brodeur*) &c., 1884 (i); (Mr. *Lister*) 2943; (Mr. *Gillies*) 3383; (Mr. *Cameron*) 3423; (Mr. *Casey*) 3622; (Mr. *Bowers*) 3671; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4360; (Mr. *McLennan* 4748 (ii).

MEMBER'S REMARKS STATED TO BE UNTRUE BY AN HON. MEMBER: the latter was called to Order by Mr. *Speaker* and asked to withdraw the same; wthdn., 2380 (ii).

MOTIONS TO ADJN. HOUSE AN ABUSE OF PRIVILEGE: Mr. *Speaker's* attention called by Mr. *Daly* to a previous ruling, 1831; Remarks by Mr. *Speaker*, 1832 (i).

OBJECTION TAKEN BY MR. FOSTER TO MEMBER asking Mr. Speaker to reconsider his Ruling *re* Unparliamentary Language: Rules of the House quoted and further remarks by Mr. *Speaker*, 2513, 2516 (ii).

ORDERS OF THE DAY: Making speeches before being called objected to by Mr. *Ives*; Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 345 (i).

REFERENCE TO PREVIOUS DEBATE objected to by Mr. *McCarthy*, 813; sustained (Mr. *Speaker*) 814 (i).

REFERENCE TO PROCEEDINGS IN A COM.: objection (Mr. *Martin*) declared out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 2839 (ii).

QUESTIONS (LENGTHY) ON ORDER PAPER: Mr. *Speaker's* attention drawn to the matter by Mr. *Foster*, 2733; Remarks by Mr. *Speaker* and Ques. ruled in Order, 2734 (ii).

ORDER—*Continued.*

QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS: Par. in Peterborough *Examiner re* Govt. Pensioners; prop. Ques. by Mr. *Landerkin* checked by Mr. *Speaker* as not being in accordance with the Rules of Parlt.; Rule and May quoted, 924; further authorities quoted, 1882 (i).

QUOTING NEWSPAPER ARTICLES: Member's attention called by Mr. *Speaker* to the Rule of the House pertaining to such matters, 4814 (ii).

UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: (Mr. *Daly*) 821; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 844; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1108; (Mr. *Martin*) 1834; (Mr. *Foster*) 1275; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1906; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2061; (Mr. *Charlton*) 2070; (Mr. *Martin*) 2380 (i); (Mr. *Lister*) 2944, 4488; (Mr. *Davin*) 3001; (Mr. *Casey*) 4491 (ii).

PRIVILEGE :

CARRIAGE OF MAILS IN P. E. I.: Personal Explanation *re* Paragraph in *Mail-Empire* (Mr. *Perry*) 517 (i).

CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS, AND GOVT. POLICY; M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to adjn. House, 4709; Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 4730 (ii).

FREE LUMBER AND SAW LOGS: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2031 (i).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P.O. SITE: Mr. *Speaker* asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg to reconsider his decision *re* Unparliamentary language, 2512 (ii).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Statement in *Canada Farmer's Sun* respecting Mr. *Taylor's* actions in the House, 4813 (ii).

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS: Omissions in division lists, attention of House called to the fact by Mr. *Boyd* whose name did not appear in two divisions, 4358 (ii).

PROCEDURE :

ADJOURNED DEBATE: prop. M. of Mr. *Foster* to to make adjd. deb. on Com. of Sup. the first Order of the Day at the next sitting of the House; objection taken by Mr. *McCarthy* and Mr. *Speaker* appealed to as to its being in Order or not; Ruling, 2918 (ii).

ADJNMT. OF THE HOUSE: Member's attention drawn by Mr. Speaker to the fact that a Motion for Adjnmt. having been negatived and nothing intervening there can be no other motion for adjnmt. made; Rule read, 359 (i).

ADJNMT. OF THE HOUSE: Ms.: Remarks by Mr. *Speaker* and authorities quoted, 1293 (i).

PROCEDURE—*Continued.*

ADJNMT. OF THE HOUSE: Remarks by Mr. *Speaker* to the effect that any Member has a right to bring before the House a matter of urgency on M. to adjourn, but the debate should be confined to the subject matter of urgency, &c., 803 (i).

AMT. TO REPEAL FRANCHISE ACT made by Mr. *Mulock* to 2° of B. 69 (Voters Lists) objected to by Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*, 3637; May quoted, 3640; Mr. *Speaker* stated that if Amt. carried it would be an instruction to Govt. to bring in a B. to repeal the Franchise Act; Mr. Speaker Brand quoted; Amt. ruled in Order by Mr. *Speaker* 3640 (ii).

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SITTINGS OF HOUSE: On M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) objection taken by Mr. *Edgar* no notice having been given, 3909; objected to also by Mr. *Casey*, 3911; objections sustained by Mr. *Speaker*, 3912 (ii).

PROCEDURE—*Continued.*

MOVING AN AMT: Members having spoken cannot move an Amt., but some other Member can do so (Mr. *Speaker*) 4361 (ii)

ON M. FOR THE HOUSE TO GO INTO COM. ON A GOVT. RES. ON A CERTAIN DAY: Members reminded by Mr. *Speaker* that no discussion can take place under the motion but can take place upon motion for Com. of the Whole, 1884 (i).

REDUCTION OF QUORUM OF SEL. COM.: M. by Mr. *Weldon*, objected to by Mr. *Edgar*, no notice having been given, 3545; Remarks by Mr. *Speaker* and Bourinot quoted, 3550, 3553; M. declared in Order, 3553 (ii).

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMT. B. 6: On 2° Mr. *Speaker* ruled that the B. involving a charge upon the public revenue should not be introduced by a private Member, 2159; would be introduced by authority of the Crown and by resolution, 2518 (ii).

581